



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-EIGHTH YEAR

1689th MEETING : 31 JANUARY 1973

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1689)	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-NINTH MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 31 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/1689)

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 our previous decision [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, Zaïre, 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 places 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: In a letter dated 30 January 1973, the representative of Cuba has asked to be allowed to participate in the discussion of this item. In accordance with the provisional rules of procedure and the usual practice of the Council, I propose, if there is no objection, to invite the representative of Cuba, under the terms of Article 31 of the Charter, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote and to take a place in the Council chamber on the understanding that he will be invited to take a place at the Council table when it is his turn to speak.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. R. Alarcón (Cuba) took the place reserved for him in the Council chamber.

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

5. Mr. NUR ELMI (Somalia): Mr. President, my delegation wishes to thank you and the members of the Security Council for giving me the opportunity to participate in the present debate on the question of the recent wanton aggression against Zambia by the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia and by the Republic of South Africa.

6. My delegation wishes also to extend to you its most sincere congratulations on your assumption of the office of President of the Council for the month of January—an honour which you have justly earned and which does credit to your great country, Indonesia, with which the Somali Democratic Republic enjoys fraternal relations.

7. Both as an East African country and as a member of the Organization of African Unity, my country feels closely involved in the immediate problems which have led to the calling of this meeting of the Security Council. My delegation has always taken an active part in discussions of the wider problem of colonialism and racism in southern Africa, and it is of course within this wider context that the developments we are discussing have to be seen.

8. We have, on many occasions, together with the other peace-loving and anti-colonialist delegations, warned the world Organization, especially the Security Council, of the danger posed to international peace and security as a result of the grave situation that prevails in southern Africa. This situation has been sufficiently described in detail in recent years in each of the reports of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The deterioration of the situation in the region has emphasized once again that this is indeed a dangerous situation which must not be neglected and that those who have special responsibilities in regard to this problem must not shirk those responsibilities.

9. The illegal Smith régime's decision to threaten Zambia with economic blackmail and military aggression and Zambia's courageous decision to join in the full implementation of the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia are symptomatic of two things: first, the continuing intransigence of the Smith régime, which continues to consolidate its illegal powers; and second, the determination of those who have a concern for justice in Southern Rhodesia to act with solidarity in the struggle for freedom. Both the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, and the Security Council must convince the world, in theory as well as in practice, that it is indeed the struggle for freedom and not the racist domination of whites over blacks in southern Africa which has their political and moral support.

10. As far as the Security Council is concerned, its involvement with the problem of Southern Rhodesia began in an impressive way, but that involvement seems to be steadily weakening. The Southern Rhodesian situation is the only one which has so far called for the application of economic sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. But what has become of the initial recognition of the responsibility of the United Nations to avert threats to international peace and security such as that presented by yet another explosive situation in southern Africa? What has become of the initial recognition that the world community has a duty to combat the intolerable arrogance of the white minority régime in Southern Rhodesia which openly seeks to deny the basic human rights to the majority of the people of Zimbabwe in their own native land? What indeed has become of the economic sanctions which were imposed as a result of the recognition by the United Nations of its responsibility and duty in this matter? The situation now is that clandestine trade with Southern Rhodesia is carried on to the point where sanctions can be seen operating more in the breach than in the observance. In addition, a super Power with special responsibilities for world leadership, both in the moral sphere and in the sphere of practical politics, has openly flouted sanctions without any compelling reasons, so that it has set an example of indifference to

the cause of justice in Southern Rhodesia and to the authority of the United Nations. I refer, of course, to the United States of America.

11. One cannot help contrasting this action with that of Zambia, a comparatively small, developing country. Because of its need for transit facilities for its main export, copper, Zambia had been unable to carry out fully the economic sanctions imposed by the Security Council against the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia. Now, with tremendous sacrifice to its economic life and in the face of threats of aggression from Southern Rhodesia and South Africa, the Zambian Government has called on its people to make the sacrifices which the application of comprehensive economic sanctions against Southern Rhodesia will entail. In the tremendous task of re-routing its exports, Zambia will receive the valuable co-operation of neighbouring independent African countries.

12. The example given by Zambia and its neighbours in the fulfilling of international obligations is one that must be taken to heart by many other States which, with much less or little hardship to themselves, could take steps to observe sanctions strictly and ensure that their nationals did not engage in illicit trade with Southern Rhodesia. This is a clear responsibility of Member States, individually and collectively, since Article 49 of the Charter states that Members shall join in affording mutual assistance in carrying out measures decided upon by the Security Council.

13. The Security Council's responsibilities, of course, go further. As the main organ with primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, it has the duty to consult, if required to do so, with any State which has special economic problems arising from the carrying out of enforcement measures. Obviously, this is the case with Zambia. It is the hope of my delegation that the Security Council will now set up appropriate machinery to ascertain the best ways of assisting Zambia to develop its alternative road, air and sea routes for the transport of its exports formerly sent through Southern Rhodesia. The Security Council must also do its utmost to enlist the support of those States which are in a position to assist the Zambian Government and people in their heroic task.

14. Another grave responsibility of the Security Council must be the condemnation of the overt acts of aggression which the illegal Smith régime is directing towards Zambia with the strong support of South Africa, its partner and mentor in racist oppression.

15. As we all know, many people have been killed or wounded in Zambia by landmines laid in Zambian territory by the Southern Rhodesian forces, and South Africa has sent several thousand troops to support the illegal and insane Smith régime. So Zambian citizens have fallen victims to the armies of hatred, oppression and racial discrimination.

16. If the United Nations has a general responsibility for maintaining peace in and around Rhodesia in the context of its concern to end colonialism and racism in South Africa, the United Kingdom has a special responsibility as the

administering Power of the Territory, for there is no doubt whatsoever as to the status of the Territory. Southern Rhodesia is a British colony under British responsibility and is on the list of Territories that have not yet attained their independence. It is a Territory still under colonial rule.

17. Throughout the history of the Southern Rhodesian problem, my Government has always maintained that it was the clear duty of the Government of the United Kingdom to make the rebel régime understand, without any shadow of doubt, that it was determined to bring about a just society in Southern Rhodesia and prepared to use its vastly superior forces to attain that end. Throughout the history of the Southern Rhodesian problem, the British Government has treated the rebels with kid gloves, with the result that we have this continually deteriorating situation.

18. Speaking on the question of Southern Rhodesia at the last session of the General Assembly,¹ my delegation expressed the view that, with the failure of the Pearce Commission and the clear expression by the African majority of its wishes and aspirations, the hour of truth of the United Kingdom in Southern Rhodesia had come. My delegation now believes that the hour of truth has come also for the international community, which has to face the issues in that area without equivocation. Straight answers must be given here to these questions: are we or are we not pledged to do our utmost to put down an illegal and unjust régime in Southern Rhodesia? Do we or do we not consider just the struggle of the national movements which seek to liberate the African majority from the inhumanity of *apartheid*? Where do our sympathies and responsibilities as Member States lie? I do not think those questions have been clearly thought through to their logical conclusions by many States around this table.

19. In reaffirming Zambia's solidarity with the gallant people struggling for freedom in southern Africa, President Kaunda has obviously thought those questions through with a clear sense of history. He knows that the freedom fighters are seeking the same liberation from oppressive and unjust rule that has in the past 300 years had to be fought for by many of the countries today represented in the United Nations. And yet some of those countries seem to see themselves as an exclusive club whose membership has now been closed. In effect, they seem to be telling the African liberation movements that it was all right for them, in their time—if I may quote Shakespeare—"to take arms against a sea of troubles and, by opposing, end them". But there is a marked reluctance in many quarters to go beyond the mere theoretical recognition of the justness of the cause of the African national liberation movements.

