

UNITED NATIONS

056.3740



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FIRST YEAR

UN LIBRARY

JUN 19 1985

UN/SC OFFICIAL RECORDS

**1945<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 28 JULY 1976

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

|  | <i>Page</i> |
|--|-------------|
| Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1945) .....   | 1           |
| Adoption of the agenda .....   | 1           |
| Complaint by Zambia against South Africa:<br>Letter dated 19 July 1976 from the Chargé d'affaires, a.i., of the Permanent<br>Mission of Zambia to the United Nations addressed to the President of<br>the Security Council (S/12147) ..... | 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.

## 1945th MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 28 July 1976, at 3 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Piero VINCI (Italy).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Benin, China, France, Guyana, Italy, Japan, Libyan Arab Republic, Pakistan, Panama, Romania, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania and United States of America.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1945)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Complaint by Zambia against South Africa:  
Letter dated 19 July 1976 from the Chargé d'affaires, a.i., of the Permanent Mission of Zambia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12147)

*The meeting was called to order at 4.05 p.m.*

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

**Complaint by Zambia against South Africa:**  
Letter dated 19 July 1976 from the Chargé d'affaires, a.i., of the Permanent Mission of Zambia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12147)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 1944th meeting, I shall now, with the consent of the Council, invite the representatives of Zambia, South Africa and Mauritania to participate in the Council's discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the provisions of Article 31 of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.
2. In accordance with the Council's further decision, I shall also renew the Council's invitation, under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, to the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the other members of the delegation of that Council.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mwale (Zambia) and Mr. Jaipal (Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia) and the other members of the delegation of that Council took places at the Security Council table, and Mr. Botha (South*

*Africa) and Mr. El Hassen (Mauritania), took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

3. The PRESIDENT: In addition, I have received letters from the representatives of Cuba, Egypt, Liberia and Zaire in which they also request to be invited to participate in the debate. I therefore propose that the Council agree, in accordance with the usual practice, to invite the afore mentioned representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote.

4. I invite those representatives to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the usual understanding that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table when they wish to address the Council.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Acosta (Cuba), Mr. Ahmed (Egypt), Mrs. Brooks-Randolph (Liberia), and Mr. Umba di Lutete (Zaire), took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

5. The PRESIDENT: I should like also to inform the members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 28 July 1976 from Mr. Abdirizak Haji Hussen, representative of Somalia, on behalf of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. That letter reads as follows:

*"On behalf of the Special Committee against Apartheid, I have the honour to request that I be allowed to make a statement before the Security Council on the item at present on its agenda."*

On previous occasions the Security Council has extended invitations to representatives of relevant United Nations bodies in connexion with the consideration of matters on its agenda. Accordingly, if there is no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to extend an invitation, pursuant to rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, to Mr. Hussen, as representative of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. At the appropriate moment I shall invite him to take a place at the Council table and to address the Council.

*It is so decided.*

6. The PRESIDENT: I have also received a letter, dated 28 July 1976, from the representative of Benin, containing a request that the Security Council extend

an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mr. O. T. Emvula, Deputy Chief Representative of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) [S/12154].

7. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to extend an invitation to Mr. Emvula, as requested. At the appropriate moment I shall invite him to take a place at the Council table and to address the Council.

*It is so decided.*

8. The PRESIDENT: Before the Council resumes its consideration of the item on its agenda, I should like to take a moment of the Council's time to say a few words about the latest news of the major earthquake which occurred in the early hours of today in northern China. I am sure that I can speak on behalf of all my colleagues in expressing our profound shock and sorrow at the occurrence of a calamity of apparently unprecedented size and dimensions. I would request the representative of China, Mr. Lai Ya-li, to convey to his Government the feelings of sincere and profound grief and solidarity expressed here today. For myself I offer my condolences with particular sympathy, owing to the occurrence of a similar disaster in my own country only a few months ago. It is, I am sure, the earnest hope of all the members of the Council, that in spite of the scale of the earthquake, the loss to the Chinese people in terms of human beings and material destruction will be less than feared and less than other countries have had to suffer from the same natural causes.

