

UNITED NATIONS

COPY
DO NOT REMOVE
FROM ROOM
2201 (17853)



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

UN LIBRARY

TWENTY-SEVENTH YEAR

JAN 19 1972

1641st

MEETING: 24 FEBRUARY 1972

UN/SA COLLECTION

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1641)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia:	
(a) Letter dated 15 February 1972 from the representatives of Guinea, Somalia and the Sudan to the President of the Security Council (S/10540);	
(b) Fourth report of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) (S/10229 and Add.1 and 2);	
(c) Interim report of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) (S/10408)	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 FORTY-FIRST MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 24 February 1972, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Mohamed FAKHREDDINE (Sudan).

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

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1641)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia:
 - (a) Letter dated 15 February 1972 from the representatives of Guinea, Somalia and the Sudan to the President of the Security Council (S/10540);
 - (b) Fourth report of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) (S/10229 and Add.1 and 2);
 - (c) Interim report of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) (S/10408).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia:

- (a) Letter dated 15 February 1972 from the representatives of Guinea, Somalia and the Sudan to the President of the Security Council (S/10540);
- (b) Fourth report of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) (S/10229 and Add.1 and 2*);
- (c) Interim report of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) (S/10408**)

1. The PRESIDENT: I should like to recall that at the previous meeting the Council decided to invite the representative of Saudi Arabia to participate, without vote, in the discussion on the question on our agenda. Since the request had already been placed on record I refrained from having its text circulated as a separate document of the Security Council, in an endeavour to support the Secretary-General in his efforts to effect economies.

* Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Special Supplement No. 2 and Corrigendum and Special Supplement No. 2A.

** Ibid., Supplement for October, November and December 1971.

2. In accordance with the decision of the Council, I propose to invite the representative of Saudi Arabia to take the place reserved for him in the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. J. Baroody (Saudi Arabia) took the place reserved for him in the Council Chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: I wish to draw the attention of the Council to a draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Guinea, Somalia and the Sudan [S/10541].

4. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): During the course of my brief statement in this Council at the previous meeting I pointed out on behalf of my delegation that in the wake of the grave political crisis that had been caused by the launching of the Smith-Home proposals for a settlement¹ the Council had diverted its attention from the highly important task of preserving and reinforcing the scope and effectiveness of international sanctions against the rebel régime of Southern Rhodesia. It is not the intention of my delegation at this meeting to address itself to the report of the Committee on Sanctions contained in document S/10229 and Add. 1 and 2 except to observe that in its view the mandate of the Committee should be widened so that it can serve not merely as a post-box for the few reports of violations which are brought to its notice intermittently by Member States but as an effective organ which would collect, sift and analyse all reports of known or suspected violations of sanctions, no matter what the source.

5. The Council should, if it decides to widen the mandate of the Sanctions Committee, provide that Committee with the necessary supporting machinery to make its aims and objectives attainable. It has been suggested in some quarters that sanctions have created more problems and more hardship for the African population of Southern Rhodesia than for the white rebel minority. It was not until last week that this Council had an opportunity of hearing the views of a prominent African leader on this question: Bishop Muzorewa, Chairman of the African National Council of Southern Rhodesia. In his statement at the previous meeting this distinguished person said:

"We . . . call upon the Security Council not to change its present attitude, which forbids States Members of the United Nations to have economic or diplomatic relations with the Smith régime . . .

¹ Ibid., document S/10405.

"Even in spite of violations there is no question of the effectiveness of sanctions: hence the desire of the Smith régime for a settlement. The economy is gradually grinding to a halt because of the lack of foreign currency, necessary capital for the advancement of the economy and the lack of machinery and vehicular spare parts used in the Army, Air Force, railways and industrial sectors." [1640th meeting, paras. 13 and 14.]