20. In this context it is pertinent to call to mind the terrible tragedy of the assassination of Amílcar Cabral, the Secretary-General of the African Party for the Independence of Guinea (Bissau) and the Cape Verde Islands (PAIGC), whose death is an incalculable loss to the cause of African freedom. Now that he is dead there is widespread recognition of his qualities, his great abilities as a leader, his resistance to oppression, his moderation in the conduct of

the movement he led and his hopes for peaceful negotiation with the Portuguese Government, which he carried side by side with his determination to gain, by force of arms, the freedom that could not be acquired by peaceful means. These things are being said; these praises are being sung by many who, during Cabral's lifetime, had the power at the very least to refrain from actions and policies which materially strengthened the Portuguese in their unjust colonial war but who, far from supporting Cabral's just cause, gave material aid and moral comfort to his enemies, the enemies of justice and freedom in Africa. And so I again ask for clear thinking on the question of the struggle for freedom in Africa and on the particular aspect of that struggle we are now considering.

21. The United Kingdom, the administering Power of the colony of Southern Rhodesia, must not—as it did in this Council in September of last year—turn aside from the task of attempting to develop further initiatives that will enable the African majority, whose troubles and trials and hopes for a better future we all know only too well, to exercise fully their political, civil and social rights, and remove once and for all the threat to peace and security in southern Africa. The Security Council, with its grave responsibility for the maintenance of peace, must ensure that Zambia will not be the subject of aggression and that it will be fully supported in its efforts to carry out its international responsibilities vis-à-vis the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia.

22. Finally, my delegation fully supports the 12-point proposal suggested by the representative of Zambia in his statement of Monday last [1687th meeting] as a guideline for the course of action to be taken by the Council.

23. Mr. MADDY (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation heard with interest and emotion the important statement of the representative of Zambia, Ambassador Lusaka [*ibid.*]. Once again the Security Council is dealing with a complaint of an independent and sovereign African State against repeated acts of aggression perpetrated by the racist and colonialist forces of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia.

24. It will be recalled that, before the shameful aggression of 22 November 1970 by the Portuguese colonialists against the Republic of Guinea, my delegation had very often drawn the attention of world public opinion to the grave dangers threatening our countries. The enemies of Africa and the freedom of peoples described that declaration as fantasy. Despite the warnings and despite the condemnation by our Organization of the Fascist Lisbon régime, the latter still carried out a barbarous aggression against my country.

25. If we carefully study those countries in Africa that have suffered aggression, we shall see that they are the Republic of Guinea, the Republic of Senegal, the United Republic of Tanzania and the Republic of Zambia: all independent countries of Africa that welcomed their suffering brothers deprived of their lands, their goods and all freedoms.

26. The complaint of the Republic of Zambia regarding the acts of aggression committed by the white minority of

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Plenary Meetings*, 2102nd meeting.

Rhodesia eloquently defines the explosive situation existing in that part of Africa, a situation which we must remedy before it is too late.

27. All these intrigues carried out by Ian Smith's minority régime against Zambia are part and parcel of a cynical and sinister plan of aggression that the racists and colonialists in Africa have elaborately prepared and carried out against the African countries that support the liberation movements.

28. May I be allowed to give some details regarding this diabolic plan of the international imperialists, revealed by officers of the Portuguese colonial army who participated in the recent assassination of the immortal Amílcar Cabral, Secretary-General of PAIGC? They said the following:

"Our mission was, first of all, to provoke division among black and mixed-blood fighters; secondly, to take advantage of all the disciplinary sanctions taken against the nationalists; thirdly, to set the members of the liberation movements against their leaders; fourthly, to promote tribal strife; fifthly, to make trouble in Guinea, Tanzania and Zambia in order to carry out subversive activities against the liberation movements in those countries; and, sixthly, to make 1973 the year of liquidation of the nationalist movements in Africa."

Those are some details of this diabolic plan conceived by the international imperialists against Africa, and we want to warn world public opinion of the grave situation which exists on our continent, and for which the Pretoria-Salisbury-Lisbon coalition is responsible.

29. Africa, that developing continent, needs peace in order to progress, but that is possible only if we can enjoy political, economic and social stability, because without political stability there can be no economic progress, and without economic progress there can be no social growth. My delegation condemns the acts of aggression and the economic blockade declared against Zambia.

30. We took note of the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom *(ibid.)* regarding the desires of his Government to assist the Republic of Zambia. My delegation would like to see those desires very speedily transformed into concrete acts. We would also insist upon the immediate withdrawal of all South African forces from that Territory and the full implementation of all resolutions referring to Southern Rhodesia. By such a courageous and laudable gesture the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, would prove that it has decided to put an end to the Ian Smith rebellion against Her Majesty's Government and Crown.

31. We need not recall the various resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly on the Rhodesian question. What is important at this stage is to see whether we can develop ways and means of ensuring respect for the sanctions which, unfortunately, are systematically violated by certain Member of the Organization, including some permanent members of the Council.

32. The Guinean delegation endorses the recommendations and suggestions made by the representative of Zambia, and urges their instant implementation.

33. Before I conclude, Mr. President, on behalf of my delegation may I thank you and congratulate you on the wise and skilful way in which you have been presiding over our debates, both in private and in public.

34. Mr. DE GUIRINGAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): The statements we have listened to with the greatest attention for the past two days in this chamber—especially those of the African delegations, members or non-members of the Council—have stressed the strong feelings created by the worsening of relations between Zambia and Southern Rhodesia. They have shown that, by closing the border with Zambia and trying to organize an economic blockade against that country, the rebel leaders of Salisbury have aroused general reprobation.

35. The French delegation, for its part, wishes to state that it deplores this initiative—a scandalous initiative, as it has been called by one of the members of the Council, because it enables an illegal régime to impose its law upon a Member State of the United Nations—and the serious incidents which have accompanied it, some of which have resulted in the loss of human lives, including those of a number of civilians. We also disapprove of the system of collective fines set up by the Rhodesian authorities in violation of international law. We consider that all these measures deal a heavy blow to the improvement of an already rather tense situation in that part of Africa.

36. Regrettable as these developments may be, they come as no great surprise to us. In imposing economic sanctions against the Smith régime—sanctions which France has always felt could not alone bring about a solution of the Rhodesian problem, but in favour of which my country voted in 1968 in order to bring to the administering Power the assistance it had requested—the Security Council knew that economic difficulties would result not only for Southern Rhodesia but also for the neighbouring countries which in the past had made up the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland and whose ties of mutual dependence, especially in regard to communications and transport, were particularly close. By dint of its geographic location, Zambia was in the most vulnerable position, and the provisions of resolutions 253 (1968) and 277 (1970), paragraphs 15 and 16 respectively, show that the Council was aware of the damage that could be caused to Zambia by the imposition of sanctions. Those resolutions indeed request Member States to grant that country priority assistance with a view to helping it solve the special economic problems which it is likely to face because of the implementation of Council decisions.

37. The countries neighbouring on Rhodesia, however, were willing to bear the consequences of the imposition of sanctions. Zambia, in particular, limited its trade relations with Rhodesia as much as possible. If we take the figures—they are rather old, since they go back to 1968—which were submitted to the Council by the Government of President Kaunda [see S/8786/Add.2 of 10 October 1968], we see that the trade between Rhodesia and Zambia, which in 1965 accounted for 33.7 per cent of that country's trade, dropped to 10.5 per cent in 1967, and that all the measures taken after the unilateral declaration of independence by Rhodesia caused Zambia a loss of \$195

million. It is clear, however, that Zambia, like other African countries neighbouring on Rhodesia, was, because of its geographic position, still dependent on Rhodesia for the transit of its own goods. To survive it had to maintain some economic ties, and of course the countries which voted in favour of sanctions, including mine, never considered the maintenance of those ties as violations of sanctions.

