

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-EIGHTH YEAR

1688th MEETING: 30 JANUARY 1973

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1688)	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-EIGHTH MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 30 January 1973, at 3 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/1688)

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 3.25 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: In accordance with the decision taken yesterday [1687th meeting], I propose, if there is no objection, to invite the representative of Zambia to take a place at the Council table.

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

2. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the same meeting, I propose now, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representatives of Ghana, Morocco, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zaire, Chile, Algeria, Senegal, Egypt and Somalia to take the places reserved for them in the Council chamber in order to participate in the discussion under the terms of Article 31 of the Charter without the right to vote. 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. Díaz 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. Ipoto Eyebu Bakand'asi (Zaire) took the places reserved for them in the Council chamber.

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

4. Mr. DIAZ CASANUEVA (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, I thank you and the members of the Security Council for your kindness in allowing me to participate in a debate of such importance. I also take this opportunity to greet you, as an international authority, and your people, with which Chile enjoys ties of fraternity and close co-operation.

5. The Government and people of Chile wish to express their support of and solidarity with the Government and people of Zambia, who at this time are suffering from the aggression perpetrated by the colony of Rhodesia, allied as it is with the racist and colonialist régime of South Africa. This aggression threatens the security, the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of Zambia and is intended to blockade and strangle it economically. This constitutes a crime against international peace and security and gives rise to indignation not only in Africa but in all parts of the world, even in the most distant areas, such as Chile, where we follow with enthusiasm and admiration the course of the struggle of the African peoples for their freedom, independence and human rights. Chile has always admired the efforts of Zambia to speed up its progress and to associate itself with all undertakings of peace and co-operation; with that country we enjoy ties of friendship and active political, economic and cultural exchanges.

6. The régimes repudiated by the international community, such as those of Rhodesia and South Africa, blame

Zambia for giving asylum to the freedom fighters. A country like Chile, a member of the Latin American community of nations, a community which possesses a long and very strong legal tradition of granting asylum, must obviously be aware of and express its full understanding of the generous attitude of Zambia in giving asylum to persecuted patriots, rescuing them from torture and death. The world as a whole is aware of the suffering, the imprisonment, the persecution, the assassinations and the sub-human conditions in which millions of men, women and children languish solely because they are black. Zambia is a country that is fulfilling the doctrines and obeying the resolutions of the United Nations despite lurking dangers. It is a country geopolitically surrounded by self-aggrandizing régimes that flout the agreements of the United Nations. Therefore this meeting of the Security Council is quite justified. The Council has dealt with this subject previously, and once again we have had brought home to us the obvious fact that colonialism, racism, imperialism and the international terrorism of Rhodesia and South Africa constitute a constant danger to international peace and security and call for decisions that will safeguard the southern part of Africa from the assaults against it perpetrated with impunity and without regard for the principles of the Charter.

7. The Salisbury Government is a spurious Government which has obtained not the recognition but rather the rejection of the entire international community. Paradoxically, it is a rebellious colony which has assumed a false sovereignty, a colony where the very negative elements of colonialism have become even stronger. I speak not of freedom or independence on a democratic and equal basis, for that represents true sovereignty. We are dealing with a white minority amounting to five per cent of the population of Rhodesia which ignores the principles of international law and the most elementary human rights in order to carry out the vile exploitation of millions of Africans.

8. The sanctions approved against the Salisbury régime either have not been complied with or have not been effective. The Security Council must consider the failure of the measures it has thus far adopted against a régime which now does not limit itself to enslaving its own people but attacks a neighbouring country. We must resort to more effective means to liberate the people of Zimbabwe and to defend peoples like those of Zambia who are sacrificing themselves for the principles and resolutions of the United Nations.

9. South Africa is another country that awakens the indignation of the international community—indignation that has grown, particularly since the Sharpeville massacre in 1960 and, on the international legal level, since Pretoria's rejection of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice with regard to the case of Namibia.¹ South Africa will go down in history as the creator and perpetrator of a doctrine and a national system entitled *apartheid*. But here again boycott and sanctions have had no effect. On the contrary, one way or another South

Africa is helped, and it has now become a veritable Power. We know that for the Africans the situation in South Africa has worsened. We have tried to take peaceful action in order to convince South Africa that its policy is shameful. But thus far all has been in vain. Pretoria is still intransigent and defiant, and we are all increasingly frustrated.

10. We are dealing with two régimes here—Rhodesia and South Africa—which closely co-operate with one another, which grow, develop and become stronger. They have expanded their foreign trade and their economies for the benefit of ruling minorities backed by strong military assistance. Both régimes constitute a powerful bastion and an as yet insurmountable obstacle to the liquidation of colonialism in southern Africa. The policies of Rhodesia and South Africa are a mixture of colonialism, racism, imperialism, expansionism, international terrorism, and so on, all constituting the most obvious and dangerous re-emergence of neo-nazism in the world. In this part of the world, all the factors of oppression, exploitation and hegemony that gave rise to the Second World War flourish and grow stronger and the situation is more serious because the neo-Nazi fortress in southern Africa is surrounded by weak and poor countries that have recently emerged into sovereign life.

11. Because of the basic doctrines that inspire them, the mere existence of the Rhodesian and South African régimes constitutes a threat to international peace and security. Their actions against countries such as Zambia flagrantly violate Article I of the Charter and fall directly within the scope of Chapter VIII of that document. Rhodesia and South Africa endanger peace and security in the region, and this threat will become all the more serious as the efforts of the indigenous peoples towards freedom and independence grow.

12. Purely and simply because it does not share the doctrinary aberrations of Rhodesia and South Africa, and refuses to bow to their dictates, a neighbouring country like Zambia is in imminent danger, and its very existence is constantly threatened. Furthermore, Zambia is at the very heart of southern Africa. On its frontiers lie the most important colonies of Africa, but it has had the heroic courage fully to assume its responsibilities in facing the problems of the unity and independence of African peoples.

13. The Republic of Zambia is a non-aligned nation, and therefore makes peace and co-operation among peoples the basic tenet of its policies. Zambia deserves not only our sympathy and understanding, but also the protection of the international community through its highest body, this Security Council. But protection cannot be expressed by words alone: it must be summed up in measures of political prophylaxis which will preserve Zambia from anything that would weaken or threaten it.

14. Both Rhodesia and South Africa have accused Zambia of helping the "terrorists"—that is, those who heroically fight for freedom and independence. However, General Assembly resolution 3034 (XXVII), on measures to prevent international terrorism, reaffirms the legitimacy of the struggle of peoples against colonial and racist régimes, in

¹ *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council resolution 276 (1970)*, Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 16.

particular the struggle of national liberation movements, and condemns the continuation of repressive and terrorist acts by colonial, racist and alien régimes in denying peoples their legitimate right to self-determination and independence and other human rights and fundamental freedoms.

15. It is perfectly obvious, in the light of that resolution, that we are in fact faced with the brutal and ruthless international terrorism of Rhodesia and South Africa—terrorism based on a powerful and aggressive racist and military economic system. It is therefore a fallacious and capricious juggling of words to apply "terrorist" to those who heroically struggle and desperately fight for the freedom and independence of their people, and who either are killed or implacably persecuted.

16. General Assembly resolution 2652 (XXV) on the question of Southern Rhodesia affirms the legitimacy of the armed struggle carried on by the movements of African liberation, and calls upon States to give them moral and material assistance.

17. By its resolution 2796 (XXVI) on the same question, the General Assembly, in paragraph 1:

"Reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of Zimbabwe to self-determination, freedom and independence and the legitimacy of their struggle to secure by all the means at their disposal the enjoyment of that right ...";

and in paragraph 9:

"Calls upon all States, the specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system, in consultation with the Organization of African Unity, to extend all moral and material assistance to the people of Zimbabwe".

18. Furthermore, resolution 2945 (XXVII) recalls the fact that, in consultation with the Organization of African Unity and, through it, representatives of the national liberation movements of Zimbabwe were invited as observers to participate in the consideration of the question of the situation in the Territory; and paragraph 7 of that resolution:

"Requests all Governments, the specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system, in consultation with the Organization of African Unity, to extend all moral and material assistance to the people of Zimbabwe".

19. In paragraph 4 of resolution 2980 (XXVII), the Assembly reiterates its urgent appeal for the granting of all possible moral and material assistance to the colonial peoples of Africa in their struggle for liberation from colonial domination.

20. Furthermore, General Assembly resolution 2908 (XXVII) urges all States to give moral and material assistance to all peoples struggling for their freedom and independence.

21. I shall not tax the patience of members of the Council by citing other resolutions dealing with the same subject or by speaking at great length on a problem that is only too well known and which the United Nations has been carrying as a heavy load for so many years. But it is a fact that the Members of the Organization not only are obligated to recognize the legitimacy of the movements of African liberation, but also are in duty bound to give them moral and material assistance. It would be absurd if we were to deny at this juncture our fullest support or if we were to refuse to defend from such bare-faced aggression a country that has been as loyal to the United Nations as Zambia has been.

22. To consider this problem justly and fairly it is not enough for us to assess the nature of the incidents that have taken place, nor is it sufficient to hear dubious excuses or specious explanations: we have to get to the very root of the problem and to become convinced once and for all that Rhodesia and South Africa, because of the political structure of their régimes, increasingly aggressive as they are becoming, are turning southern Africa into a permanent hot-bed of uncertainty and aggression that disturbs and affects the neighbouring countries and causes anxiety all over the world. We consider as very important the proposal of Zambia [1687th meeting] that a group go to that country to assess its vulnerability, gauge its needs and define its rights. We must condemn the actions of Rhodesia and South Africa and ponder the need immediately to draw up a statute for the people of Zimbabwe, creating for that people a council similar to the United Nations Council for Namibia, for example.

23. The delegation of Chile considers that the necessary conditions for a final normalization of the desperate and disturbing situation in which Zambia finds itself are: the elimination of the illegal Rhodesian régime, the independence of the people of Zimbabwe, and the granting to them of the full measure of their rights. But that will not be achieved in a day because of the diverse practices that are used to perpetuate the present situation. At the same time, we cannot postpone it year after year, nor can we delay the solution of a problem which undermines the very efficiency of the United Nations. Thus we must adopt new measures that are positive and vigorous.

24. We repeat our profound moral support for Zambia's cause, and we trust in the calm, the wisdom and the sense of responsibility of this Security Council so that, in keeping with its powers, which are so wide, it will eliminate from that part of Africa a danger that can daily become more grave and thus thwart the efforts of the United Nations to achieve stability in a world of peace in which the principles of freedom and the sovereignty of States will be respected and where, once and for all, racism will be outlawed as one of the darkest shames of mankind today.

25. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Algeria. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

26. Mr. RAHAL (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, this meeting of the Security Council, in

which you so kindly have allowed me to take part, is being held at a time when your term of office is coming to an end. It is also being held at a time when your country has just been invested with the heavy responsibility of taking part in the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Viet-Nam. The important role thus played by Indonesia in all efforts on behalf of peace, in Asia as well as in Africa, deserves recognition by all of us. I should therefore like, before coming to the subject of our debate, to express our heartfelt gratitude to you and to assure you of a sympathy which you know to be sincere since it is founded on our ties of personal friendship.

27. The Security Council is once again invited today to answer the appeal of an African country threatened in its security, confronted with an attempt to isolate it and an attempt at economic strangulation, and exposed to armed aggression from the racist régime in Rhodesia. The latter, powerless to contain the development of the armed struggle of the Zimbabwe patriots, threatens to attack Zambia, which it accuses of lending assistance to the African fighters.

28. These threats are not imaginary. While the border with Zambia was closed and a blockade thus set up on the external trade of Zambia, incidents were multiplying in the neighbouring areas and large numbers of South African forces were coming to strengthen the Rhodesian army deployed along the Zambezi. This serious situation is likely to worsen rapidly under the pressure of the Rhodesian racists, who do not hesitate to warn the Lusaka Government that "the Rhodesian air force is able completely to devastate many capitals of central and east Africa before anyone could even lift his little finger". These of course are their own words I have just quoted, as reported by many press agencies.

29. The crisis thus developing in southern Africa contains the risk of unleashing a conflict whose scope cannot be foretold by anyone. The odious assassination of Amílcar Cabral, Secretary-General of PAIGC, [*Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde*] during the same period, confirms the concern of the African peoples and casts light on the curious synchronization which constantly characterizes the actions of Portugal, Rhodesia and South Africa.

30. Only a few months ago Amílcar Cabral was setting forth in the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly² the new situation created in Guinea (Bissau) and the progress achieved in the liberation struggle, and was addressing an appeal to Portugal to agree to engage in a dialogue with the leaders of the liberation movement with a view to settling the future of the country. Cabral fell, a victim of a blind colonialism which believes it can thus discourage the fight for freedom and ensure the permanence of its domination.

31. It is therefore a matter for Portugal and the racist régime of Rhodesia to recoup a situation characterized by the development of the armed liberation struggle. South

Africa, through its *apartheid* policy and its consistent attitude concerning Namibia, is naturally tied to Portugal and Rhodesia, and makes available its constant support for their colonial and racist domination. Unanimously condemned for its *apartheid* policy, South Africa has always refused to recognize the authority of the United Nations over Namibia and to implement the right of self-determination and independence of the people of Namibia. Not so long ago the Security Council was able, through the report of the representative of the Secretary-General [*see S/10832 of 15 November 1972*], to assess the intentions of the Pretoria Government and its undisguised determination to pursue a policy essentially founded on *apartheid* and on the consolidation of the exploiting régime in Namibia.

32. The well-known complicity—a complicity which we have been denouncing for a long time—between Lisbon, Salisbury and Pretoria is evident once again in the situation created in southern Africa, which represents an immediate danger to an independent country of Africa, Zambia. Only a few months ago Senegal was a victim of Portuguese aggression, and such incidents had already occurred repeatedly in the past. This confirms the fact that the presence in Africa of colonial and racist régimes in itself constitutes a permanent threat to the African countries and explains the solidarity of Africans in their struggle for the total liberation of their continent. This is above all a solidarity with the peoples who continue to be subjected to foreign domination and whose country is prey to foreign exploitation; with the peoples who wish to recover their freedom and their dignity. But it is also a matter of the preservation of independence, an independence which most African countries acquired only recently, and often through very heavy sacrifices.

33. Efforts are made today to make Zambia pay for this solidarity. Ian Smith has said clearly: "Our objective was and continues to be to make the Zambian Government see reason and compel it to face its responsibilities and recognize the fact that there is among civilized nations a code of conduct which it must respect". It is ironic that Ian Smith should talk to us about a "code of conduct of civilized nations". I do not know to what civilization Mr. Smith is referring. But we in Africa reject that civilization which is so evidently rampant in a Rhodesia which is subjected to the law of the white racist minority and which so easily disregards the dignity and life of man when that dignity and that life are those of Africans, crushed by its domination.

34. What the racist Salisbury régime refuses to accept is that the Zimbabwe people, aware of its situation and its rights, from now on refuses to bow to a domination and an exploitation which people today can no longer accept. Its will to liberate itself is evidenced in a struggle taking shape and developing in a manner which is a matter of ever-growing concern to the illegal Government of Rhodesia and which leads it to redouble the extreme measures through which it strives to break the resistance of the Africans.

35. The determination of the Zimbabwe people to recover its rights and put an end to the racist minority régime was clearly set forth by the Pearce Commission when it undertook to ascertain the feelings of the population with

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Fourth Committee, 1986th meeting.*

regard to the draft agreement between Britain and Rhodesia. The conclusions of that Commission³ leave not the slightest doubt as to the deeply-held aspirations of the Rhodesian Africans and their will to recover their legitimate rights.

36. Such a conclusion urgently warranted the adoption of a policy in conformity with the clearly expressed wishes of the population, if one wanted to avoid a worsening of the situation which was all too easy to foresee. The Security Council has already been seized of this matter by the African countries which endeavoured to persuade it and also the United Kingdom as the administering Power, to draw conclusions from the report of the Pearce Commission and to study new possibilities for the settlement of a problem whose elements had just been made evident in the most responsible manner. It may not be useless to recall that the countries of Africa then proposed a new approach to the question, through the convening of a constitutional conference, under the aegis of the United Kingdom, in which the representatives of all the sectors of the Rhodesian population would participate [see S/10606 of 2 February 1972]. The British veto of our proposal was naturally a source of deep disillusionment for all African countries, all the more so since, as a result of United Kingdom vetoes, two other principles were rejected which until then had been the corner-stone of our attitude and that of the international community and on which unanimous agreement had always seemed to exist: the principle of consultation of the Rhodesian population on the basis of "one man, one vote", and the principle that the independence of Rhodesia would not be recognized prior to the installation of majority rule. The refusal of the United Kingdom therefore closed the door to any possibility of a settlement of the Rhodesian problem since, while rejecting the African proposals, the London Government envisaged no new solution, once the one it had negotiated with Ian Smith had been rejected. Further, the situation became worse because the administering Power was clearly showing that it was now abdicating its responsibility of ensuring that the majority would be given its rights in the Government of the country.

37. We have had many opportunities of reaffirming that we recognize the responsibilities assumed by the United Kingdom as administering Power in Rhodesia. It is clear that this means to us that it is responsible for the state of affairs in that country and especially for the conditions in which the Rhodesian people, especially the African majority, will accede to full sovereignty. The unilateral declaration of independence by the white minority puts an end neither to the rights of the Africans in Zimbabwe nor to the direct responsibility of the United Kingdom. We therefore find unacceptable, as does the international community as a whole, an attitude by which the Government of the United Kingdom would consider that its obligations are transferred to the Salisbury Government even before, and in conformity with the will of the population, the majority was enabled normally to exercise its rights.

³ See *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), Cmd. 4964.

38. We do not yet know the intentions of the United Kingdom concerning the future of Rhodesia. The Security Council has always supported British initiatives and supported them with the whole weight of its authority. Confronted by the obvious hesitation of the British Government to resort to the use of force in order to restore its authority and to assume a mission which it is the first to claim for itself, the Council endorsed its proposals for economic sanctions, which unfortunately did not succeed in bringing down the Salisbury régime. Another set of measures is therefore required, whose urgency is underlined by the worsening situation. It is high time for the London Government, which so brutally rejected the African suggestions, clearly to state how it intends to discharge its responsibilities.

39. The Zimbabwe people, after having made its viewpoint abundantly clear to the Pearce Commission, is now entirely at the tender mercies of the Salisbury régime, which has every reason to fear the consequences of such clearly expressed views. The inertia of the United Kingdom leaves it full leeway to undertake generalized suppression, all the more brutal since it applies to a population which has been able to make clear its aspirations and which has begun to fight to achieve them. We know these situations where, by the succession of violence and repression, a whole country is fatally drawn into a war which, by the very nature of things, spills over neighbouring countries, thus creating an extremely dangerous state of tension.

40. This is what is now happening on the border between Zambia and Rhodesia. The threats against Zambia are felt by all the African countries. Our solidarity with the Zambian people is total, not only because they are Africans but, above all, because they are courageously facing, as they have always done, the pressures coming from the Salisbury régime, resulting from the powerlessness of the international community to impose its authority and its law. Zambia, a neighbour of Rhodesia, is suffering more than any other country from the implementation of the economic sanctions decreed by the Security Council. It has accepted the sacrifices entailed for it and its people by the implementation of international decisions. It suffers from the difficulties caused by the presence on its borders of an area which is troubled and is likely to become ever more so. Confronted with the coalition of Rhodesia, South Africa and Portugal, Zambia must also be able to count on the support of the world community and of the Council.

41. The situation brought to this Council today entails threats to peace on the continent of Africa and in the world. Yet, at this very time, the voice of arms has been stilled in Viet-Nam, putting an end to a nightmare which haunted us for so many years. The suffering of the Viet-Nameese people and the incredible martyrdom which it has undergone represent a very heavy price paid for its freedom by a country of the third world. The price should be more than sufficient for the freedom of all peoples to be respected from now on, for mankind to emerge from the horror which accompanied this war, to find in its deepest essence that feeling of justice and solidarity among all peoples which the unleashing of violence, the thirst for domination, had completely erased from international relations. But if a lesson were to be drawn from this

tragedy—and it must be drawn—it is that the freedom of a small country is as valuable as that of a powerful one, and that nothing can stay a people no matter how weak, if it is determined to die for its freedom and its dignity. This lesson was expensive—extremely costly. May it be well heeded.

42. The countries of Africa have many times appealed to international bodies and to the Security Council so that, with their support and their assistance, they would be able to complete the liberation of their continent and free it from the practices of a racism which is an infringement upon their dignity and an insult to mankind as a whole. The sympathy which they have met and the numerous resolutions adopted in their favour have not been effective. They know that they must first of all rely on themselves and on the still limited means at their disposal, in an unequal struggle where the interests of international politics and the coalition of interests constantly clash. But the international community also has its share of responsibility to assume in a situation which, in the final analysis, is a condition for world peace.