Addressing himself to effects which sanctions were having on the African population, the Bishop said:

"The Africans accept sanctions as a price for their freedom and declare as our enemy any person who claims on our behalf that sanctions should be withdrawn to alleviate African suffering through lack of employment. In fact, sanctions were never designed to hit Africans—and this has indeed been the effect, because it is the farmers, miners, importers and exporters that have suffered as a result of sanctions. None of these are Africans." [ibid., para. 15.]

The bishop went on to focus on one great loop-hole in the enforcement of sanctions, namely, the twin ports of Beira and Lourenço Marques. He asked for a blockade of those two ports under Chapter VII of the Charter on the grounds that without the facilities offered by the Portuguese through those ports the Smith régime would have collapsed long ago. This is an aspect of the fourth report of the Committee on Sanctions, on which no agreement could be reached. Yet, if the Council is earnest and serious in its decisions, it is difficult to conceive of how it hopes to win respect for its decisions and to make them effective if it continues to act if Portugal and South Africa had special status in the United Nations, removing them from the obligations imposed under Article 25 of the Charter.

6. In the view of my Government—and I am glad that this view is shared by the overwhelming majority of Members of this Organization—the United Nations must keep up the pressures on the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia, so that it is forced to struggle for economic survival and forced into a position of insecurity. Sanctions must be preserved and intensified to maintain the illegal régime's present international isolation and sustain a world view of the unacceptability of the Smith régime. If there were no sanctions, the drift towards recognizing it *de jure* would follow as surely as day follows night.

7. Therefore my delegation would appeal to the Security Council to continue to act in concert on the basis of the objectives established by this Organization; to continue to apply the force of moral, political and economic pressure against the rebel régime; and to remain committed to the proposition that the sure guarantee of justice for the African people of Southern Rhodesia—indeed for all the people of Southern Rhodesia—lies in their being able to control their destiny through the full exercise of their political and human rights. Above all, my delegation believes it is necessary for the Security Council to reassure the international community that, despite all that has taken place in the Territory of Southern Rhodesia since the Smith-Home settlement proposals, the continuation of sanctions depends not on the outcome of the arrangements

agreed on between the British Government and the rebel régime but on the decision of the Security Council, arrived at after due consideration of the best interests of all the people of Southern Rhodesia:

8. While my delegation does not wish to indulge at this stage in a discussion of the action the Council should consider taking against those States which refuse to co-operate in the implementation of its mandatory decisions, it is appropriate that Council members should bear in mind the statement Mr. Moktar Ould Daddah, President of Mauritania and current Chairman of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, when he dwelt briefly on this disturbing aspect of the Southern Rhodesia question in his statement to the Security Council in Addis Ababa on 28 January. He asked:

"Have not Portugal and South Africa accumulated a sufficient record of challenges to the most fundamental rules of the United Nations as well as to the clearest decisions of the Security Council to lead all men of good will and good faith to consider, as an extreme solution, their suspension from the international community, the United Nations, which they have a thousand times over denied by their actions against its authority?" [1627th meeting, para. 52.]

He added: "... this decision would have the merit of being immediately subject to execution and its specific implementation would not be subject to the capricious interpretations of one side or the other, or to the changing interests of certain parties." [ibid., para. 53.]

9. There is a theory abroad that prospective new Members can be judged on their willingness to abide by the Charter but that, once in, nobody should be forced out on any grounds. Why, then, does the Charter make provision for the expulsion of Members or for their suspension? Is it that Members have an unqualified right within the family of nations in all circumstances despite all acts committed by them in defiance of the Charter? This is a serious question to which this Council must pay serious attention in due course.

10. Those are some of the broader considerations involved in the failure or refusal of certain States to co-operate in the implementation of sanctions against the rebel régime in Southern Rhodesia. They are considerations which must be taken into account when the Council takes up the fourth report of the Committee on Sanctions.

11. Our immediate attention today should be given to the recommendations contained in the interim report of that Committee contained in document S/10408 of 3 December 1971. The reasons which gave rise to that report are well known to the Council and consequently my delegation will be brief in recalling them.