38. That is why we join most willingly in the tribute which several delegations have already paid to the courage shown by the Government and people of Zambia by refusing to take advantage of the exceptions granted by the Ian Smith régime for the transportation of copper from Zambia. By picking up the challenge hurled at them, they showed that they were determined fully to implement the resolutions of the Security Council, despite their own difficulties and the higher costs they would have to pay for more severe sanctions. We noted with satisfaction the statement made last Monday by the representative of Zambia, according to whom the closing of the border between his country and Rhodesia offered "a golden opportunity" [see 1687th meeting, para. 37] for intensifying the sanctions régime.

39. The determination shown by Zambia, its clear-cut desire to find permanent ways for replacing the channel for its imports and exports, should result in reducing the hard currency earnings of the Salisbury régime and, therefore, in increasing its economic difficulties, and in the long run should make it the main victim of the closing of the border. The tightening of the vice around Rhodesia should render nugatory the adoption of new sanctions, but the occasion could be taken to reaffirm the need strictly to observe those already decided by Security Council resolutions 253 (1968) and 277 (1970), especially in the financial field. Further—and this is a decision to be taken by the Council—the international community should endeavour to limit the damages which Zambia and other African countries too will inevitably suffer. The dispatch of a team of experts, which would assess the assistance which Zambia would require to put together a system of communications enabling it to maintain its economy as proposed by Mr. Lusaka in his statement, could constitute a good approach to the problem.

40. While the French delegation deeply deplores the events of recent days and their immediate consequences for Zambia, it is also worried about the results of the present crisis for the future. It fears that this crisis will not foster the solution of the political problem of Rhodesia and that the exceptional measures just taken by Salisbury will further delay the liberalization of political methods and the return to individual freedoms which all of us wish to see installed in Rhodesia. Despite this concern, we nevertheless take note of the fact that the British delegation reaffirmed in its statement that the objective remains the search for a just and acceptable political settlement in Southern Rhodesia [ibid., para. 123]. The French delegation, whose constant thesis has been that fundamental responsibility for the solution of the Rhodesian problem and for leading the country to self-determination in conformity with the freely expressed wishes of the population belongs to the administering Power, wishes to take note of that statement. We

hope that those entrusted with the heavy task of seeking a solution to this difficult decolonization problem will know how to discharge their duty in conformity with their traditions and the wishes expressed by the General Assembly and the Security Council.

41. As I come to the end of my statement on this item of our agenda I should like, Mr. President, to address to you our congratulations and our thanks—congratulations on the most competent manner in which you have presided over our debates during this month, which is also the first month of your participation in the work of the Council, and our thanks for the way in which, during this month of January, you guided the work of the committee entrusted with the task of preparing for our series of meetings in Panama. I am convinced that the success of that special session away from Headquarters will be due to a large extent to the wisdom and talent with which you guided that preparatory work.

42. Sir Laurence McINTYRE (Australia): We have listened with close attention to all the speakers who have already taken part in this debate. We listened to the representative of Zambia with particular attention, because it is Zambia that is bearing the immediate brunt of the crisis that has arisen from the deplorable action of the illegal régime in Rhodesia in closing the border with Zambia.

43. We believe that this development is deplorable on two principal counts. First of all, it threatens to impose a severe economic strain on Zambia, at least in the short term, and an acute psychological and physical strain as well. It cuts Zambia off from its main sources and channels of imported supplies and it is bound to raise formidable problems for Zambia in the export of its copper and other commodities on which it primarily depends for its national livelihood. None of us here can fail to have the fullest sympathy for the Government and people of Zambia in the situation in which they find themselves, and with it a desire to help them in any way that may be practicable. Secondly, the Rhodesian action has created, in a singularly provocative fashion, a new area of tension, a new and critical flash-point in the troubled southern African scene, with the predictable accompaniment of more violence and more death. This can only present another serious set-back to hopes that, given time, we might all help to accelerate a process of peaceful and orderly change in that disturbed area of the world.

44. For these reasons, we fully share the condemnation that we have heard expressed around this table of the aggressive and dangerously provocative action of the Rhodesian rebel régime in closing the border with Zambia. If there is any consolation to be drawn from this lamentable development, which is highly doubtful, it can only lie in the expectation that the Rhodesian régime, by a decision which is from every point of view as perilous as it is impetuous, will have done damage to its own position in both the short and longer term.

45. The Australian Government has repeatedly made clear its aversion to the blinkered and repressive régime in Rhodesia and its abhorrence of the policies of social and racial discrimination that are being pursued by that régime. At the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly my delegation voted in favour of resolutions 2945 (XXVII) and

2946 (XXVII), thus conveying the full endorsement of my Government of the right of the people of Rhodesia to self-determination and independence on the basis of majority rule. It must be the task of all of us to induce Ian Smith, his colleagues and the white minority as a whole to recognize that there can be no genuine peace throughout southern Africa and no secure future for Rhodesia as long as the existing policies of the régime remain in effect.

46. In opening this debate [1687th meeting], the representative of Zambia made a number of proposals that he would wish to see incorporated in any decision reached by the Council on the agenda item before it. My delegation can support the main thrust and purpose of these proposals, which we have carefully studied. They appear to resolve themselves into differing orders of priority and cogency, and not all of them can be expected to command an equal degree of acceptance by the Council as a whole.

47. I do not intend, at this stage, to comment individually on all these proposals, but I can say, first of all, that we can join in condemnation of the economic and military pressure that the Rhodesian régime has brought to bear upon Zambia by its closure of the border. We would also condemn in the strongest terms the presence of any foreign forces in Rhodesia, about which much has already been said in the Council and much written in the press, and we would naturally support a call for their withdrawal.

48. On the question of increasing the effectiveness of the sanctions against Rhodesia, we are of course still awaiting the latest report of the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968). The Council may well consider it useful to explore possible ways of extending the scope of sanctions. But the main objective, as was pointed out by the representative of the United Kingdom [*ibid.*], must be to make the existing range of sanctions fully effective, which has clearly not been the case up to the present. I might note here that the Australian Government has taken a number of steps in recent weeks to identify and close any loop-holes that may remain in respect of its own domestic measures to apply the sanctions resolutions.

49. On the question of the serious economic difficulties forced on Zambia as a result of the closure of the border, we note that the representative of Zambia has emphasized the importance of maintaining alternative road, rail and sea communications with the outside world. It may well be that a survey of Zambia's needs in this regard by a communications expert or experts, as recommended by Ambassador Lusaka, might offer the best means of establishing what further action might be required to help Zambia to sustain its economy.

50. Those are merely preliminary comments on the Zambian proposals, and they are not intended to be in any sense exclusive or final. My delegation will wait before commenting further until definitive proposals begin to take shape for the Council's consideration. Let me simply repeat, in conclusion, that we have great sympathy for Zambia in the intolerable situation in which it finds itself. We shall do our best to help the Council in reaching decisions that will reduce the present tension along the

border and offer practical assistance to Zambia, and will at the same time represent, we hope, a constructive contribution towards a solution, by peaceful and not violent means, to the complex and difficult problems of southern Africa.

51. Mr. JANKOWITSCH (Austria): The Council continues to debate the complaint by Zambia concerning the situation on its frontier with Rhodesia. My delegation has listened with the closest attention to the previous speakers in this debate, in particular to speakers from African countries, members and non-members of the Council, who have given us their views on this question.

52. The representative of Zambia informed us two days ago [1687th meeting], in the clearest possible terms, of the extremely dangerous situation that has developed along the border between Zambia and Rhodesia and of the fatal casualties caused by this situation in recent days. I should like to extend, on behalf of my Government, our most sincere condolences to the Government of Zambia and to the families of the victims. Austria deeply deplores these acts of violence that have not only caused a most alarming aggravation of the situation in the area, but also resulted in the death of innocent people.