43. Mr. CHUANG Yen (China) (*translation from Chinese*): On 9 January 1973, the white racist régime of Rhodesia, on the pretext of two South African policemen having been killed by the freedom fighters of the Zimbabwe people, flagrantly declared the closure of its borders with Zambia and banned all traffic and transport to and from Zambia, in an attempt to sabotage the normal economic life of Zambia, and force it to abandon its just stand of supporting the Zimbabwe people's struggle. At the same time, the Rhodesian white racist régime has further colluded with the South African white racist régime and the Portuguese colonialists in carrying out armed provocations against Zambia.

44. It is reported that Rhodesian troops and policemen have even crossed the frontier to plant mines within the territory of Zambia and fired in its direction, thus causing casualties. What is more, the South African authorities have sent an additional 4,000 troops to join the Rhodesian armed forces and police in creating tension along the Zambian border by threat of force and intensifying their barbarous repression of the Zimbabwe people. The Rhodesian white racist régime has also openly threatened to apply what it calls "collective punishment" on certain tribes in Zimbabwe, in furtherance of its policy of racial discrimination and oppression.

45. This is a fresh grave provocation and threat carried out by the Rhodesian white racist régime with the support of imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism against the people of Zambia, Zimbabwe and other African countries. The Chinese Government and people express great indignation at, and strongly condemn, these barefaced acts of blackmail and provocation committed by the Rhodesian white racist régime.

46. The Zambian Government has taken resolute measures to resist the blackmail and provocations of the Smith régime. This demonstrates the firm determination of the Zambian Government and people dauntlessly to defend their national independence and sovereignty in defiance of

brutal force and their just stand of supporting the Zimbabwe people's struggle. The Chinese Government and people admire the Zambian Government and people for their just stand in resolutely resisting the Rhodesian white racist régime, and we give our firm support to them. We are also pleased to note that, since the incident, the Organization of African Unity and the government leaders of many African countries have issued statements to condemn the criminal acts of the Smith régime and support the just stand of the Zambian Government. The Governments of some African countries have already initiated practical actions and measures to give active support to the just struggle of the Zambian Government, thereby further demonstrating the firm determination of the African countries and people to unite and fight against the common enemy.

47. The despicable act of the Rhodesian white racist régime has not only revealed its reactionary stand of stubbornly making itself the enemy of the African countries and people but also shown that it is putting up a desperate struggle at the end of its tether. The Smith white racist régime, which came to power with the support of imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, has long been categorically resisted and opposed by the broad sections of the Zimbabwe people and has also met with the opposition of the African countries and all the justice-upholding countries and peoples throughout the world. Not long ago the Zimbabwe people, through unremitting struggles, foiled the fraudulent "proposals for the settlement of the independence dispute of Rhodesia" concocted by the United Kingdom in collusion with the Smith régime. In the recent period the armed struggle for national liberation waged by the people of southern Africa has been forging ahead steadily. The Rhodesian white racist régime is increasingly beset with troubles both internally and externally. It is trying to extricate itself from its plight by carrying out blackmail and provocations against Zambia. This is sheer daydreaming.

48. The Zimbabwe people's struggle is a just struggle against racist oppression and for national liberation. Their just struggle is perfectly right, and no one can obstruct it. The General Assembly and Security Council, in relevant resolutions, have called upon all countries to give moral and material support to the just struggle of the Zimbabwe people. All justice-upholding countries and peoples are duty bound to give active support to the just struggle of the Zimbabwe people. This is absolutely irreproachable. How can one use it as a pretext for carrying out blackmail and armed provocations against a sovereign State which upholds justice? The Security Council has long adopted resolutions to apply strict sanctions against the Smith régime. But imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism in collusion with the Smith régime has continuously sabotaged the sanctions against Rhodesia. At present, a racist régime which is subject to sanctions has gone so far as to carry out wanton blockade and provocations against a sovereign Member State of the United Nations. This is not only a gross violation of the Charter but also a gross mockery of the relevant Security Council resolutions. We certainly must not remain indifferent.

49. The Chinese delegation has listened attentively to the speeches made by the representatives of Zambia and other

African countries, and we support their just position. In the opinion of the Chinese delegation, the Security Council must sternly condemn the Rhodesian white racist régime for its outrages against the Zimbabwe people and its blackmail and provocations against Zambia and ask it to stop the above-mentioned crimes immediately; the Council must strongly condemn the white racist régimes of Rhodesia and South Africa and the Portuguese colonialists for their criminal collusion to suppress the national liberation movement in Zimbabwe and step up the policy of racial segregation and demand that the South African troops and police immediately withdraw from Rhodesia. The Security Council must further strengthen its sanctions against Rhodesia and expand them to cover South Africa and the Portuguese colonialists and must call upon the Governments and people of all countries to give active support to the Zambian Government and further support and assistance to the Zimbabwe people's just struggle. We are convinced that so long as the peoples of Zambia, Zimbabwe and the rest of Africa unite as one and fight together, they will surely smash all the provocations and blackmail of the Smith régime and win victory in their struggle.

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

51. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, may I first of all congratulate you most warmly on presiding over the Council during the month of January and say how happy we are to see the representative of Indonesia, a brother and friendly country and a member of the Group of Non-Aligned Countries, to which we belong, in the Chair of this important body. The way in which you are guiding the work of the Council will doubtless lead to successful conclusions worthy of the just cause we are defending and proof of the respect we all attach to the Charter of the world Organization.

52. Speaking today to support the complaint contained in document S/10865, which was so brilliantly submitted to the Council at its meeting of 29 January by the representative of Zambia, Mr. Lusaka [1687th meeting], I should like, on behalf of Egypt and of the Arab delegations, which have entrusted me with the task, as Chairman of the Arab Group for this month, to express our solidarity with the people and the Government of Zambia in their struggle against the racist clique of Ian Smith which has set itself up in Salisbury by force and in the name of piracy.

53. Speaking today I cannot fail to mention in this body the cowardly assassination of a courageous fighter and leader of Africa, the deeply lamented Amílcar Cabral, President of the African Party for the Independence of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde. That shameful act goes hand in hand with the policy of terrorism which is carried out by the Portuguese colonialists in the Territories of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde, which they illegally occupy by force.

54. That comparison is well founded and the similarity between Rhodesian and Portuguese terrorism is obvious:

colonialists always use the same methods. Whether in the north or the south, the east or the west of the African continent, they always seek the same goal: to wipe out the national forces and subjugate the indigenous populations in order to continue their colonization of Africa and their exploitation of its wealth.

55. More than a year ago it was South Africa that carried out a brutal attack against Zambia; today it is Southern Rhodesia and the pretext for their military intervention is the same—to defend themselves against the movements of liberation that they have the audacity to call "terrorism".

56. In 1967, after the war in the Middle East, there was strong speculation regarding the possibility of an Israeli-type action against Zambia because the Israeli aggression gave rise to great interest among the governmental circles of South Africa, particularly after the Commander-in-Chief of the Israeli Air Force addressed himself directly to the ranking officers of the armies and of the Army Air College of Voortrekkervhagie of South Africa. The analogy is striking to us and we should not discard the possibility of this type of tactics being employed against Zambia since the latter has supported the principles of anti-racism and anti-colonialism, and an attack could take place to illustrate their bad faith. In order to prove this, the press tells us that a few days ago Rhodesian elements invited Mr. Smith to remind the adversary that the Rhodesian Air Force was quite capable of wiping out numerous capitals of southern and eastern Africa before anyone could even raise a finger to help.

57. This is the concept of the strategy of the racist régimes; this is the philosophy of these twentieth-century pirates that invade, attack and pillage the possessions of others.

58. We are told in the press, too, that Mr. Ian Smith has just this week announced that the provincial commissioners that administer the tribal lands of Rhodesia have unlimited power to impose fines on the African communities without hearing their defence or resorting to the courts. If they default on their payments of these fines, their cattle can be seized. About 200 Africans, suspected of having assisted the nationalists in bringing arms and munitions to the Rhodesians from the Mukumba region of Mozambique, are to be interrogated by the police.

59. The Prime Minister of the illegal Rhodesian régime inflicts collective punishments against the Africans whom he suspects of having collaborated with the freedom fighters, and he explained his attitude towards Zambia by his contention that Zambia assisted, encouraged and helped those he termed the "international gangsters".

60. The Pretoria-Salisbury-Lisbon axis, having been specifically strengthened in the military field, these régimes will continue to wage their attacks against the independent countries of Africa, against the movements of liberation, in order to subjugate them and to hold them under their domination. But the African solidarity which has emerged strongly will toll the knell of colonialism and racism, wipe out any conspiracy against the independence of the continent and finally triumph.

61. Analysing carefully the situation in southern Africa, my delegation is convinced that the very crux of the problem lies in the fact that the indigenous populations have been deprived of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. We continue to contend, as we explained in Addis Ababa in January 1972 *[628th meeting]* when the Security Council held its series of meetings in the Ethiopian capital, that, in order to eliminate tension in Rhodesia, there must be an immediate transfer of power to the people of Zimbabwe on the basis of majority rule. Any settlement must be negotiated with the liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity and with the political leaders of the majority of the people of Southern Rhodesia and we are deeply convinced that it is the duty of the permanent members of the Council—who bear the responsibility of preserving international peace and security—to act with determination against the illegal régime of Ian Smith, to put an end to its aggressive acts against Zambia and also put an end to its illegal usurpation of power in Rhodesia so that the rule of law will prevail.

62. Unfortunately, it appears that the Charter, which was presumably to be applied to all Members, scrupulously and wholly, exempts certain States and racist régimes and colonialists that only recognize the law of force. Why should they be allowed to apply the Charter for their own benefit, deriving all the advantages but washing their hands of all obligations it imposes on them?

63. The racist régimes that threaten the north-east of Africa and those that threaten the independent countries of southern Africa continue to violate the Charter without being punished. Racists that they are, they consider us, developing countries, as the pariahs of the world.

64. Why should such régimes be allowed to apply the law of force in order to deny it to those that suffer from oppression, to those that resist foreign occupation, to those that struggle to liberate their national territory? Not only are they denied such rights, but furthermore they are being even deprived of the means of liberating themselves, of obtaining their independence and of resisting tyranny.

65. Why should a country such as Portugal have been allowed for almost three centuries to turn its ferocity against the indigenous populations of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau)?

66. Why should Ian Smith be allowed an illegal independence, when a well-earned and legitimate independence is denied the Rhodesian peoples themselves?

67. Why do you, members of the Security Council, fervent believers in the principles of the Charter, allow such aggressions to take place? What has happened to the power of the Council to preserve international peace and security? Have you forgotten that a Charter exists, on which our Organization's very existence rests as well as the salvation of the international community?