12. It will be remembered that on 22 November 1971 the three African members of the Committee on Sanctions called for an urgent meeting of the Committee to review the situation in the light of a decision by the United States Congress to pass legislation which would make the importation of chrome ore from Southern Rhodesia into the

United States permissible as of 1 January 1972. During the discussions that followed we were told by the United States delegation that in its view the new law would not mean a serious break in the observance of the sanctions in the United States or in the world, particularly as the quantities of chrome ore likely to be imported into the United States would be insignificant compared to the contraband quantities already being imported by other countries. The delegation assured the Committee at the time that the United States Government would study the legal ramifications of the amendment adopted by the United States Congress within the terms of both United States and international law.

13. Finally, the delegation stressed the point that regardless of any law there could be no violations of the sanctions until chrome ore from Southern Rhodesia was actually imported into the United States. The Committee on Sanctions indeed took account of the statement made by the United States but there was unanimity among the 15 members of the Committee that a report should be addressed to the Security Council which would recall the decision of the Council to impose sanctions under Chapter VII and the obligations imposed on all Member States of the United Nations to prevent, in the terms of resolution 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968, the import into their territories of all commodities and products originating in Southern Rhodesia and exported therefrom after the date of that resolution.

14. The Committee on Sanctions recommended that the Security Council should state that if any legislation were passed, or act taken, by a State Member of the United Nations with a view to permitting the importation from Southern Rhodesia of any commodity falling within the scope of the obligations imposed by resolution 253 (1968), including chrome ore, then that would set a dangerous precedent and weaken the effectiveness of the sanctions. It was further suggested in the report that the Council should call upon all States not to pass or implement legislation or take any other act that would permit the importation from Southern Rhodesia of commodities falling under the scope of the obligations imposed by resolution 253 (1968), including chrome ore.

15. The draft resolution contained in document S/10541 of 23 February 1972 sponsored by Guinea, Somalia and the Sudan, was based primarily on the recommendations made by the Committee on Sanctions. The draft resolution requires little introduction. It does not bring up any new factors, but concentrates entirely on the recommendations contained in the interim report of the Committee. If anything special is to be attached to it, it is the question of its adoption.

16. We believe that the situation, in so far as it impinges upon the enforcement of sanctions, requires that this Council assure the international community that it still stands by its original decision to impose effective sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, without qualification and without exception, so as to enable the illegal rebellion to be brought to an end. It would be interesting, in view of alarming reports that are being repeatedly carried in the international press and particularly in the press of a number

of countries which are alleged to have violated sanctions, if first the United States could endeavour to enlighten the Council on two points, which it undertook to do in the Committee on Sanctions. The first was that the United States was studying the implications of the amendment adopted by its Congress in so far as it impinges on United States law and international law and, above all, on United States obligations towards the United Nations in so far as the enforcement and observance of sanctions are concerned. Secondly, it would certainly create a proper psychological climate if the United States could give an assurance that the reports which are being carried in the international press to the effect that chrome ore is being loaded in the Portuguese-controlled ports of Beira and Lourenço Marques for importation into the United States are not true, and that the United States still abides by the sanctions decision contained in resolution 253 (1968).

17. During the meeting held at Addis Ababa several delegations represented in this Council gave assurances—and they were timely assurances—that they were honouring the sanctions both in the letter and the spirit of the resolution. The whole purport of the draft resolution now before the Council is to assure the international community that sanctions will continue to be carried out with the same will and with the same purpose with which they were originally conceived in 1968.

18. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (*interpretation from French*): Although we are not completely convinced that this debate is timely and we have often warned members of the Council against a too frequent repetition of its meetings—because of the effectiveness which we seek to obtain from the Council—we understand the impatience and concern which have prompted our African friends to call for this meeting. The Council knows that we are very anxious that it act effectively and that we seek the most positive and constructive resolutions, as opposed to what are sometimes called verbal resolutions.