53. Since the political situation in Rhodesia has a direct bearing on this question and since, on the other hand, this is the first time that Austria has stated its position on the Rhodesian question in this chamber, I should like to elaborate rapidly on the attitude my Government has consistently taken on this question in the past.

54. After the unilateral declaration of independence, the Austrian Federal Government decided, on 23 November 1965, not to recognize the illegal régime in Salisbury. This decision was communicated to the Secretary-General by a letter dated 26 January 1966 [S/7115]. It was in this way that Austria clearly manifested that it could never approve of a policy of social and racial discrimination by a small minority without regard to and even against the will of the vast majority in the country.

55. The decision not to recognize the illegal régime in Salisbury was followed by economic measures taken immediately. The most important one was the decision of the Austrian Government to stop all imports of tobacco from Rhodesia by the Austrian State monopoly for tobacco. In the succeeding years, Austria has, without prejudice to the question of principle arising in this context from Austria's status of permanent neutrality—a status I referred to in my statement before this Council on 16 January of this year [1684th meeting]—accepted the sanctions imposed by the Security Council on Southern Rhodesia in resolutions 232 (1966), 253 (1968) and 277 (1970), and has, in so far as they affected Austria, provided for the implementation of the relevant provisions. I should like to refer in this connexion to notes addressed to the Secretary-General on 28 February 1967 [see S/7781/Add.2, annex], 31 July 1968 [see S/8786, annex II] and 28 June 1970 [see S/9853 of 1 July 1970, annex II].

56. As a consequence of that policy, total Austrian imports from Southern Rhodesia dropped from approximately 7,000 tons in 1965 to only 228 tons in 1969. They

have ceased altogether since 1970. The composition of Austrian imports during the last years before the resolutions on sanctions shows, moreover, that only tobacco was imported in any sizable quantity. This most substantial import item has been eliminated completely, not without certain economic sacrifices. It fell to zero in 1968.

57. Let me now turn to the complaint of Zambia. As I have demonstrated with regard to my own country, the sanctions orders of the Security Council did have economic and administrative effects on all countries which previously had economic relations with Rhodesia. It goes without saying that these effects were magnified in countries which had particularly close relations with Southern Rhodesia. Among these, Zambia can be said to have a special position since, as the Northern Rhodesia of colonial times, it was most closely linked to the economy of Rhodesia until its own independence in October 1964. That such a situation cannot be reversed in a matter of months, or even a few years, seems equally clear, and I should like to quote here a passage from the reply Zambia gave on 23 February 1967 to the Secretary-General on carrying out the sanctions, a passage which seems relevant in this context:

"Although the Government of the Republic of Zambia does not believe that the measures adopted by the Security Council would be effective enough to bring down the illegal régime, and despite the fact that Zambia's and Southern Rhodesia's economies have for the past 70 years been inextricably joined like Siamese twins, and whereas any sanctions aimed at disrupting the economy of Southern Rhodesia are bound to disrupt the economy of Zambia, the Government of the Republic of Zambia is prepared to give its maximum co-operation in the implementation of resolution 232 (1966), and in fact it has already adopted a policy which aims at severing all economic and trade connexions with Southern Rhodesia. To achieve this the Government of Zambia has already imposed far-reaching and more extensive voluntary sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

"Since the unilateral declaration of independence by the minority white régime in Southern Rhodesia, Zambia has spent well over \$90 million implementing its policy of severing its trade and economic ties with Southern Rhodesia . . ." [See S/7781/Add.2, annex.]

58. Equally illuminating are trade statistics for 1965, which show Zambia in the first place among the countries importing from Southern Rhodesia, receiving roughly 25 per cent of Southern Rhodesia's exports.

59. Zambia's special position was recognized by this Council when, in paragraph 15 of resolution 253 (1968) and paragraph 16 of resolution 277 (1970), it requested Member States, the United Nations and the specialized agencies to extend assistance to Zambia with a view to helping it solve its economic problems. I should like to quote in this connexion from the reply given by Zambia on 10 July 1970, on the implementation of resolutions 232 (1966), 253 (1968) and 277 (1970):

"Security Council resolutions 253 (1968) and 277 (1970) requested Member States, the United Nations,

the specialized agencies and other international organizations to extend assistance to Zambia as a matter of priority, with a view to helping Zambia solve such economic problems as Zambia had been confronted with as a result of the decisions of the Security Council. I wish to report with deep regret that no Member States, specialized agencies or other international organizations have given Zambia effective assistance as a result of these resolutions." [See S/9853/Add.1 of 1 October 1970, annex I.]

60. In the years that have followed, Zambia has undertaken the greatest efforts in order to comply with sanctions, and these efforts were not least among the acts which earned Zambia and its President, Mr. Kenneth Kaunda, the sympathy and admiration of many countries, including my own. Zambia certainly has borne the brunt and has been in the forefront of the struggle of Africa to gain full freedom and independence of the continent.

61. As the result of severing its last economic ties with Rhodesia during recent weeks, Zambia today faces a new and more serious situation. My delegation is therefore convinced that the request expressed by Zambia, based on Articles 49 and 50 of the Charter and on the aforementioned provisions of resolutions 253 (1968) and 277 (1970), for economic assistance by United Nations organizations and by Member States deserves most serious consideration by this Council. We feel that such assistance should enable Zambia to reinforce its economic independence from Rhodesia and contribute to diminishing the danger of a confrontation along the common border line.

62. Austria holds the firm belief—which it has expressed time and again in the competent organs of the United Nations—that decolonization in areas where colonialism persists should progress by the fastest means possible, but that peaceful means constitute the best and safest way to a lasting . . . of the problems inherent in this process. Austria therefore feels that the continued presence on Rhodesian territory of non-Rhodesian forces must be deplored as it contributes to the rise of tension in the area and could widen the scope of conflict.

63. The representative of Zambia in his statement has suggested, among other measures, new efforts in order to ensure the strictest compliance with sanctions. In view of what I have said earlier, the necessity to ensure the strictest compliance with Security Council decisions on sanctions on a universal basis certainly exists. Zambia, in the light of recent developments, has now made a new and important contribution, involving great sacrifice, to this end. But we have to recognize the fact that sanctions are not yet as effective as they should be and that considerable trade from and to Southern Rhodesia is still continuing. The Committee on Sanctions² is now actively engaged in a study of this matter and should present a report to the Council within the next month. We feel that, in the light of this report, which we hope will contain all the necessary technical information on possibilities to enforce sanctions, the Council will be able to consider whatever steps are necessary.

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

64. Some other possibilities of action for the Council have been mentioned. In considering them we should, however, not lose sight of the underlying political goals that we are pursuing. For more than seven years the political problem of Southern Rhodesia has remained with us; if any change is perceptible, it is a change for the worse. Successive United Kingdom Governments have devoted a great deal of political effort to a solution of this problem and we do not hesitate to pay tribute to these endeavours. In particular we welcome the decision taken by the United Kingdom Government to respect fully the verdict of the people of Zimbabwe expressed through the Pearce Commission.

65. It is our firm belief that the success of any action taken by this Council and by the Organization itself depends strongly on the continued co-operation and goodwill of all parties concerned.

66. It is the primary task of the Council to pursue the maintenance of international peace and security. Without any doubt, the situation as it exists today in Rhodesia and as it has developed particularly after the unilateral and hostile act of the illegal Smith régime against Zambia, is disrupting the security of the area. In considering any action the Council might wish to take in this context, we should carefully examine whether such action can effectively contribute to a rapid elimination of the existing threat to the peace in a part of the continent already torn by too many years of tension, conflict and confrontation. My delegation is ready to associate itself with all efforts meeting those requirements.

67. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America): Recent events along the Zambian-Rhodesian border are causes for concern on the part of members of the Security Council. The incidents described to us by the representative of Zambia [1687th meeting] and the subsequent closing by the Smith régime of its border with Zambia demonstrate the tension which can arise in the southern part of Africa.

68. In previous meetings, the Security Council has been primarily concerned with developments occurring within the Territory of Southern Rhodesia as well as with the effectiveness of sanctions. During this series of meetings, however, our attention has also been directed to events which involve a Member State of the United Nations. Even though we are always aware of the possibility of incidents occurring in an area of tension such as this, we had all hoped, I am sure, that the problems could have been substantially contained to a certain degree within the borders of Southern Rhodesia. It would have been better for Rhodesia not to involve another country through a series of incidents and in closing the border. Unhappily, however, this has not been the case.

69. Turning to the complaint raised by Zambia, it is clear that, in view of the economic relationships that existed between Zambia and Southern Rhodesia prior to the illegal declaration of independence, it would have imposed a heavy economic burden for Zambia to sever all its links with Southern Rhodesia. Despite this, Zambia has since 1965 done its best to comply with the sanctions instituted against Southern Rhodesia. It was clear at the outset that, if it was to reduce its dependence on Southern Rhodesia,

Zambia would require outside assistance. This assistance was almost immediately forthcoming. Many Member States, including the United States, responded to Zambia's request for help during the early days of sanctions. During the period January through April 1966 it provided, at a cost of \$4.5 million, a comprehensive airlift for the transport of petroleum products. During that period, United States planes made some 500 round trips, transporting 4 million gallons of such products from other points in Africa to Zambia—a unique, costly, but very necessary airlift. In addition, the United States provided some \$38 million towards the construction of the great north road, which has enabled Zambia to transport, by truck, its copper to the United Republic of Tanzania for export to other parts of the world and to transport its imports.

70. Additional assistance was also provided by my Government as well as by other countries. This assistance has strengthened Zambia's ability to weather the adverse effects on its economy of the application of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

71. The United States has followed Zambia's plight with close attention, and we have been in close touch with the Zambian Government since the border was closed. We are very much aware of the problems for Zambia resulting from this act. It is unfortunate that the closing of the Zambian Southern Rhodesian border has forced Zambia to take drastic measures and seek alternate routes for its goods. The present difficult circumstances in which Zambia finds itself obviously underscore the need to examine carefully appropriate ways in which Zambia might be assisted.

72. The United States has long held the view that the problem of Southern Rhodesia should be resolved through peaceful means. The imposition of sanctions against that Territory was one of the peaceful ways in which the United Kingdom and the United Nations could help bring an end to the rebellion against Her Majesty's Government. Unfortunately, sanctions have not yet brought about the desired results.

73. Southern Rhodesia has continued to flout world public opinion. Its obstinate refusal to agree to the principle of self-determination for all of its population and to accept the principle of majority rule has only served to exacerbate an already tense situation. Its willingness to take action against a neighbouring country makes it most difficult to achieve the peaceful settlement of the problem which we all seek.

74. The Smith régime persists in its rebellion and, furthermore, is rapidly enacting and enforcing racist laws discriminating between the races and imposing abhorrent collective punishment. Many African States have voiced their opposition to these racist policies. The United States also cannot condone the actions taken by the Smith régime both inside and outside Southern Rhodesia. The United States believes that sanctions should be maintained and tightened and that further attempts should be made to achieve a peaceful settlement. We are fully conscious of the fact that there are those in some quarters who feel that additional measures should be undertaken. These are matters of which the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of

resolution 253 (1968) has been seized since the adoption of resolution 320 (1972). I am sure that this Committee, aware of the urgency of making a report to the Council, will examine fully the various suggestions that have been made in order to render sanctions more effective.

75. But in deliberating this question, both the Committee and the Security Council should examine all the effects which might follow from the acceptance of those suggestions. While we all hope that the rebellion will end at the earliest possible date, we wish meanwhile to keep the Rhodesian population informed of what is happening outside Rhodesia. It is necessary to maintain a free flow of communication, if only to avoid helping the minority régime further to consolidate its position by our dropping down a curtain around its people. Such an act would, in our view, be totally ineffective—indeed, counterproductive—in inducing the régime to change its oppressive policies.

76. Our views on the extension of sanctions have been made clear time and time again and I need not repeat them today. It has been suggested that a team of United Nations experts be sent to Zambia to assess the economic situation. The United States supports this suggestion and wishes to propose that, inasmuch as there is already capable United Nations representation on the spot, the Resident Representative of the United Nations Development Programme might be requested immediately to undertake this task for the Security Council. We would hope that whoever undertakes such a task would draw on all the previous studies made after the unilateral declaration of independence. It is of course necessary to examine all aspects of the problem, and my delegation can conceive of circumstances in which it might be highly desirable that a representative of the Secretary-General visit the area to examine both the political and the military situation.

77. Finally, the United States is very gratified to note from the statement of the United Kingdom representative [*ibid.*] that his Government has been in touch with both sides and that they have made clear their desire to see an end to the confrontation, the reopening of the border and an early return to peaceful conditions. We warmly associate ourselves with these hopes and objectives.

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

79. Mr. ALARCON (Cuba) (*Interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, may I first of all express to you and, through you, to the members of the Council our thanks for allowing us to take part in this important debate in which the Security Council is engaged under your wise and skilful leadership.

80. I do not intend to make a lengthy statement in this debate since a number of speakers have already spelled out in detail the significance of the situation facing us because of the provocations and attacks of which our sister republic of Zambia has been the victim during the last few weeks, and also since we have heard a very complete statement by Ambassador Lusaka [1687th meeting] which enlightened

the Council regarding this aggressive campaign now being waged against Zambia.

81. The Council has very often examined similar situations involving the Republic of Guinea, the People's Republic of the Congo, the United Republic of Tanzania and Senegal, countries which in the past have also been victims of provocations and attacks from the colonialist and racist enclaves which still persist on African soil.

82. We should like to point out, however, that we believe that, contrary to what might be gathered from some of the statements made here, the Security Council is not dealing with a complaint of one Member of the Organization against another. This is not a bilateral dispute where the Security Council can lend its good offices. Rather, the Security Council has before it a question which concerns the international community as a whole because, while in this specific situation we find, on the one hand, the people and the Government of Zambia, we find, on the other, those interests that have been repeatedly condemned by the international community, interests which represent policies that have been vehemently repudiated by the General Assembly and the Council on many occasions. Behind Zambia stand not only its own people but most of world public opinion, which shares Zambia's support for the African national liberation movements, support for the principle of the sacred right of peoples to independence, support for the inalienable right of the African population to dwell in Africa free from all forms of modern slavery, such as those that still exist in southern Africa—support, in one word, for principles and tenets which the international community laid down many years ago.

83. Thus we feel that the duty of the Security Council is not merely to express its support for the people and the Government of Zambia and adopt measures in defence of its just position, but also to stand up and defend itself, defend the agreements it previously approved, defend a very clear-cut policy that has been spelt out on many occasions by the General Assembly. To do so the Security Council must adopt measures that not only will alleviate the immediate difficulties of Zambia, but also will validate and implement the decisions that have been repeatedly adopted here regarding the inalienable right of the Zimbabwe people to freedom and independence, with full respect for the stated views and desires of the majority of the population.

84. Only when the problem of the survival of colonialism and racism in Africa has been solved once and for all, will it be possible to safeguard the security, the independence and the territorial integrity of the new African nations. And the problems of colonialism and racism can be settled only if determined measures are adopted to wipe them out.