9. Mr. BOYA (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, here for the second time under your presidency during this month of July, we have an African complaint concerning a serious act of aggression. My delegation would hope that this time the Council, under your perspicacious and impartial presidency, will do useful work and examine with objectivity the act of aggression committed by the racist minority régime of South Africa against the Republic of Zambia.

10. My delegation is very disappointed that self-interest was able to triumph when we were dealing with the question of the Israeli act of aggression against Uganda; the conclusion of that debate creates a precedent which is dangerous and of concern because it encourages the strongest countries to impose themselves on others.

11. We are convinced that some members of the Council that are directly responsible for this regrettable situation, where the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of an African State have been blatantly disregarded in order to protect and encourage the Israeli Zionists, are well aware of the significance of such actions.

12. The People's Republic of Benin is deeply convinced that neither the repeated use of the anti-democratic weapon of the veto, nor blackmail, nor all the immoral political manoeuvres of international imperialism will succeed in hiding the truth and preventing justice from being done wherever necessary.

13. Having made this brief clarification, Mr. President, my delegation shall be relying heavily on your eminent human qualities, to direct our debates on this important question now before the Council: the act of aggression perpetrated on 11 July 1976 in Sialola, 30 kilometers within Zambian territory, by the racist minority régime of South Africa against the Republic of Zambia, which resulted in 24 dead, 45 seriously injured and more than 16 missing, quite apart from the destruction of the neighbouring fields and the belongings of the villagers. This incident is part of a series of daily acts of subversion of which Zambia and the African countries of southern Africa are the victims. These repeated and senseless acts of aggression constitute a very serious threat to international peace and security.

14. The racist régime of the Vorster clique is in a situation of two-fold juridical illegality: in violating the sovereignty of Zambia, it is using the international Territory of Namibia, a Territory which it is occupying illegally and in contravention of all the resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council requiring the unconditional and immediate withdrawal from that Territory.

15. The question before the Council is therefore clearly defined. My delegation denounces in advance all the manoeuvres of the shameless protectors of Vorster and of all those who for reasons of pure moral convenience condemn *apartheid*, which is the most abject form of racism of our age, but act weakly and hypocritically when there is a clear need to take concrete actions aimed at the systematic elimination of this régime of exploitation and oppression of the people of South Africa.

16. All the repeated acts of aggression committed by the racists of South Africa, yesterday against the People's Republic of Angola, today against the Republic of Zambia and perhaps tomorrow against another African State, under the pretext of a racist law of "hot pursuit", are an eloquent demonstration of the fact that the situation is becoming more and more complicated for the minority racist régimes of southern Africa because of the ever-increasing determination of the oppressed peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa to hasten their liberation and put an end to this ignominious oppression which is unworthy of man.

17. It is becoming increasingly clear that the threat which the minority racist régimes of southern Africa pose to international peace and security will become

greater day by day as the danger faced by the régimes themselves increases.

18. Here I should like, without comment, to bring to the attention of the Council two dispatches of the Associated Press from Cape Town published in *Le Monde* on 23 July. The first dispatch reads as follows:

“Rhodesia. Many former foreign servicemen are enrolling in Mr. Smith’s army. Cape Town. The explosion of grenades on Tuesday, 20 July, in Salisbury marks the opening of a new front in Rhodesia, according to those responsible for security in South Africa. One of them stated to us: ‘We were expecting these actions, as were our Rhodesian counterparts. This is the opening of a fourth front, that of urban terrorism, in addition to guerrilla warfare on the frontiers of Zambia, Botswana and Mozambique.’