19. It would seem that lately the Council has embarked on two courses which are not incompatible and which seem to us to be positive. The first has been the long-debated question of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, sanctions requested by the administrative Power, the United Kingdom, two years ago. Another step to be taken in the very near future flows from resolution 309 (1972) adopted at Addis Ababa on Namibia, and will necessitate the Secretary-General embarking on an inquiry which will be both difficult and delicate. We think that in both cases these are very positive courses of action which are likely to lead to results.

20. However, to return to the debate today on Southern Rhodesia, there are certain questions which I should like to put to the authors of the draft resolution. I must say that, as a whole, this draft resolution seems to be properly drafted and well thought out. In the past we have often been rather critical, but in this case we must say that the text seems to be serious and constructed on a legal foundation.

21. Here are the questions I should like to put to the sponsors of the draft resolution. First of all, there is a point

of detail in the preamble. In the second paragraph of the preamble I note the words "Reaffirming its resolutions . . .". We would prefer the word "Recalling" instead of "Reaffirming", since we abstained on some of the resolutions mentioned and voted in favour of others. Therefore, it would be more convenient for us if the word "Recalling" were used rather than the word "Reaffirming". That is a point of detail. My first comment on the substance of the draft resolution refers to operative paragraph 1. It will be remembered that the purpose of the sanctions called for in the resolutions on sanctions, in particular resolution 253 (1968), was defined as being to end the rebellion, that is, to end Mr. Smith's illegal régime. Here another purpose is indicated: ". . . until a solution enabling all the people of Southern Rhodesia to exercise freely and equally their right to self-determination is implemented;". Of course, we have no objection to the exercise of the right to self-determination. On the contrary, we are prepared to vote in favour of the reaffirmation of that principle. Nevertheless, we wonder if substituting those words for the idea originally intended, namely, to end the illegal régime, might not rob the Council of some of its flexibility of action; we wonder whether it would not be better to reproduce the words "until the illegal régime has come to an end", and then perhaps reaffirm the right to self-determination in another paragraph. This is my first comment.

22. My second comment concerns operative paragraph 2, which reads:

"*Urges* all States"—these are obviously States Members of the United Nations—"to implement fully all Security Council resolutions pertaining to Southern Rhodesia . . .".

There have been many resolutions on Southern Rhodesia, some of which are mandatory because they were adopted pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter. Those are the ones which we voted in favour of and which we have implemented. Therefore, it would seem to us more accurate to say that this refers to all the mandatory resolutions of the Security Council, or else to mention specifically resolutions 253 (1968), 277 (1970) and 288 (1970), which were adopted under Chapter VII. Obviously Article 25 of the Charter cannot be applied to resolutions which were not adopted within the framework of Chapter VII. Those were the remarks I wished to make before listening to any other comments. I would be grateful to the sponsors if they could take these remarks into account and enlighten us on these points.

23. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): I am most grateful to the representative of France for drawing the attention of the sponsors to certain paragraphs of the draft resolution. However, before taking up the points that he has raised, I would say that I regret that my delegation does not share his view that it is not timely to hold this meeting of the Council to discuss sanctions. The Council has been seized of two reports on sanctions, one dated June and the other November 1971. It is now February 1972. Sanctions constitute a very important measure taken by the Security Council, and any developments which relate to the effectiveness of those measures certainly deserve the attention of

the Council at all times. The international community, in the view of the sponsors, requires an assurance now that the Council is as serious in its intention to implement sanctions today as it was in 1966 and that there have been no developments since then which have changed the mind of the Council.

24. With regard to the points raised concerning the draft resolution, my delegation—and I am sure that the delegations of the Sudan and Guinea would agree—would have no objection to using the word "Recalling" instead of the word "Reaffirming", since some delegations did not vote in favour of a number of the resolutions.