85. My delegation felt that it was its bounden duty to participate in this debate of this Council in order to express our solidarity with the people of Zambia and the Government of Zambia, presided over by Kenneth Kaunda, the eminent African leader. We feel that the problem confronting that nation today has aspects that are fundamental also to all the nations of the third world and all the anti-colonialist forces. If today Zambia is the victim of

aggressions, of a blockade, of provocations carried out by the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia and the racist régime in South Africa and their imperialist and colonialist lords and masters acting behind the scene, it is purely because that small developing country—which has already borne the great burdens of its colonial heritage, compounded by the difficulties caused by its land-locked geographical location and the fact that it is surrounded by hostile régimes—has adopted and adhered to a firm position in the defence of the basic principles that underly the very concept of the third world.

86. It is because of its defence of the right of African peoples and because of its determined and consistent support for the African liberation movements, that Zambia has earned the right to universal solidarity and the support of all the fighting peoples of the third world. So, too, Zambia has earned the right to specific decisions from this Council to help it, particularly to overcome the additional difficulties that the present situation has created.

87. My delegation appeals to the Council to act in accordance with the suggestions made by Ambassador Lusaka, for we consider that that would be the only way adequately to meet the present situation. We use this opportunity to express again to the Government and people of Zambia our complete support in these difficult times and in general, as has always been the case, we support them in their unflagging struggle for African liberation.

88. We fully understand that solidarity among the peoples of the third world, the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, is more important than ever at this stage in the struggle for the liberation of our peoples because the resistance to these movements by the colonialist régimes has become more obdurate. It is not a coincidence that the aggression against Zambia has been intensified lately, at the very moment when one of the greatest leaders of the third world, Amílcar Cabral, was being mowed down at the criminal hands of colonialism.

89. Both phenomena are facets of the same colonialist and racist arrogance; they are both facets of the complete flouting by the colonialists and racists of the sacred rights of peoples. Such an attitude can be met only by even greater solidarity on our part, by even more determination on our part and on the part of all the anti-colonialist and anti-imperialist forces of the world. Therefore, we repeat our constant readiness to participate in that continuing effort made by the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

90. Mr. PEREZ DE CUELLAR (Peru) (*Interpretation from Spanish*): We listened with great attention to the very clear and calm statement of the representative of Zambia, Mr. Paul Lusaka [1687th meeting], on the grave events that have recently affected his country, as well as on the course of action he recommended to the Council.

91. The Security Council is today confronted by a clear-cut case of threats to peace and security in the region, and therefore the Council should, promptly and with determination, adopt the measures provided for in the Charter of the United Nations. My delegation believes that

those threats are particularly alarming since they seem to form part of a colonialist escalation in Africa of which the first sign was the cowardly assassination of Amílcar Cabral. It is an eloquent fact that the aggression has taken place precisely against a country that has always taken a very valiant stand of vigilance and struggle in Africa and in the third world against the permanent aggression of racism and colonialism. Therefore we cannot avoid the fact that the southern neighbours of Zambia expect their aggression to intimidate that country.

92. The sealing off by the illegal régime of Salisbury of its frontier with Zambia constitutes typical economic aggression against Zambia, all the more deserving of condemnation since that country is fighting in particularly adverse circumstances to achieve independent development. The Government of Zambia is even forced, at the cost of great sacrifices, to find different ways of shipping its exports, which are vital to it. For all these reasons, we have followed with admiration the decision of Zambia to comply fully with the sanctions that were decreed by the Security Council in resolution 253 (1968), even though this would spell an increase in hardship to its own economy.

93. However, the aggression of the Salisbury régime is not limited to an economic blockade. There has been a deployment of military forces and a series of incidents that constitute a warlike threat to the sovereignty of Zambia, which becomes even more grave since it has the effective support of South Africa, a powerful neighbour of Rhodesia with the same racist theories.

94. Furthermore, we cannot deny that the constant lack of compliance with the economic sanctions imposed by the Council stands in the way of the full application of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), to the colonial Territory of Southern Rhodesia. This lack of compliance is thus bolstering the illegal régime of Salisbury in its aggression against Zambia.

95. This picture of increased harassment is aggravated by the presence of South African forces on the soil of Southern Rhodesia and on the very frontier with Zambia, and these forces are not there to help fight alleged terrorism but are true expeditionary forces sent to support aggression.

96. In the light of this situation and under the law and in conformity with the clear decisions of the Security Council, repeated by the General Assembly, we find that Rhodesia is still a British colony. The unilateral declaration of independence of 1965 does not grant legal status to the régime that at present holds power in the Territory, and therefore the responsibility of the United Kingdom as administering Power still stands.

97. Now we must admit with disillusionment that, had the people of Zimbabwe been given the right freely to decide their own fate in time, the liberation movement would not exist today in Southern Rhodesia, a liberation movement which, because it receives assistance from Zambia, is the pretext that the Smith minority has adduced for the aggression it has committed.

98. My Government believes that it is now up to the Security Council, as the organ of the United Nations entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security, promptly to assume the responsibilities incumbent upon it and to adopt the necessary measures to help the country that has been attacked. These measures should be designed to free southern Africa from the colonialist escalation to which I referred at the beginning of this statement.

99. Among the initiatives of the Council should be included an immediate withdrawal of the South African military forces at present stationed on Southern Rhodesian soil—for they in themselves constitute an element of friction in the region—and the adoption by the legitimate administering Power of means at its disposal to put an end to the act of aggression of the illegal Smith régime.

100. Furthermore, we consider it indispensable to assess the sanctions against the régime and, if necessary, increase them. At the same time we should consider action assist Zambia in its difficult task of dealing with the economic problems that this aggression has created for it.

101. It is imperative that we act with calm but we must also act with determination and efficiency in order to discourage an aggression in which all the aggravating circumstances are added to one another, because it not only threatens international peace and security but also itself stems from complete contempt for the elementary norms of international law. These norms have been honoured by international usage and they have also been enshrined in the Charter and the resolutions of the General Assembly, and they constitute the *sine qua non* for civilized coexistence among States.

102. Mr. BOYD (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): On 9 January last, the illegal authorities of Rhodesia sealed the frontier of Rhodesia with Zambia and prohibited all traffic between them in order to blockade Zambia and force it to abandon its determined stand in favour of the liberation of the people of Zimbabwe.

103. The Ian Smith racists adopted as their pretext the fact that two South African policemen had been killed by elements that they contended the Lusaka Government protected. We have heard that Rhodesian forces have crossed the frontier with Zambia and laid mines on Zambian soil and adopted an aggressive stand that has caused considerable material damage.

104. Among the threats that have been mentioned, we have been most deeply concerned over the fact that South Africa has sent a force of 4,000 men to repress the freedom movements of the noble people of Zimbabwe and also to threaten the territorial integrity of Zambia.

105. The determined anti-colonialist stand of Panama places us shoulder to shoulder with Zambia with regard to the complaint that the latter has brought to this Council. From the very beginning of our consultations, we agreed that this body should meet urgently in order to consider measures to be adopted in the case that Zambia has brought to the Council.

106. We are confronted by a situation which, without any doubt, is a provocation and a threat to peace on the continent. The economic blockade imposed on Zambia by the racist régime of Rhodesia and the military deployment on its frontiers are acts that call for prompt and energetic measures on the part of this Council.

107. The representative of Zambia, Mr. Lusaka [1687th meeting], listed events that leave no room for doubt regarding the gravity of the crisis that that region of Africa is undergoing at present. However, the problem becomes even more complex because, as Mr. Lusaka pointed out, there are South African troops on Rhodesian soil, which is an open threat to a Member State of the United Nations.