68. As I stated earlier, it is the same procedure that is employed and the same goals that are sought by the aggressor.

69. In the south of the African continent, it is the establishment of the great South Africa that hungers to annex Namibia and to impose control over the entire economy of southern Africa and, since Ian Smith granted independence to himself in November 1965, South Africa has always hastened to the assistance of that illegal régime. The international policy of sanctions was thus reduced to a veritable farce by South Africa, which acts as the middle-man in order to facilitate Rhodesian trade with the rest of the world. In 1967, when Mr. Ian Smith's régime was threatened by the African National Congress and by the Zimbabwe African People's Union in the valley of the Zambezi River, South African reinforcements were rapidly sent.

70. In the south-east and the west of the African continent the Portuguese empire is taking root, the use of brutal and criminal force is becoming general, might is right, and barbarism is invading Africa.

71. As we all see, these daily acts immediately threaten the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all African countries, and international peace and security is being jeopardized.

72. In the report presented by the Committee on Decolonization to the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session⁴ we read of the military force of the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia, and that document stresses the constant and intensive co-operation that exists between South Africa and Salisbury in this field, shown by the detachment of a contingent of 3,000 men equipped with the most modern weapons to the Zambian frontier to fight against the liberation movements. It was in November 1971 that the Prime Minister in Pretoria announced that that South African contingent would remain on the frontier of Southern Rhodesia as long as the security of South Africa required it, and he has not broken his word. It is for this reason that my delegation is convinced that, if South Africa had not received foreign military assistance, Salisbury would not have been able to continue to challenge the United Nations constantly and, jointly with Pretoria, carry out these aggressions against Zambia.

73. In point of fact, South Africa has become the very centre from which colonialism and racism spread over southern Africa. It is the source of the military and economic assistance sent to the illegal régime of the white minority in Rhodesia, and it exports the odious system of *apartheid*, the new type of twentieth-century slavery, condemned though it is by the international community.

74. To illustrate this fact in economic terms, suffice it to mention that, although the national exports of Rhodesia rose to \$360 million, representing 10 per cent less than the 1965 export level, South Africa officially imported from Rhodesia goods to the value of \$95 million, to say nothing of the \$220 million which, according to the report of the Committee on Decolonization, is the equivalent of exports which were sent to the international market via South Africa and Mozambique and which are reflected in the

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 23*, vol. II, chap. VI.

recent census of international trade as merchandise imported by those countries but coming from Southern Rhodesia.

75. The aggression undertaken by Ian Smith against the sister Republic of Zambia is a grave act which the Security Council should seriously consider, since it is a clear violation of the Charter and must be considered as aggression against all Africa. The courageous stand adopted by the brotherly people of Zambia and by President Kaunda has evoked our admiration and deserves to be hailed by all the international community. Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter reads:

"To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace".

76. Furthermore, the programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), which was adopted by the Assembly in 1970 by resolution 2621 (XXV), reaffirmed the inalienable right of colonial peoples to fight by all the necessary means available to them in order to confront the colonial Powers. Furthermore, the States Members committed themselves to give all the moral and material assistance required by the peoples of the colonial Territories in order to achieve their freedom and independence. It is for these reasons that we call upon the Security Council to give its assistance to the peoples of Rhodesia to help them to liberate themselves and therefore eliminate the cause of tension, which the illegal Salisbury Government exploits in order to carry out aggression against Zambia, whose only crime is to have adhered to the principles of decolonization as defined in the Charter.

77. My Government strongly supports Zambia in its just cause, fighting as it does against the aggressor, and we condemn the existing collusion between the racists of South Africa and those of Rhodesia in their aggressive acts and in their joint sabotage against Zambia and all Africa. These violations of the Charter require that the Security Council adopt suitable measures to repel the aggressor and to preserve all the rights of Zambia, the country that is the victim of this conspiracy.

78. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on my list is the representative of Senegal, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

79. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, on behalf of my Government I should like to thank you for having authorized me to take part in the debate in this Council with regard to the complaint of the Republic of Zambia against the illegal Government of Southern Rhodesia. My thanks are also addressed to all the other members of the Council, who were good enough to accept the proposal you made to them in this connexion.

80. Knowing the feelings of friendship which you in particular and your great people in general have for the peoples of Africa, my delegation is happy to note that you are presiding over the Security Council in this very painful

period for the peoples of Africa. Indeed, barely 10 days ago a shocked world learned that Amílcar Cabral, the famous fighter for freedom, had been felled by the bullets of hired assassins armed by the reactionaries of Portuguese colonialism. At the same time, units of the Portuguese Air Force were violating Tanzania's sovereignty and bombing villages located more than 50 kilometres inside the country. At the same time the Government of white minority settlers in Southern Rhodesia was creating on the Zambian border the explosive situation which has caused our meeting today.

81. There are concatenations of events which give rise to situations where an enlightened or honest man cannot but impugn the values of what still remains of a humanism whose virtues appear more and more dubious and less and less acceptable. That is a disturbing coincidence which leads us to note that, at a time when Africa is undergoing these new convulsions, Europe, that continent of blocs and ideologies, is engaged in negotiations seeking the best way to ensure the permanence of its collective security. At a time when Africa is undergoing these new trials, the great Powers finally agree to make peace and to put an end to what used to be called the cold war—a war that was not always "cold" for everyone.

82. Thus, the Council is meeting today to consider the consequences of one of these events currently shaking the continent of Africa, an event of which the Government and people of Zambia are the victims. The representative of Zambia, Ambassador Paul Lusaka, has already given the Council a clear and objective account of the facts [*1687th meeting*]. I believe that no one will now gainsay that these facts are likely to threaten peace and security in that part of the world. The Council must therefore, as provided in the Charter of our Organization, take the measures necessary to put an end to this state of affairs. As far as it is concerned, my delegation fully supports the 12 points proposed yesterday afternoon by Ambassador Lusaka.

83. The question concerning us today finds its place in the general framework of the global problem of decolonization in Africa and in particular of that tragic dispute with the British colony of Southern Rhodesia which the United Kingdom refuses to settle.

84. The present relations between Zambia and Rhodesia are based on the historical past of those two countries, which formerly were one single territorial entity—the British colony of Rhodesia. The colonial authorities had then concentrated all political and economic infrastructures in the southern part of the country, where the highest concentration of European settlers was also to be found. That explains why, after its accession to independence, Zambia, the former Northern Rhodesia, was more or less dependent upon the white settler régime of Salisbury, especially in the field of rail and road communications. Thus, the United Kingdom is at the origin of the facts which have led us to the explosive situation we deplore today.

85. Let us also note that relations between Southern Rhodesia and the neighbouring African countries were greatly worsened by the rebellion of the white settlers in Salisbury and the different events surrounding that rebel-

lion: the appeal to the armed forces of the Republic of South Africa; police repression against the black populations; legalization of racial discrimination; and, finally, the unilateral declaration of independence of the country.

86. Faced with this constantly worsening situation, the United Kingdom, while justly claiming responsibility for the Rhodesian problem, adopted—and still adopts—an attitude only encouraging the rebels grouped around Ian Smith. It will be recalled that in October 1964, when the white settlers in Salisbury were for the first time threatening to secede, the British Prime Minister, Sir Harold Wilson, dispatched to the racist leader Ian Smith a note in which he advised him against the proclamation of unilateral independence of the colony while giving him the assurance that in the event of disobedience no measures would be taken against Rhodesia. We must admit that that was an implicit invitation to rebellion, and it must also be noted that the United Kingdom had not accustomed us to such an indulgent approach. We still recall the promptness with which the British army so "courageously" repressed the rebellion of the small island of Anguilla. Indeed, the leaders of that island were doubly guilty: they were both rebels and blacks.

87. During the past year the United Kingdom has thrice resorted to its veto to thwart decisions of the Security Council against the Salisbury régime—once in February 1972, during the Council's meetings in Addis Ababa, and twice in a row in September of the same year in this very chamber. Yet all those draft resolutions were consonant with the provisions of the Charter; they were in keeping with the exercise of the historical, political and legislative responsibilities of the United Kingdom for its colony of Southern Rhodesia. Let us note in passing that the General Assembly, at its last session, supported the majority of the Council by adopting the draft resolution that had been blocked by the British veto, by the overwhelming majority of 111 votes to 4, among which, of course, were those of the United Kingdom, Portugal and South Africa [*resolution 2945 (XXVII)*].

88. In 1971, the United Kingdom submitted to the Council the text of an Anglo-Rhodesian agreement [*S/10405 of 1 December 1971*] containing constitutional as well as electoral and administrative clauses, which was to be submitted for approval to the Rhodesian people before being carried out. The Pearce Commission, which was chosen to ascertain the feelings of the black population of Rhodesia, reached unequivocal conclusions after its mission. The people of Rhodesia as a whole does not consider acceptable the proposals of the Anglo-Rhodesian agreement of last November as a basis preparing it for independence—that was stated in the report of the Pearce Commission. I even know that in the United Kingdom some voices were heard calling the agreement a regrettable joke.

89. Still within the framework of the responsibilities of the United Kingdom, let us recall that on 17 November 1970 the Security Council adopted resolution 288 (1970), urgently calling upon the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, to take effective measures to put an end to the Southern Rhodesian rebellion and to enable the people of that country freely to exercise its right to self-deter-

mination. As far as we are concerned, it is the United Kingdom which is therefore mainly responsible for the present state of affairs in its colony of Southern Rhodesia. It must face its responsibility, and the Council has the duty, and even the right, to remind it of them again.

90. Many people here wondered about the reasons for the recent actions of the Smith Government against Zambia. Some have spoken of wilful and desperate acts; others have gone so far as to insinuate that there was disapproval on the part of the Pretoria authorities. The truth is that Ian Smith was pushed by his South African advisers and allies to impose what they called "sanctions" against Zambia. It is no secret to anyone that the true instigator of that decision was General Joubert, head of the South African police, who is responsible for the 4,000 soldiers and policemen which the Pretoria régime dispatched to the assistance of the Salisbury Government. The truth is that Smith and his South African protectors and allies have begun to realize the scope of the fight waged on Rhodesian Territory by the Zimbabwe freedom fighters. They have had the painful surprise of seeing that those fighters currently enjoy not only the approval of the indigenous population of that country but also their moral and material support.

91. On the other hand, the existence of the Republic of Zambia is a disturbing witness for Ian Smith and his *apartheid* friends. It destroys the very basis of their racist theory. Indeed, how can they continue to persuade 5 million blacks in Southern Rhodesia that they are incapable of leading their country while next door their brothers, of the same race and people, in the former Northern Rhodesia have assumed with such competence and dignity the responsibility of their own fate?