25. With regard to the wording of operative paragraph 1, this is a matter to which the sponsors attach great importance, and we shall certainly take into account the suggestions made by the representative of France. No doubt we shall be in a position to present our views at a later stage in our meetings. The same is true concerning the remarks made by the representative of France concerning operative paragraph 2.

26. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): Not long ago, the Security Council held its meetings in Africa, when it concentrated its deliberations on a series of urgent questions facing Africa, including the question of Southern Rhodesia. During those meetings, the Secretary-General, the Foreign Ministers and government representatives of many African countries, President Moktar Ould Daddah of Mauritania, current Chairman of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, and his Imperial Majesty Emperor Haile Selassie I of Ethiopia, the host country, as well as many representatives of the African national liberation movements, made important speeches at the meetings which reflected the excellent situation prevailing on the African continent and expressed the strong will of the African countries and people to further unite, resolutely oppose imperialism, social-imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, and wage unremitting struggles to win and safeguard national independence.

27. This not only serves to further mobilize the people of southern Africa in their just struggle, but also has attracted the attention of all countries and peoples of the world that uphold justice, and has landed imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism in unprecedented isolation, thus making important contributions to the promotion of the common cause of the unity of the people of the third world against imperialism.

28. The Security Council meetings in Africa achieved positive results, although, owing to the obstruction of the United Kingdom and its allies, they have fallen short of the successes expected of them. This is a victory of the African people as well as the people of the whole world. As a result of the obstruction and sabotage by certain imperialist Powers, particularly the misuse of another veto by the British representative on the question of Southern Rhodesia, the Council was unable to fulfil its duty in regard to the question of Southern Rhodesia. Such an attitude of the British Government in wilfully trampling upon the principles of the United Nations Charter has evoked the righteous

indignation of the African countries and the people of the whole world.

29. The facts are very clear. Although by its arbitrary and unreasonable attitude, the British Government has prevented the Security Council from adopting the necessary resolutions, it cannot check the forward strides of the Zimbabwe people, no matter how often it may use the veto, be it a thousand or ten thousand times. One has to be grateful to the United Kingdom and its representative in the Council for they have taught the Zimbabwe and other African peoples by negative example, enabling them to further realize that in order to win complete national liberation it is essential to cast away illusions, rely on their own strength, further strengthen their unity, wage resolute struggles and carry to the end the just cause of national liberation.

30. In this sense this is also a positive result of the Security Council meetings in Africa. The historical experience of the development of human society has repeatedly told us that it is necessary to have not only positive education but also education by negative example and that, by summarizing experience in both positive and negative aspects, human experience will become more complete and comprehensive, and with the benefit of those experiences it will be possible to lead the struggle towards victory.

31. As to the British Government colluding with the Smith racist régime of Southern Rhodesia in an attempt to maintain the colonialist rule in Southern Rhodesia, it will only come to the tragic end of "lifting a rock only to drop it on its own feet".

32. Recently, the Organization of African Unity discussed the question of Southern Rhodesia and unanimously adopted a resolution on this question at the eighteenth session of its Council of Ministers. The resolution condemns the persistent use of the veto in the United Nations Security Council by the United Kingdom designed to entrench the racist régime of Rhodesia, calls upon the Security Council to take measures to strengthen and widen the scope of sanctions against the illegal régime of Rhodesia and to impose sanctions upon the South African authorities and the Portuguese Government which have flagrantly refused to implement the Security Council resolutions and demands the immediate withdrawal of South African police and armed forces from Southern Rhodesia. The resolution also reaffirms full support of the valiant struggles waged by the Zimbabwe people for national liberation and appeals to all the liberation movements of Zimbabwe to close their ranks so as to prosecute the liberation struggle until final victory is achieved. This resolution adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity at its eighteenth session is just. The Chinese Government and people express their firm support for this.