108. The colonialist forces, aware of the fact that the struggle of the peoples for their liberation cannot be contained, are resorting to all steps in their mad desire to maintain in existence a system which is contrary to all tenets of the Charter of the United Nations.

109. My Government condemns the aggression that the racist authorities of Rhodesia are launching against the Republic of Zambia and gives all its support to any measures that might ensure for that State its territorial integrity and sovereignty.

110. We should urgently try to avoid that infamous blockade and at all costs stop the incursions of mercenaries that sow terror and death among a people whole-heartedly struggling to emerge from underdevelopment.

111. We wish categorically to state that Panama repudiates the alliance of the colonialists who keep alive racial discrimination and *apartheid* in Rhodesia, in South Africa and in Portugal, and we denounce those systems as contrary to human rights and all the principles of international law set forth in the Charter.

112. The delegation of Panama wishes to assure the delegations of Guinea, Kenya, and the Sudan that, as far as we are concerned, we shall be highly gratified to support any draft resolution they may see fit to submit in support of Zambia.

113. Since today is 31 January, the last day of the month during which, in accordance with the rules of procedure, the representative of Indonesia will be President of the Council this year, we wish to express our whole-hearted thanks to you, Mr. President. We congratulate you on the efficient way in which you have presided over our debates. We should particularly like to recall that the positive results of the forthcoming meetings of the Security Council in Panama will, as the representative of France has just correctly pointed out, always be linked to the work done by the Security Council Committee on Council Meetings away from Headquarters over which you skilfully presided with prudence, talent and energy. Panama has already linked your name with its history. You have led us along the most difficult part of the road to the meetings of the Security Council in Latin America, and for that we thank you.

114. Mr. ABDULLA (Sudan): During the last two days, a large number of speakers representing Africa, Latin Amer-

ica, the Arab world and the non-aligned world, the President of the Organization of African Unity, the Chairman of the Committee of Twenty-Four³ and, not least, the representative of Zambia himself, have spoken. If those speakers have manifested anything, it is their grave concern over the recent developments in Africa, which pose a threat not only to Zambia—serious as the threat to Zambia may be—but also to international peace and security in southern Africa. Had the events that have taken place during this month of January been individual or isolated, the occasion would not have drawn the mass demonstration and concern the Council has witnessed during the last two days.

115. My delegation cannot be persuaded to believe that the treacherous murder of Amílcar Cabral by the agents of Portugal was not a planned murder executed at a time when all was set for a decisive declaration by Cabral of the decision of PAIGC on the future of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde. This is not the first black mark in the record of the notorious Portuguese colonial system in Africa. Before the murder of Cabral, the Portuguese had arranged the murder of Eduardo Mondlane, the leader of Mozambique. None of those criminal acts, however, has stopped or will stop the liberation struggle symbolized by those two heroes during their lives. On the contrary, the armed struggle in Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde will continue to intensify and gather force in the march towards the logical goal.

116. Nobody could be swayed into believing that the recent air bombardment of Tanzanian villages by Portuguese planes was accidental. All those criminal acts followed the decision of the Council last November (*resolution 322 (1972)*) to call on Portugal to negotiate with the parties concerned—meaning the liberation movements—a peaceful settlement in the so-called Portuguese Territories. This is Portugal's answer to the Council's call, and its reply to those members of the Council who championed that cause here.

117. Is it a coincidence or an isolated incident that South Africa has sent more military troops to the illegal white minority régime in Rhodesia in time for the rebel Ian Smith to conduct a campaign of terror and blackmail against Zambia and to decide, against its real interest, on the closure of the border with Zambia?

118. Finally, is it possible to believe, by any stretch of the imagination, that the assassination of Cabral, the bombardment of peaceful Tanzanian villages by the Portuguese, the massive reinforcement of South African troops in Rhodesia, the consequent aggression by the racist régime of Ian Smith and the blockade imposed on Zambia on 9 January are all isolated and accidental events taking place within such a short period of time?

119. My delegation refuses to take seriously any attempt to underestimate the gravity of those criminal acts through flat denials by those who committed them; nor can we accept any argument that may be advanced to explain them as isolated incidents with no master plan behind them. Those horrid and criminal acts can make sense only when

reflected upon and judged against the common criminal nature shared by these three régimes and the inhuman miseries and humiliations they inflict upon the millions of Africans they try in vain perpetually to exploit and dominate. It is no wonder they are drawn together in an attempt to preserve their morbid régimes, which are meeting with mounting resistance from those they oppress from within and overwhelming condemnation from without.

120. The criminal acts we are discussing today call for more than mere condemnation by the Council, since this, together with other measures, has not deterred those régimes from following the course they have defiantly chosen to follow in southern Africa. The representative of Zambia has already given the Council an account of the acts the rebel régime of Southern Rhodesia, in collusion with and with substantial military support from the racist régime of South Africa, has committed against his country and people. In a fit of frenzy and fear, sparked off by the armed resistance of the millions of Zimbabweans whom he and his white minority clique attempt to subjugate, the rebel Ian Smith decided to close the border between Zambia and Southern Rhodesia. In his false calculations, that decision, coupled with military manifestations, was to blackmail and scare both Zambia and the liberation movement in Zimbabwe. To his disappointment and that of his accomplices in Pretoria and Lisbon, Zambia dealt a blow to his designs and, indeed, to the economy of the illegal régime.

121. My delegation, following my Government's wishes, reiterates its full support for and admiration of our sister Zambia for the courageous act it has undertaken at great cost and tremendous sacrifice. As a land-locked country, whose traditional routes of communication until recently ran through Southern Rhodesia, it will now have to re-route its exports and imports along rough and longer routes to the north through friendly countries and ports.

122. The Council cannot fail to realize that such a decision by Zambia constitutes a substantial contribution to the strengthening of the mandated sanctions against the rebel régime in Southern Rhodesia. In the meantime, the Council cannot fail to appreciate that Zambia has made this contribution in the face of difficulties and at a cost that it is beyond its means to meet with its limited resources.

123. My delegation will therefore support any measures the Council considers appropriate to alleviate the burden imposed upon Zambia by the rebel régime of Southern Rhodesia. It is our strong belief that Zambia took the right decision at the right time, for it is most probable that, as long as the rebel régime of Ian Smith exists, similar and perhaps graver acts of aggression may be committed again by that régime against Zambia.

124. The situation in southern Africa is loaded with danger that will continue to threaten international peace and security in the area as long as the present perilous conditions are not treated with the necessary decisiveness by this Council, whose primary responsibility is the maintenance of international peace and security.

125. My delegation fully shares the views expressed here by many delegations that the provocative and criminal acts

³ Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

committed recently by the minority racist régime of Southern Rhodesia constitute only one aspect of a concerted offensive strategy by the Salisbury-Pretoria-Lisbon axis. With the alarming pace at which South Africa is intensifying its offensive military capacity, with the substantial military and financial aid Portugal receives, and through the considerable support the rebel régime of Southern Rhodesia is receiving from those allies, it is inevitable that this concerted strategy will repeat its provocative and aggressive acts on a scale and scope much more dangerous than that of the aggression we are dealing with today. In this strategy, the racist régime in Zimbabwe is at once the spearhead and the buffer Territory which both South Africa and Portugal sustain, exploit and co-operate with in carrying out their hostile designs against neighbouring States for the subjugation and exploitation of the millions of Africans they dominate.

126. Among the three régimes, the rebel minority régime is unique inasmuch as, ever since 1965, its existence has been condemned. It will be recalled that the Security Council determined in that year that the Government of the United Kingdom, the administering Power, should put an end to the rebel régime in Southern Rhodesia, and "take all other appropriate measures which would prove effective in eliminating the authority of the usurpers and in bringing the minority régime in Southern Rhodesia to an immediate end" [resolution 217 (1965)].