92. Southern Rhodesia is a country of the African continent; 95 per cent of its population is of the black race. The obstinacy of Ian Smith in denying this reality in no way detracts from its obviousness.

93. The Republic of Zambia would fail in its duty were it not to show its solidarity with the Zimbabwe fighters struggling for the freedom and dignity of their people. The United Nations recognizes the legitimacy of that national liberation struggle; so does the Organization of African Unity, which brings to bear its moral and material support for the Zimbabwe fighters. Therefore, the only sin of the Zambian Government is that of remaining faithful to its international obligations and to the decisions and ideals of the Charter of the United Nations. But I am convinced that, if that is a crime according to the Salisbury Government, the feelings of the members of this Council are diametrically opposed.

94. To us Africans, the Rhodesian question is a matter of justice and dignity. We do not oppose the régime currently in power in Salisbury because it is controlled by whites, but because that régime represents but a minuscule minority of the population and because the only basis for its right to exercise the power of a State lies in its members belonging to a specific race.

95. The Africans of Southern Rhodesia have taken up armed struggle because they could no longer choose their

means. They have now taken the firm decision to triumph, because they have abandoned any hope of convincing an opponent obstinately resolved to continue with its policy of humiliating, repressive domination.

96. The march of history is irreversible; the liberation struggles waged at present by the Zimbabwe fighters will continue inexorably until the liberation of their country. The problem is now raised only in terms of a deadline, which, unfortunately, can be further postponed, with its accompaniment of suffering, bloodshed, tears and grief.

97. The Security Council has the means and is in duty bound to stop this useless bloodletting. A racial confrontation in that part of the African continent could not be limited to the banks of the Zambezi, nor could it bring any advantage to anyone. I was happy yesterday afternoon to hear that fact stated here by the representative of the United Kingdom [1687th meeting]. But the United Kingdom is still responsible for the Rhodesian problem, and the Security Council must constantly remind it of its duties, as the Council did on 17 November 1970, in its resolution 288 (1970), when it called upon the United Kingdom as the administering Power:

"to take urgent and effective measures to bring to an end the illegal rebellion in Southern Rhodesia and enable the people to exercise their right to self-determination in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and in conformity with the objectives of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)".

That resolution was adopted without any veto; it is still valid. Its implementation would undoubtedly make it possible to solve the tragic problem of Rhodesia once and for all.

98. If the United Kingdom admits its impotence in assuming its responsibilities, it will be up to the Security Council to assume its own, making use, as has been done in other cases, of all the means provided for in the Charter for circumstances of that kind.

99. Last Saturday, at the time when the plenipotentiaries of the parties were in Paris signing the agreement which was to put an end to 30 years of war in Viet-Nam, the President of the United States of America issued a proclamation asking all men and women of goodwill to unite in prayers of thanksgiving in the hope that that moment would mark not only the end of the war in Viet-Nam, but also the beginning of a new era of peace in the world and of understanding among men. We heeded that appeal. But while praying we could not fail to feel a sense of anguish in thinking of the millions of men and women in various parts of the African continent who have yet no reason to believe in the future of this new era of universal peace, no hope of living, albeit in the distant future, in a world of understanding and brotherhood among men. Yet we remain convinced that this Council, through firm, just and effective decisions, can still awaken in these martyred peoples some reason to believe and to hope.

100. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next name on the list of speakers is that of the represen-

tative of Zaïre. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

101. Mr. IPOTO EYEBU BAKAND'ASI (Zaïre) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, the delegation of Zaïre is gratified to see you presiding over the Security Council during the month of January, for, in the list of peace-loving, freedom-loving and justice-loving States, your country is placed very high.

102. "When a house is on fire, one does not worry about the stables." It was with that phrase—and no more bitter phrase could be imagined—that the France of Louis XV, before the beginning of the Seven-Year War, resigned itself to the loss of its beautiful Canadian colony, which it abandoned to all-powerful Britain.

103. When it is a question of a fight for a country linked to Zaïre by destiny, history and geography—and I have in mind a neighbouring country, a friendly country, close to the hearts of all Zaïre nationals: Zambia—obviously it cannot be a question of resignation or of giving in to a fait accompli, that is to say, surrendering to brute force.

104. In fact, as far as we of Zaïre are concerned, it is not a question of giving sentimental support or of quietly complying with relations of good-neighbourliness, or of merely fulfilling an international obligation. Our commitment is total. It flows from a reflex of self-defence, as part of self-defence or prevention, to reaffirm a twofold principle: that of the security of international trade, on the one hand, and that of the principle of the self-determination of peoples, on the other. In other words, the Republic of Zaïre feels directly involved. Therefore, we assume as our own struggle that of the Zambian people, standing as a single man behind their courageous guide, Mr. Kenneth Kaunda. In the gesture of despair of the authorities of the rebel, fascist, racist, minority Salisbury régime we see a sign of the times, namely, a herald of the shipwrecked of that racist régime. Furthermore, in it we see a type of irony of fate, because it is precisely that régime against which all mankind has decreed a general embargo that lies at the very heart of a blockade of "underdeveloped", that is to say, an upheaval in international communication and trade. But irony of fate does not imply fatalism, and those who thought they were deceiving others will themselves be deceived.

105. Before going further, we are justified in questioning the legal nature of the act that has been committed, in desperation, before we try to study it and draw the inevitable consequences.

106. Through its representative on the Sixth Committee, on 2 November 1971, the Republic of Zaïre, in the course of the debate on the question of the definition of aggression, summed up the item under discussion today, that is, provocation which falls in the category of acts termed hostile or inimical. He said:

"Under the concept of 'hostile or inimical acts', we can include all acts of a serious and grave nature flowing from warlike plans. Technically, a hostile act is synonymous with provocation. This presumes a moral responsibility, at

least with respect to the provoker. It is an act or an event so calculated that the provoker, after having prepared for a response, pretends hypocritically to do nothing in order to avoid the weight of the responsibility. In other words, the provoker is the State which, without resorting to war, by its acts, its manoeuvres or its conduct, incites one or more States to take the initiative of opening hostilities under the pretext of self-defence. One might say that it is done so that the provoker is the one who sets the bomb but does not ignite the detonator. He is the moral creator of the war; he is the one who prepares the ingredients, pours the oil on the fire and thus is the catalyst to the reaction . . . As an example, the following facts may be borne in mind:

“(a) Measures which can prejudice or damage the economy of another State—in other words, an attack on property—such as blockade, boycott, embargo, sequestration, despoiling of the goods of another State or of its nationals. All these measures are grouped under the common heading of economic aggression or acts of indirect aggression.

“(b) Attacks against the nationals of a State, such as expulsion, arbitrary imprisonment and the violation and displacement of populations.

“(c) Unilateral acts of terror, such as ultimatums, threats, concentration of troops on frontiers and so forth.”⁵

I do not believe I need to stress the fact that these characteristic situations which are examples, are limited cases and are also classical, have all been carried out by the rebel régime of Ian Smith and his clique.

107. But the question cannot be put into such a simple answer. It is far too complex, since it raises the thorny problem of responsibility, that is to say, who is to blame for damage caused by a body corporate which, in the eyes of the law, is internationally non-existent, that is to say, legally a nothing.

108. At the fall of the Bastille, Louis XVI is said to have asked one of his friends, “Is this a rebellion?” And the reply was, “No, Sir, it is a revolution.” It is obvious that in the case of Rhodesia it is not a question of a revolution but a mere rebellion: it is an act of rebellion against the administering Power.

109. Legally speaking, the Rhodesia of Ian Smith is still a British colony which does not even possess the status of a dominion. Therefore, regardless of the specific legal status that is to be assigned to it—integral part of the Metropolitan territory or separate dependent territory administered in the interests of the population—it is only the administering Power itself that can assume the representation of it and assume responsibility for it. I have just mentioned the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Legally speaking, the régime of Ian Smith cannot be

considered as a “general” *de facto* Government, which would imply that it has managed to break away from the metropolitan country, either through a military victory in the field or by the dissolution of existing constitutional ties, which would presuppose the granting of independence by the metropolitan country; nor can it be considered a “local” *de facto* government, which would presume an act of rebellion against the metropolitan country, leading to secession. But Rhodesia has never organized a struggle against the administering Power, but against the indigenous population, whose aspirations to self-determination and freedom of choice of its destiny it endeavours to stifle. Nor can it merely be termed a belligerent, for that would be a form of recognition of Rhodesia as a virtual international subject of law, subject actively or passively to the laws governing war.

110. Without resorting to other arguments, the entire arsenal of the resolutions adopted by the Security Council or the recommendations of the General Assembly is there: the United Kingdom has not only the moral commitment but the legal obligation to ensure respect for the stipulations of its own Constitution, to put down the rebellion and to establish a democratic régime in that part of Africa represented by the Zimbabwe people.

111. As the United Kingdom has the duty, so has it the power: it possesses the means and the strength. The sole problem confronting it is to acquire the courage, which is a matter of sincerity, honesty and conscience. Without it, it will stand before the world in the way in which history has defined it, in the hardly flattering term, correctly or incorrectly applied to it: “perfidious Albion”. The challenge has been hurled. It is up to the United Kingdom to respond. As far as we are concerned, we can only make a last and most heartfelt appeal.

112. We therefore know who is truly responsible, who should really be the master of the situation. Therefore the United Kingdom should be able to guarantee freedom of circulation and movement of persons, of goods and of ideas in the Zambian part of Rhodesian territory still under its domination. But the act just committed by Ian Smith only swells the volume of illegal acts that the United Kingdom should repress, within the framework of its domestic jurisdiction. It is true that a frontier, like a door, as Shakespeare put it, is made to be opened or closed. This is a truism, but it is presumed that either way it will not damage the interest of third parties. In other words it is the classical principle of the abuse of rights.

113. But, having said this, we expect a formal objection on the part of the administering Power. Out of curiosity we glanced at the *Treaty Series* of the United Nations and it appeared that the United Kingdom is not a party to the “Convention on transit trade of land-locked States”, which was done at New York on 8 July 1965⁶ and which, according to the provisions of its article 20, entered into force on 9 June 1967. We are not going to try to avoid a discussion, but at this stage we should like to cast full light on the main provisions of the Convention, whose Preamble says in essence:

⁵ This statement was made at the 1273rd meeting of the Sixth Committee, the official records of which are published in summary form.

⁶ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 597, p. 42.

"Noting General Assembly resolution 1028 XI on the land-locked countries and the expansion of international trade which, 'recognizing the need of land-locked countries for adequate transit facilities in promoting international trade', invited the Governments of Member States 'to give full recognition to the needs of land-locked Member States in the matter of transit trade and, therefore, to accord them adequate facilities in terms of international law and practice in this regard, bearing in mind the future requirements resulting from the economic development of the land-locked countries',

"...