33. The Chinese delegation has repeatedly pointed out that the so-called proposals for the settlement of the independence dispute of Rhodesia, concocted by the British Government and the Smith racist régime are an out-and-out fraud. The speeches made by the representatives of ZANU (Zimbabwe African National Council) and ZAPU (Zimbabwe African People's Union) at the Security Council

meetings in Africa, as well as the speech in the Council which we heard recently from Bishop Abel Muzorewa, Chairman of the African National Council, have all fully testified to this indisputable fact.

34. Having stated the above views, the Chinese delegation maintains that on the question of sanctions the Security Council should further strengthen and widen the sanctions against the Rhodesian racist régime and should also impose sanctions against South Africa and the Portuguese colonialist authorities. The Council should sternly condemn the Act of the United States Congress violating the relevant United Nations resolutions on sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. At the same time, in view of the reports about the import of chrome from Southern Rhodesia by certain big Powers through covert channels in violation of the sanctions, the Chinese delegation deems it necessary to entrust the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) on sanctions against Southern Rhodesia as well as related United Nations organs with serious investigations into the above reports. If the investigations prove the above reports to be true, the Council must take measures to sternly condemn the countries concerned.

35. The Chinese delegation supports the draft resolution sponsored by Guinea, Somalia and the Sudan.

36. We hope that the Security Council will attach great importance to the resolution on the question of Southern Rhodesia adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity at its eighteenth session, and that the Security Council will not disappoint the hopes placed in it taking measures to strengthen and widen the sanctions against the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia.

37. Mr. KOMATINA (Yugoslavia): In the remarks my delegation made during the Council's last meeting on the Southern Rhodesian question, on Wednesday, 16 February, it specifically addressed itself *inter alia*, to our collective duty to maintain and strengthen the sanctions system that we unanimously imposed against the illegal Smith régime. My delegation stressed that it was very much disturbed by reports that a shipment of large quantities of chrome ore might be actually taking place and suggested then that we should try to do all we could to persuade the United States to rescind the unfortunate decision to re-establish chrome imports from Southern Rhodesia. Now the reports of the first actual shipment of Southern Rhodesian chrome ore for the United States, to take place from the port of Beira, seem to have been largely confirmed in numerous dispatches.

38. At the same time, of course, there persist numerous other violations of the sanctions established by relevant Security Council resolutions, despite the fact that their strict observance is mandatory for all Member States.

39. It is in that very disturbing context that we think that the draft resolution submitted by Guinea, Somalia and the Sudan is most relevant and timely and that the Council would be well advised to discharge its clear responsibilities by deciding in favour of it.

40. We for our part think that the text of the draft resolution deals with the matter of sanctions and their

violations specifically, decisively and constructively. The text is direct and specific enough: it makes quite clear what the Council's decision would request from all Member States and all other States, and it is clearly addressed to the situation at hand—and yet it is couched in a way that realistically facilitates a positive decision by the Council. Confronted with the actual situation, we cannot and we should not do anything less.

41. In explaining our stand on the draft resolution, I should like very briefly to mention only some of the considerations that guide us in the obtaining situation.

42. First, the fact that violations are taking place is not in the least a reason for us to weaken our resolve to continue applying the sanctions and to fight for the strict observance of our resolutions. It is now widely recognized that whatever the fate of some other past attempts at applying sanctions, the sanctions against the Smith régime, although violated, have been effective, nevertheless. The illegal Smith régime knows that best, and it is that régime and its friends who want to make us dismantle the sanctions. On the contrary, we must make them more effective.

43. Secondly, the case has been repeatedly made that the sanctions, even when effective, do not hurt the Smith régime but the African majority, so that dismantling them would allegedly be in the true interest of the Zimbabwe people. Again it is interesting and indicative that this particular thesis is advocated only by the Smith régime and its friends and never by the true representatives of the African majority. On that subject the statement by Bishop Muzorewa at the previous meeting was a very conclusive one.