127. Even at that early stage the Council determined that the continuance of the régime constituted a threat to international peace and security. It is therefore deplorable that, ever since 1965, the Government of the United Kingdom has virtually declined to fulfil its responsibility as administering Power, to the extent of what is often described as selling out the five and a half million Africans to the racist white minority régime in Zimbabwe. Because of this betrayal and the deference extended by the administering Power to the white minority régime, the latter has started to spread its atrocities beyond the border of Zimbabwe.

128. Africa in particular, and the peace-loving countries in general—indeed this Council—cannot absolve the Government of the United Kingdom from fulfilling its moral and political responsibility towards the people of Zimbabwe, and no use of the veto can clear its conscience before the people of Zimbabwe or world public opinion for this abdication of responsibility. With the verdict of the Peace Commission and the rejection of the minority régime by the overwhelming majority of the people of Zimbabwe, and the overwhelming support of international public opinion as represented in the General Assembly and the majority of this Council, the Government of the United Kingdom has all the support it can obtain for leading the colony to self-determination and independence through universal suffrage, secret ballot and the principle of one man, one vote.

129. The Security Council, too, has an extra role to play in Southern Rhodesia. For reasons of which the Council is aware, sanctions against the régime have to be further strengthened by extending the blockade to the port of Lourenço Marques and by reactivating the blockade of Beira in the Portuguese Territories.

130. In conclusion, may we impress on the Council the importance of considering the complaint of Zambia in the context of the threat to international peace and security in southern Africa, constituted by the aggressive and concerted strategy of the three colonialist and racist régimes that exist in southern Africa. As such, any measures that may be taken to ensure the political and economic integrity of Zambia should not overlook the importance of security and peace in the region and in Africa as a whole, which will continue to be threatened by South Africa, Portugal and the rebel régime in Zimbabwe.

131. The PRESIDENT: Allow me now, in my capacity as representative of INDONESIA, to address myself to the item before the Council.

132. We are considering the latest threat against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Zambia—a threat which is but a part of a continued process of desperate attempts on the part of the colonial and racist Powers to halt the march of freedom in Africa and to keep their political and economic oppression entrenched in that part of the world.

133. This is not the first time that Zambia has come to the Council to present its complaints and appeal to this body to exercise the responsibilities assigned to it by the Charter. In October 1971, this Council met to consider a series of systematic and premeditated violations of the sovereignty, air space and territorial integrity of Zambia [1590th to 1592nd meetings]. The Council then had the opportunity to take appropriate measures against the aggressor, but regrettably failed to do so and, instead, adopted a rather mild censure against the Pretoria régime. The failure of the Council to take swift and effective action against South Africa could be viewed by the members of the Pretoria-Salisbury-Lisbon axis only as a licence for further aggressive acts directed against independent African States.

134. The illegal Salisbury régime has, for some years, felt the heat of the independence struggle. Encouraged by the Council's ineffectiveness in its actions and in an attempt to divert attention from its troubled domestic conditions, the illegal minority régime of Ian Smith has now embarked on new efforts to put military and economic pressures against Zambia. It has done so in view of the victories scored by the Zimbabwe freedom fighters. It tries to put the blame on Zambia, which in no way had any responsibility for the activities of those freedom fighters in their own territory.

135. The stubborn refusal of the illegal Smith régime to effect peaceful changes such as are proposed in the Lusaka Declaration has made it imperative for the people of Zimbabwe to intensify their struggle to achieve self-determination and freedom.

136. Since its unilateral declaration of independence in 1965, the illegal racist régime of Ian Smith has continued to deny the black people of Zimbabwe those fundamental freedoms which are their birthright, and has become even more oppressive in its treatment of the indigenous Africans, who constitute 95 per cent of the population.

137. I shall not tax the Council's patience by enumerating the inhuman acts perpetrated by the illegal Smith régime,

under the guise of "emergency measures", against the indigenous people of the Territory. Our colleague from Zambia, Ambassador Lusaka, already enumerated them in his clear and sober statement to the Council two days ago [1687th meeting].

138. It cannot be denied that it remains legally the responsibility of the Government of the United Kingdom, as administering Power, to ensure that the unacceptable state of affairs in Southern Rhodesia is brought to an end. It is therefore incumbent upon the British Government to do all within its power to terminate the minority rule in Zimbabwe and not to interpret the rejection of the provisions of the Home-Smith Agreement by the people of Zimbabwe as an opportunity to extricate itself from its duties to the indigenous people.

139. My delegation believes that resolution 2945 (XXVII), adopted by the General Assembly on 7 December 1972 by an overwhelming majority, and other related resolutions adopted by the Security Council should serve as a clear mandate to the British Government to take the necessary steps to accord the indigenous people of the Territory a life of dignity and freedom, as provided for in the Charter which we as Members of this world Organization stand pledged to uphold.

140. The right of the people to achieve self-determination and independence is at the very foundation of the United Nations and is embodied in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Indeed, the time is long since gone when the struggle of a people for freedom can be summarily dismissed as being disruptive of the internal order of a colonial territory without the international community expressing strong opposition to such a myopic view of man's quest for the realization of his dignity.

141. It is therefore all the more condemnable that, instead of initiating the necessary steps towards the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), the illegal régime of Ian Smith, in its desperate efforts to crush the inevitable opposition of the majority of the population, not only closed the border between the British colony of Southern Rhodesia and Zambia and imposed an economic blockade, but furthermore committed acts of subversion and sabotage against Zambia. In addition, its troops, reported to be reinforced by some 4,000 men from South Africa, were deployed along the 400-mile-long border. It is furthermore reported that the South African railways have stopped accepting goods destined for Zambia, while similar steps have been taken by Portugal at the port of Beira. This series of aggressive acts committed by these colonial and racist Powers in southern Africa against Zambia will not only cause considerable economic difficulty to that country, but, if not arrested forthwith, may well lead to a

full-scale war, thereby endangering the peace in the region. For these reasons, the Security Council should act promptly to prevent the situation from deteriorating. I believe that such preventive action could be taken with the full co-operation of the Government of the United Kingdom.

142. My delegation shares the pride with which the peoples of Africa view the courageous determination of Zambia to uphold the principles of the Charter and the rights and dignity of man, while facing the provocative and criminal acts of the remaining colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa. We must face the fact that their just struggle will impose a heavy burden upon the people of Zambia. In view of the foregoing, my delegation is of the opinion that the proposals put forward by the representative of Zambia fully merit the serious consideration of the Council and should be used as a basis for decisions and for concrete measures to be taken by the Council.

143. Indonesia for its part, together with other non-aligned countries, indicated a week ago its solidarity with Zambia. I should like to reiterate that Indonesia stands ready to support any measures to alleviate the burden of Zambia and its people as a consequence of its steadfast and consistently positive stand on the struggle of peoples for their freedom and independence.

144. In conclusion, my delegation would like to express the view that, as long as the root causes which lie in colonialism, racism, and illegal minority régimes continue to exist, the United Nations and the Security Council will continue to be faced by events like those now taking place in Zambia. Today it is Zambia, yesterday it was the United Republic of Tanzania, Guinea and Senegal, and who knows where colonialism and racism at bay will strike tomorrow?

145. My delegation sincerely hopes that the Council, together with other United Nations bodies concerned with the problems of decolonization, like the Committee of Twenty-four, will be able to eradicate the root causes which, unless eliminated, will continue to be a threat to peace and security.

146. I shall now speak as PRESIDENT of the Council.

147. Before adjourning the meeting, I should like, as I have arrived at the end of my term as President of the Council, to express my sincere thanks and appreciation for the co-operation and understanding shown by all my colleagues during my term of office. They have been most considerate and helpful to me as a newcomer to the work of the Council, whom the alphabetical order placed in the Chair.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.