"1. In order to enjoy the freedom of the seas on equal terms with coastal States, States having no sea-coast should have free access to the sea. To this end States situated between the sea and a State having no sea-coast shall by common agreement with the latter and in conformity with existing international conventions accord:

"(a) To the State having no sea-coast, on a basis of reciprocity, free transit through their territory;

"...

"Principle IV

"In order to promote fully the economic development of the land-locked countries, the said countries should be afforded by all States, on the basis of reciprocity, free and unrestricted transit, in such a manner that they have free access to regional and international trade in all circumstances and for every type of goods.

"...

"(b) The term 'traffic in transit' means the passage of goods including unaccompanied baggage across the territory of a Contracting State between a land-locked State and the sea when the passage is a portion of a complete journey which begins or terminates within the territory of that land-locked State and which includes sea transport directly preceding or following such passage. The transshipment, warehousing, breaking bulk, and change in the mode of transport of such goods, as well as the assembly, disassembly or reassembly of machinery and bulky goods shall not render the passage of goods outside the definition of 'traffic in transit', ..."

114. The general framework of that Convention, which is of a general nature, rests on the following principles: freedom of treatment between coastal and land-locked States, non-discrimination, reciprocity. Its sphere of application in principle excludes the non-contracting States, but admits the exception of necessity as an exonerating clause; the existence of a most-favoured nation clause; the existence of specific agreements, which are not contrary and more general and generous, as well as that of other universal conventions.

115. Could the United Kingdom consider itself as not bound by the provisions of this Convention? Formally

speaking, yes. However, it is still subject to the Convention because of the principle of reciprocity which it enjoys in its relations with Zambia and also under international usage.

116. Against an argument of that nature one can even invoke the historic argument of the existence of the former Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland. Although one can say that politically that Federation no longer exists, and that the accession to independence of two of the three members—that is, Zambia and Malawi—has implied an end to the Federation, the other ties have not been shattered, especially those constituting international duties, such as the right of transit.

117. Furthermore, the conditions and modalities of application of principle V of the Convention have not, we believe, been met. Therefore, neither the United Kingdom nor the rebel régime can validly invoke it. This is how principle V reads:

"The State of transit, while maintaining full sovereignty over its territory, will have the right to take all indispensable measures to ensure that the exercise of the right of free and unrestricted transit shall in no way infringe its legitimate interests of any kind."

118. The same applies to the prohibitions laid down in article 11 prohibiting the passage of specially defined persons, and goods of a category whose import is prohibited either for reasons of morality, health or public security or as a precaution against animal or plant diseases, or against pests.

119. Those are the reasons why Zaire has taken up Zambia's problems and cause. It is for those reasons that the most authorized voice of Zaire, that of our President, General of the Armed Forces, Mobutu Sese Seko, promised economic, political and military assistance to the brother State of Zambia.

120. Before concluding, and supporting all the claims submitted by Zambia, the delegation of Zaire would like to ensure that the discussion of the Zambian complaint will not be closed, but that the Council will follow its development, keeping it on the list of items that it has to examine, until a suitable solution has been found.

121. Following the example of the French revolutionaries, I shall conclude by saying: "Let the colonies die, but not the principles"—the principle of self-determination of peoples and the principle of free movement of persons, goods and ideas.

122. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya): First of all, allow me, on behalf of my delegation, to register my delegation's thanks to the representative of Zambia for the clear, factual and unemotional manner in which he presented his country's complaint to the Security Council yesterday [1687th meeting]. The statement made yesterday by the representative of Zambia, my good friend and colleague Ambassador Paul Lusaka, will stand out in the records of this Council as an accurate, honest and factual presentation and analysis of one of the most explosive and emotionally

charged situations in the world today. It speaks well of the integrity, courage and commitment of the Zambian people that one of their most outstanding and experienced diplomats should inform this Council of that situation in words which convey the truth, and not propaganda, and in tones which seek peace and brotherhood, and not hatred and discord. The Ambassador of Zambia, the people of Zambia, the Government of Zambia and the Zambian leadership must be congratulated for keeping their heads while all others around them are losing theirs.

123. The friendly posture of Zambia during this hour of trial is the mark of President Kaunda's humanism and practical application of all that is good and noble in a leader who works for peace. President Kaunda has been put to a rigorous test. His Government and people have withstood serious threats to their country's national security and political integrity. The Zambian people have faced aggression and economic blockade and have emerged triumphant and determined that freedom and human dignity in southern Africa shall not be lost by default to racialism and imperialism. On behalf of my Government, I should like to record our appreciation to Mr. Kaunda and the Zambian people for their steadfast defence of African freedom, African dignity and the personality of the African people.

124. In support of the Zambian people, this is what the Foreign Minister of Kenya, Mr. Njoroge Mungai, had to say a few days ago:

"The Kenya Government strongly deplores the recent inhuman decision by the rebel régime of Rhodesia to close its border with Zambia as it is aimed at paralysing the Zambian economy, especially the transport of copper through Rhodesia to the outside world which earns Zambia 95 per cent of her foreign currency.

"Kenya regards this inhuman decision as a desperate move by the rebel régime, as it will not affect the activities of the freedom fighters in Rhodesia. It hails President Kaunda's wise decision to reject Rhodesia's concession that copper may pass through Rhodesia while Zambian imports suffer.

"Kenya rallies around Zambia to defeat the forces of oppression, imperialism, racism and colonialism in Zimbabwe and assures Zambia of its goodwill towards her and of Kenya's readiness to make every facility available to help Zambia's import-export trade through Mombasa. Equally important, Kenya is willing to consider any request for imports, purchase, transport of copper, etc., and the use of KENATCO transport facilities.

"The Zambian Government will shortly be sending a strong delegation to Kenya

"(a) To negotiate the possibilities of the use of the Port of Mombasa; and

"(b) The use of KENATCO transport capacity;

"(c) To review TANZAM progress in order to operate directly to Mombasa; and

"(d) To explore the possibility of Kenya supplying wheat and other essentials to Zambia."

125. I should like this Council to know that our commitment to support Zambia is total in terms of economics, politics, trade and otherwise. Following the closure of the border by the illegal rebel régime of Ian Smith, the Government of Zambia sent a delegation to Kenya to explore ways and means of organizing this support. The delegation of Zambia, which was led by the Honourable A. J. Soko, Zambia's Minister for Trade and Industry, and which included the Honourable F. M. Mulikita, Zambia's Minister of Power, Transport and Works, visited Kenya on 17 January 1973. During their brief stay in Kenya, the Zambian delegation had talks with the President of Kenya, His Excellency President Mzee Jomo Kenyatta, and delivered a personal message to our President from the President of Zambia, His Excellency Mr. Kenneth Kaunda. The delegation held detailed discussions with Kenyan ministers which centred on communications, trade and transport problems. At the conclusion of these discussions, the Government of Kenya pledged its full support to the Zambian Government in the difficulties it faces as a result of the illegal and inhuman activities being pursued by the rebel Smith régime. The full logistics of this support have already been put into action and will continue in operation as long as it is necessary to defend Zambia's economic and political integrity and sovereignty, and will also last as long as the southern African situation remains what it is.

126. The item placed on the agenda yesterday, namely, the threat to the security, independence and integrity of Zambia, is one of the negative elements of the southern African situation. As was clearly stated by the representative of Zambia in the course of his statement, the southern African situation today constitutes one of the gravest threats to peace and security in Africa and indeed in the whole world. First, the southern African situation constitutes a threat to international peace because in southern Africa we have a white population—a white minority—which is committed to imposing on our people a political and social philosophy akin to fascism and nazism in its ruthlessness and oppressiveness. Secondly, there is a threat to international peace and security in southern Africa because in that area racialism, *apartheid* and colonialist imperialism are working in collusion to stem the tide of nationalism and self-determination in Africa. Thirdly, the situation in South Africa constitutes a threat to international peace and security because the philosophy of *apartheid* and racialism of South Africa enjoys the support and encouragement of certain powerful ruling circles in the West. Lastly, the southern African situation constitutes a threat to international peace and security because the racists of South Africa are so bigoted and blind in their illogical racial conception of history and economics and, as with the Nazis and the Fascists, nothing short of war and nothing short of their complete defeat will change the situation.

127. Southern Africa has been described variously in Western circles as "the southern frontier of Western Christian civilization". It has also been termed the southern defence line of NATO and a stronghold of Western capitalism. An illusion has been created and well-meaning

persons and circles in the Western world have been railroaded by South African propaganda into believing that white minority domination in southern Africa is in the interest of the Western world and that is in the interest of Western economies and so-called Western civilization. Even now, in January 1973, when knowledge of the monstrosities and atrocities of *apartheid* and racialism has been given the widest circulation and reporting throughout the world, there are still diehards in the West who continue to support the minority régimes of southern Africa.

128. I do not think there is any honest leader of any sect of Christianity who still believes that the *apartheid* and racialism of southern Africa are in accord with Christian philosophy and principles. The World Council of Churches has made it abundantly clear that racialism and *apartheid* are in fact a negation of Christian teachings. The World Council of Churches has made it clear that denial of freedom and the right to self-determination is opposed to Christian teachings and the brotherhood of man. In other words, southern African racial régimes are in themselves a negation of the basic principles of Christianity and, therefore, that which Vorster, Smith and Portuguese colonialists stand for in southern Africa is not Christianity.

129. In the context of the cold war, the minority régimes of southern Africa have been paradoxically regarded as NATO's last defence line. But this claim has been devoid of any logic right from the start and is now more or less defunct in view of what the West and the socialist countries are doing to reach accommodation with each other. In this exercise, the position of the minority régimes of southern Africa is not only ambivalent but highly illogical. Is it not necessary for the Western world to inform the southern African racialists that the bogey of communism, which they hold as a pretext for oppressing the Africans, is a mere figment of their own imagination?

130. The other reason for racial oppression in southern Africa and the obstinate posture of Portugal is that the southern African minorities want to preserve the racial purity of the southern African whites. The southern African racialists are holding on to the myth of racial purity and racial superiority despite the total eclipse of nazism and fascism and despite all the knowledge that science has advanced to show that racial superiority and racial purity are mere myths. Despite all the studies conducted by various bodies at national and international levels, the white racists of southern Africa are clinging to the belief that racially they are superior to non-whites in southern Africa and that, because of this, they are the chosen race who must rule and dominate the non-whites in southern Africa.