44. Thirdly, and finally, we should not accept a decision, by however high a governmental body of any country, to violate the sanctions as something final and unchangeable. We should never give up our efforts to obtain a positive change; we should never resign ourselves to powerlessness. The Governments involved continue to recognize their obligations to observe the sanctions decisions of the Security Council; they profess sympathy for the African causes. We must never cease to make use of that attitude to make them co-operate, and fight to change those decisions of their State bodies that go clearly contrary to their unmistakable obligations under the Charter. Our common task would be much facilitated if they themselves were prepared to indicate their firm resolve to do everything to change the situation, rescind unfortunate decisions and make their countries respect our decisions.

45. Mr. SEN (India): I have a feeling—and I hope it is justified—that the draft resolution at present under discussion has been drafted without adequate consultation. That is not to say that we shall not support it and vote for it. I have made it repeatedly clear that whatever the African delegations wish to have in this respect will have the full support of the Indian delegation at all times. But at the same time I believe that this draft resolution, unless it is treated as a first step in a process, will require further consideration.

46. For instance, operative paragraph 1 has already been commented upon by the representative of France, but even

operative paragraph 2 has been drafted in a way which would perhaps make it possible—I suspect it would in fact make it possible—for States not Members of the United Nations to continue to violate the sanctions provisions.

47. Secondly, I should be unhappy to see the present formulation of operative paragraph 3 adopted. It speaks about weakening the effectiveness of sanctions. From what many speakers have said, the proposal to import goods from Rhodesia is a direct and pure violation and not a weakening of the sanctions. Again, I should think that there is room for improvement in that paragraph.

48. Much has been said about the proposed legislation of the United States Government permitting the importing of chrome from Rhodesia. If that legislation is passed and the Government of the United States gives effect to it, obviously that would be against the provision of sanctions. But in fairness to the United States it should be said that while its action has come out in the open we have many, many reports that many Governments are violating the sanctions. This is not merely a question of reports. The figures of the Rhodesian Government itself establish that it could not have amassed the vast fortune it has done since the sanctions were imposed, without the co-operation, direct or indirect, of many Governments. I think, therefore, that it is not adequate to stop our work at this stage with this draft resolution alone. We shall have to go much deeper into this, and, as has been proposed, the sanctions should be strengthened and widened, violations should be publicized and every effort should be made to find out where the leakage is going to take place, how it can be stopped, and what other improvements to the machinery will be necessary.

49. In the same context it would perhaps be necessary to have another look at the Committee on Sanctions which the Council has established. It is conceivable that some improvement in its working methods will be necessary. It is conceivable that the Council itself should deal with this report in a much more thorough fashion than has heretofore been possible.

50. In the light of those remarks I think it would be advisable to adjourn the meeting now and come back to the subject, perhaps tomorrow or next Monday, depending on Mr. Farah's convenience because he has obviously worked very hard on this draft resolution. Perhaps we should have another look at the text and see what improvements can be suggested and how we can keep this problem under continuous examination and review.

51. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): In response to the remarks made by the representative of India I would say that, as members will see, this draft resolution is not addressed to any particular State. It mentions no particular States, but is a general draft resolution which addresses itself to principle, to courses of action which States Members of the United Nations should adopt towards sanctions.

52. Naturally, Guinea, Somalia and the Sudan, in their usual manner, will be quite happy to receive suggestions for improving the draft resolution, provided that we do not deviate from principle. If members have any proposals to

make we should like to hear them now, or perhaps immediately after the Council adjourns, so that we can take them into account and perhaps present a revised draft resolution. I can assure the representative of India that this is a draft resolution not of Somalia alone but of Somalia, Guinea and the Sudan.

53. The PRESIDENT: It is evident that there is a general feeling amongst members of the Council that perhaps there

is need for further reflection and consultation on the draft resolution now before the Council. Since this is so, I propose that the Council adjourn now and meet again tomorrow afternoon at 3 o'clock.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

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

如何购取联合国出版物

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

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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