131. After six years of research into blood groupings to establish scientifically the origins of southern Africa's coloured peoples, a South African scientist, Dr. M. C. Botha, has come up with some shocks for the whites of southern Africa. He says that the whites of South Africa are neither as white nor as pure as they think they are. He concludes that the coloureds of southern Africa are more white than they are generally believed to be by the whites of southern Africa. To elaborate this point I should like to quote from a report on this which appeared in the *Nairobi East African Standard* of 13 April 1972:

"White South Africans are not quite as white as they think they are. The observation came as a shock to this race-conscious privileged society and destroyed two widely held racial notions.

"It was made by the eminent South African immunologist, Dr. M. C. Botha, after six years of genetic research conducted on blood groupings of a cross-section of the multiracial community living in and around Cape Town.

"The results of Dr. Botha's research are published in a special supplement to the *South African Medical Journal*. They are earning him far fewer plaudits than the world's first heart transplant operation in which he matched the tissue and became a near-national hero along with Professor Chris Barnard.

"Dr. Botha concludes that the genealogical heritage of white South Africans is 7 per cent black. He also finds that the 2 million Coloureds—the people of mixed descent in South Africa regarded as non-white and deprived of the privileges of the elite white group of nearly 4 million—are genetically 34 per cent West European (white) 36 per cent southern African (black) and 30 per cent Asian.

"The racial notions refuted by these findings are first that the coloureds are descendants only from Hottentots and imported black Malay slaves, and therefore have no white blood, and that the whites have only 1 per cent of black blood. These are the optimistic figures which were arrived at by a medical survey in 1902.

"Instead they establish scientifically the fact that coloureds and whites in South Africa share a gene pool that is 41 per cent common to both groupings.

"This raises the immediate question of whether or not the Coloureds—South Africa's lost people—should not be regarded as whites and assimilated into the group.

"In an interview, Dr. Botha came down firmly on the side of the integrationists and said: 'The genetic difference is insufficient to divide us into separate races. . . . The fact is that the coloureds are just a little less pure than we whites are.'

"Although the purpose of his work evolved 'into an attempt to give the coloured people some identity', the original motives were purely medical and scientific.

"Dr. Botha is a pathologist in charge of the provincial blood grouping laboratories in the Cape Province. His first aim had been to determine the Rh factors in a multiracial society so that blood groupings could be carried out on a more scientific basis.

"At the same time a startling and intriguing medical case involving the brother of 'one of the country's most prominent' white men—his name is not mentioned—convinced him that a scientific investigation into the racial admixture of South Africans was vitally necessary for medicine.

"Dr. Botha was called in to do blood tests on the man whose doctors were baffled by a blood disease from which he was suffering. Exhaustive tests finally revealed a disease usually found only among the indigenous people of Africa.

"But the diagnosis came late—far too late. The man died. The drugs with which he was being treated merely aggravated the disease—and killed him. If the correct diagnosis had been reached earlier, his life could have been saved.

"These were the medical objectives of Dr. Botha's research. But as it developed he began to appreciate the historical and sociological significance of the scientific facts which were emerging. Not only would the doctors be made aware of diseases usually associated with one race group occurring among the other, but he saw merits also in publishing the results to give the coloured man an identity.

"He said, 'I feel it is time the coloured man knew the facts. It is time he knew he is not descended only from Hottentots and slaves. It is time he realized he has all the faults, all the virtues and all the potentialities of the three continents.'"

132. I have taken the time to reveal these facts because they are basic to the southern African situation we are dealing with. The white racists of South Africa, after all these facts are known, cannot be regarded in any other light. The only logical way of judging them is to regard them as a group of bigoted people, notorious people who do not know where their interests lie and who do not care about their own future. They are not defending southern African Christianity against infidels. They are not fighting to preserve the so-called purity of their race, because, as the scientific evidence shows, there are no pure races in South Africa. Like the Nazis, they are victims of a sordid ideology, victims of their own self-inflicted fears. In other words, like the Nazis and the Fascists, the southern African white minorities are a cancer in the body politic of Africa. They are desperate people who think they can maintain their illegal and oppressive régimes by force of arms; they labour under the illusion that Africa and indeed the rest of the world will countenance this oppression, and this denial of fundamental human rights and fundamental freedoms for all time.

133. The aggression against Zambia, which was so graphically depicted by my friend, Ambassador Lusaka, must be seen only in this context. Over the past 25 years, the international community has appealed to South Africa to abjure *apartheid* and racialism and live in peace with the African people in South Africa who so greatly outnumber them. The records of the General Assembly of the United Nations are full of these appeals: South Africa has been condemned on many occasions, but to no avail. Rather than heed these appeals, the South African racists have decided not only to entrench their vicious régime through terrorism and the machinery of a police State; they have also embarked on a mission to convert Territories to the north and around South Africa into strongholds of racialism and white minority domination.

134. Zambia is a victim of the southern African situation because the Government and people of Zambia have refused to be blackmailed into denying support to the people of Zimbabwe, Namibia and the Portuguese Territories of Angola and Mozambique who are heroically fighting to vindicate their right to independence and self-determination. The Republic of Zambia is being victimized because it has refused to betray the tide of nationalism which is currently sweeping the whole of southern Africa.

135. Two developments in southern Africa have led to the present confrontation between the minority racists of southern Africa and Zambia.

136. The first of these is the verdict of "no" returned by the Pearce Commission, which demonstrated that the 5.5 million Africans living in Southern Rhodesia want nothing less than full-fledged independence and majority rule. Following this setback, the racists in the British colony of Southern Rhodesia took the ill-advised road of increasing the stench of their oppressive régime. This is how *Time* magazine of 1 January 1973 describes it:

"Harder times lie ahead for Rhodesia's blacks. The Parliament of the breakaway colony recently adopted a series of harsh new measures designed to impose South African-style *apartheid* on its 5 million subjugated Africans. Rhodesian Prime Minister Ian Smith still speaks confidently of achieving a 'settlement' with Britain some time next year. But he knows full well that the new measures, if his Government enforces them severely, could hardly be accepted by the British Government.

"Among other things, the new laws (1) forbid Rhodesian blacks to travel outside the country unless each journey is approved by a white civil servant, (2) force all Africans over age 16 to carry an identity pass at all times, on pain of a \$140 fine and six months in jail, (3) reinforce the segregation of public swimming pools, (4) bar blacks from moving to white urban areas unless they have jobs or special permits, (5) prevent Africans from being served food and drink in white areas after 7 p.m. on weekdays and all day Sunday, and (6) declare purely white areas 'Europeanized' to prevent 'infiltration' of Asians and coloreds.

"A likely next step: race classification boards, like those in South Africa, to determine who is white and who is not."

137. It is significant to recall that those oppressive measures were conveniently enforced after full consultation between Ian Smith and his South African and Portuguese counterparts. Just before the enforcement of those measures there was a meeting. This is how *The Economist* of 4 November 1972 reports it:

"Last week-end's high-level defence talks between South African and Rhodesian ministers and defence chiefs, following closely Mr. Ian Smith's visit to Lisbon, reflect growing southern African concern at what is believed to be a deteriorating military situation in Portuguese Mozambique. Until very recently Rhodesia's

only real security threat came from Zambian-based guerrillas making occasional—and very unsuccessful—sorties across the Zambezi.

"But two recent developments have served to jolt Rhodesian complacency. In the past two months two landmines have exploded near the south bank of the Zambezi, injuring one civilian and, last week, killing a Rhodesian soldier. The implication is that the guerrillas have discarded their unsuccessful strategy of large-scale incursions in favour of hit and run warfare.

"Secondly—and even more seriously—Rhodesia's eastern flank is being increasingly threatened by what an official report calls 'vastly increased terrorist activity' in Mozambique. The first stage of the campaign waged by FRELIMO—the Front for the Liberation of Mozambique—to affect Rhodesia was the mining of the road that links Salisbury with Malawi. Several trucks have been destroyed, with loss of life, and one transport company revealed this week that its business on the route had been halved. Even more serious has been the southward penetration by FRELIMO which, it is feared in Salisbury, could disrupt the vital rail and road links between Rhodesia and the Mozambique port of Beira. The focus in the Rhodesian security situation has now switched from the Zambezi to this eastern border, which is much more difficult to defend.

"It is no secret that the Rhodesian authorities are openly critical of the Portuguese handling of the war in Mozambique, and last week's meeting hardened the belief in some political circles that it is only a matter of time before the Rhodesians and the South Africans start to play a much more active role in Mozambique's defence. And Zambia's position may also have been discussed at the meetings. Only two months ago Rhodesia issued a toughly worded statement warning Zambia about the dangers of harbouring guerrillas; the most recent landmine explosion is bound to have increased the pressure for some form of Rhodesian retaliation, which, if it comes—although this seems unlikely—is liable to take an economic rather than a military form. But the real problem for Rhodesia is to persuade the Portuguese to improve security in Mozambique. And this they will not, or cannot, do."

138. That brings me to the second reason behind the present confrontation between Zambia and the racist régime of Ian Smith. As I said earlier, the march of freedom in southern Africa is beginning to worry the racists of southern Africa. The racists have come to realize that the impending confrontation is going to be between themselves, on the one hand, and the rest of Africa, of which Zambia is a part and the nearest target, on the other. South Africa, Portugal and the illegal régime of Smith are always quick to deny that the freedom fighters of southern Africa are making quick and meaningful headway in their fight to rid their countries of minority dictatorship and racial minority régimes. But the truth is there, and one has only to read some recent newspaper reports to realize the actual position. This is what the *Daily Nation* of Nairobi said on 23 January 1973:

"Rhodesia's rebel Prime Minister, Ian Smith, has, at long last, done exactly what many independent African countries have all along feared he would some day do. Having arbitrarily closed the Rhodesia-Zambia border, the Rhodesian rebel has unleashed on his country's entire African population new Emergency regulations aimed at defeating their clamour for [independence].

"Under the ruthless new measures announced by him [some weeks back], whole villages will be ordered by White Provincial Commissioners to pay exorbitant communal fines if any (African) inhabitants are suspected of aiding, abetting or harbouring guerrillas.

"Closely examined, however, Smith's actions are, in reality, aimed at placing Rhodesia on a war footing. President Kaunda of Zambia has said as much; and as the rebel Prime Minister has been bragging of having had an upper hand over the freedom fighters, his latest warlike provocations cannot deceive anybody.

"Zambian official reports of South African troop movements into Rhodesia over the last few days have not been convincingly rebutted by Smith and his friends in Pretoria. At least 4,000 South African troops were [some weeks back] reported by the Zambians to have arrived in Rhodesia.

"Who dare now doubt the timing and designs of the racist axis in Southern Africa? Zambia has obviously been chosen as their immediate target and, unless the warmongers are assured of solid African and world opposition to their designs—and immediate measures taken to reinforce Zambian defences—anything can happen at any time.

"It might have been unthinkable a few months ago that the minority régimes which rule over southern Africa would be so foolish as to incite the horror of what might turn into a racial war. They have closed their eyes completely to Africa's post-[independence] history for they now realise that, almost to a man, all the rulers of independent Africa are non-racialists and regard all their citizens as equal partners in nation-building.

"This is the edifice the racists of southern Africa are bent on sabotaging, possibly by force.

"Smith and his confederates have always dreaded the prospect of losing the lucrative trade returns they have been harvesting from landlocked Zambia. Now that work on the Tanzam railway is proceeding satisfactorily, Smith had to find a scapegoat in the occasional intrusion on Rhodesia by African freedom fighters. He therefore abruptly sealed off the . . . borders [between his country and Zambia].

"But the white Rhodesian rebels started provoking Zambia as long ago as 1970 and 1971. It was then, too, that the first contingent of South African troops took up positions along the Zambezi River.

"In October 1971, for instance, the Smith régime created a 25-mile-long buffer zone along the Zambezi

River and cleared the area of all human inhabitants in order to allow security forces to shoot on sight any 'unauthorised' African found in the area. It is known that detachments of South African troops have been patrolling the region [since then].

"Although Governments in all independent African countries are aware of South Africa's military might, and the strength and calibre of the White Rhodesian armed forces and their modern kit, they will definitely not stand aloof if Zambia is attacked.

"Any type of war is always wasteful. It would be the height of folly if the racists of southern Africa invite upon themselves the wrath of armies from independent African countries. Taking solace in what they call intricate logistics and geographical inhibitions, the racists have been making a terrible mistake in thinking that they could overrun any of the independent African countries and get away with it.

"Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania and Malawi have offered Zambia every possible assistance and facility. Several other independent African countries have denounced Ian Smith's warlike provocation and called on the Organisation of African Unity to take up the challenge.

"Unfortunately, due . . . to [certain difficulties], the independent African States have so far failed to create the type of High Command or 'Defence Commission' they have been talking about since 1963. That idea should now commend itself [to the African countries] in the light of the current events in Central Africa."

139. The Security Council and the international community must now act to defuse the southern Africa situation. As has already been indicated by many speakers, the situation is pregnant with conflict. It is full of strife and agony signifying the inevitable racial clash, bloodshed and holocaust.

140. As was clearly indicated by the representative of Zambia in his statement yesterday, South Africa's practice of intervening in the affairs of dependent Territories in southern Africa must be curbed completely. The United Kingdom must force South Africa to remove its armed forces from the colony of Rhodesia. The Security Council must again reaffirm its support for the people of Southern Rhodesia, Angola, Mozambique and Namibia in their fight for independence and self-determination.

141. Of immediate importance is the crisis precipitated by the Rhodesian closure of its border with Zambia and its imposition of an economic blockade against Zambia. Two immediate actions are called for here. First, the confrontation created by the action of the rebel régime is a dangerous symbol of the likely clash of black and white people of southern Africa—and here I must say that fighting and bloodshed have long been predicted as the inevitable outcome of *apartheid* and blinkered refusal to acknowledge African political aspirations—and the independence movement cannot at any time be stifled. Also, the guerrillas have shown that they will fight and carry their fight and the shooting war to the borders of Rhodesia. Because of the

inevitability of these developments, one of these days Mr. Smith will find himself faced with the totality of the opposition of the African States.

142. This situation must be defused; the United Kingdom must intervene by force to help stop this bloodshed. In this exercise the United Kingdom must be assured of the support which, I am sure, the Council will gladly give. The friends of Ian Smith and the South African white minority régime in the West must choose now either to line up with racialism and white minority domination in southern Africa or to join in the wholesome exercise of helping to establish régimes in southern Africa based on principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations.

143. The Security Council and the international community must come to the aid of Zambia and help it salvage its economy, and protect its political and economic sovereignty. The Council must come to the aid of Zambia, both as a loyal Member of this world body and as a champion of the purposes and principles of the Charter. In this respect my delegation not only supports all the conditions and recommendations which were outlined by the representative of Zambia in his statement yesterday, but also urges that the Council invoke the provisions of Articles 49 and 50.

144. We also urge the Council to set up and immediately dispatch to Zambia a high-powered mission, supported by experts in economics, trade, transport and communications, to assess the needs of Zambia at this time and report back on this to the Council as soon as possible.

145. Moreover, economic sanctions against the rebel régime of Ian Smith must now be declared total and must be rigorously applied and supervised to ensure that they are not violated. The Council must appeal again to all countries of the world to cut off all relations with the rebel colony of Southern Rhodesia in order to give the sanctions a chance of success. The machinery for enforcing the sanctions should be carefully re-examined and tightened where they are found wanting.

146. Finally, I should like to point out that the warnings we are giving in the course of this debate are not new. This is not the first time we African representatives have pointed to the dangers and to the likely conflagration in southern Africa. We appeal to members of this Council to judge our statements and to weigh our judgements carefully, because it appears to me and to my delegation that very soon this Council and the international community will have no way of avoiding a racial confrontation and blood bath in southern Africa.

147. Mr. JAIN (India): It was with close attention and a feeling of deep concern and sympathy that we listened to the statement of the representative of Zambia at the commencement of our present debate [1687th meeting]. He gave a comprehensive exposition, eloquent and yet restrained, of the extremely dangerous situation which has been created in southern Africa as a result of the most recent and serious aggressive activities of the illegal racist régime in Southern Rhodesia.

148. Our anxiety and concern at the situation created by the illegal régime on 9 January by its economic blockade of Zambia and the accompanying activities of sabotage and aggression against Zambia have already been expressed both bilaterally to Zambia and in the forum of the Group of non-aligned countries, which sent a message to the President of Zambia on 23 January. The message stated, *inter alia*:

"In this critical moment for Zambia and for peace, the representatives of the non-aligned countries at the United Nations express their complete and fraternal solidarity with the Government and the people of Zambia. They pay tribute to the determination of the people of Zambia under your leadership to face the challenges which confront them and to their readiness to make sacrifices and undergo sufferings to safeguard their independence and the cause of freedom."

149. Basically, what is happening is nothing new. The history of decolonization is replete with examples of oppressor Powers which, unable to contain the struggle for freedom, turned in desperation against others to make them scapegoats of their own folly. There have been, in recent times, a number of such aggressions by colonial Powers against neighbouring States in Africa. The Council has already dealt with complaints by Senegal, Zaïre and Guinea. Now it is Zambia which is afflicted.

150. Both by its geographical location and by the courage and dedication of its people, Zambia is in the vanguard of the struggle for freedom in southern Africa. As has repeatedly been pointed out, the present activities of the illegal régime in Rhodesia, in full connivance with the South African Government, are designed to coerce, intimidate and blackmail Zambia into withdrawing its solidarity and just support for the legitimate struggle of the people of Zimbabwe to secure their inalienable rights.

151. The legitimacy of this struggle has been recognized in resolutions of this Council itself. The Council is also fully aware that attempts to suppress this struggle are not confined to the Smith régime alone. They are, in fact, only a part of the pattern worked out by the unholy alliance of that régime with South Africa and Portugal. My delegation would therefore like to reiterate that it is necessary for the Council to take a comprehensive view of this pattern in the perspective of what is happening between the Territories controlled by Portugal, South Africa and the Smith régime on the one hand, and independent African countries on the other.

152. In the present instance, despite the denials from South Africa, it has been well known for a long time that its so-called police force in Rhodesia, by whatever name it may be called, is really an army in disguise. During last February's meetings of the Security Council in Addis Ababa, my delegation suggested that we should study methods by which the South African army could be withdrawn from Rhodesia. This question has now assumed a critical urgency in the present context.

153. The explosive situation arising from the continued denial of the inalienable rights of the people of Zimbabwe

has repeatedly come before the Security Council. Repeatedly the question has been asked: what can the Security Council do? Since the commencement of our present debate a number of suggestions have been made. The representative of Zambia provided us with many specific and concrete suggestions. Like the basic causes of the crisis they are intended to resolve, these suggestions are also not new to the Council. However, in the present situation threatening international peace and security, we have to consider what measures can be effectively applied.

154. It is clear to us that the present acts of aggression against Zambia should be condemned and stopped, and that the South African forces in whatever form they exist in Southern Rhodesia, should be removed. We must extend full support and sympathy to Zambia in its determined struggle to protect its independence and applaud Zambia's bold stand, acute economic consequences notwithstanding, against the economic blockade imposed on it by the illegal régime of Ian Smith in collusion with South Africa. It is equally clear that the sanctions policy should be intensified and made more effective and the Council's Committee in this regard should undertake immediate and appropriate action to this end. We should also reaffirm the inalienable rights of the people of Zimbabwe, already enshrined in so many resolutions in the United Nations and hold the United Kingdom Government to its commitment. The unreal air which surrounds these responsibilities, and the consequences which flow from it, were explained by my delegation at the 1666th meeting of the Council on 29 September 1972.

155. Another important measure required of us is to provide support to Zambia in the face of economic pressures which are being exerted against it. The need for this support had already been recognized by the Security Council in paragraph 15 of resolution 253 (1968) which was unanimously adopted. This reads:

"Requests States Members of the United Nations, the United Nations Organization, the specialized agencies, and other international organizations in the United Nations system to extend assistance to Zambia as a matter of priority with a view to helping it solve such special economic problems as it may be confronted with arising from the carrying out of these decisions of the Security Council."

We believe that implementation of this paragraph of that resolution is particularly important in the present context. We on our part are ready to co-operate and contribute in relieving these pressures on Zambia in its present time of crisis.

156. We know very well that the present crisis has been brought upon Zambia because it opposes colonialism and discrimination, because it stands in the way of the unholy alliance between South Africa, Portugal and Ian Smith, and because this unholy alliance is out to undermine countries like it. The crisis facing Zambia should not be seen only as one threatening its independent existence but also as one threatening the cause of freedom from the colonial yoke and endangering the principles which are enshrined in the

Charter and which we all cherish and uphold. We deem it our duty to support, as we have consistently done, the cause of the liberation struggle, of justice and of the human dignity of the subjugated and oppressed people of southern Africa. It is indeed ironic that colonialists and racists in southern Africa and elsewhere continue, in total disregard of international public opinion, to cling to the myth of a colonial order that is already dead and desperately defend policies of racialism and human exploitation through

intensified provocations such as those now confronting Zambia.

157. It is in this total perspective that we support Zambia's present complaint. My delegation would be ready to co-operate with other members in devising an effective course of Council action in the present situation.

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. استلم منها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى: الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

如何购取联合国出版物

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

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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