“In the Rhodesian capital this new escalation seems to have been received stoically by the population of European origin. Since young policemen are required to guard the frontiers, patrols in the towns are being carried out by older men; urban defence will therefore have to be strengthened by calling up the police reservists. Because of the present tension, an average of 1,000 Rhodesians are leaving their country each month. In order to stem this exodus, Mr. Smith’s cabinet has adopted restrictive measures and the South African authorities have limited the number of visas granted to Rhodesians. However, the majority of whites seem to have decided to stay. Furthermore, many foreigners are arriving in Rhodesia. They are mainly former servicemen who have come to fight against the black nationalists. According to an informed source, the new recruits of the Rhodesian army are approximately 80 per cent American, South African and British.”

The second dispatch reads as follows:

“About 100 New Zealanders have volunteered to serve in Rhodesia and some 20 of these are said to have arrived about six months ago, a leader of the Rhodesian-New Zealand Friendship Society reported on Wednesday 21 July. These recruits were reportedly offered a monthly wage of \$1,000 and an airline ticket.”

19. As the Organization of African Unity (OAU) has recognized and repeatedly proclaimed, there can be no compromise on the principle of the systematic elimination of racist and colonialist régimes in southern Africa. The Governments which continue to violate the arms embargo and the multinational corporations which help the racists survive are the enemies of the struggle for the liberation of Africa. The sports organizations of certain countries which maintain close relations with racist sports organizations should now

better appreciate the extent of their misdeed and the harm they do to the spirit of international sport.

20. As far as the People’s Republic of Benin is concerned, there can be neither dialogue nor détente with the Vorster-Smith clique, which has imposed violence on the oppressed peoples of that region. Benin will continue to denounce, condemn and combat, wherever necessary, the new strategy which imperialism is now trying to elaborate in order to overcome the freedom fighters who have already made so many sacrifices for national liberation. Any strategy based on so-called peaceful negotiation, a clever imperialist device, is suspected of having a neo-colonialist taint, and is therefore absolutely contrary to the basic interests of the oppressed masses of the region.

21. South Africa’s aggression against Zambia is well within the context of this strategy, which is nothing more than blackmail designed to dissuade countries in the area from entering into confrontation with the racist régimes of southern Africa or from giving the brotherly assistance provided for by OAU for the total liberation of Africa from all oppression, both internal and external. That is why Benin, like all other African countries, from north to south and east to west, must feel directly concerned.

22. It must now be clear to everyone that “dialogue” or “peaceful negotiation to put an end to the existence of the minority racist régimes of southern Africa” are mere words or soporifics to lull one to sleep and that they ultimately help to maintain and strengthen the positions of Vorster and his clique.

23. The complaint brought before the Council, as has been emphasized by a number of preceding speakers, is an African complaint—a complaint brought by the entire OAU.

24. My delegation vigorously condemns the aggression committed by the racist Vorster régime against the Republic of Zambia. From now on, the Council will have no excuse if effective measures are not taken to prevent further such acts of international gangsterism which endanger international peace and security.

25. In conclusion, we wish to say that those who support the Vorster régime because they are blinded by their selfish interests should know that times have changed. We simply want the Vorster racist régime to know that it will not always be able to commit aggression with impunity against Angola and Zambia, because the peoples of southern Africa are awakening; the peoples of Azania, Namibia and Zimbabwe are mobilizing and intensifying their struggle against the ignominious racist and colonialist régimes.

26. Mr. DATCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should like, first of all, to associate myself with the words spoken by you in conveying to the representative of the People’s

Republic of China, Mr. Lai Ya-li, the expression of our sincerest sympathy for the victims of, and the material losses incurred by, the recent earthquake.

27. The Security Council is meeting to consider the repeated acts of aggression committed by South Africa against the Republic of Zambia.

28. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zambia, Mr. Siteke G. Mwale, in his clear and comprehensive statement [1944th meeting], presented some most enlightening facts and information concerning the scope of the acts of aggression committed by South Africa against Zambia. He described how this year South Africa has on a number of occasions violated the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Zambia, thus trampling under foot the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the elementary rules of international law.

29. In this connexion, it should be noted that this is not the first time that South Africa has violated the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Zambia, nor is it the first time that the Security Council has had to deal with acts of aggression committed by the racist Pretoria régime against independent States of southern Africa. In this regard, it is to be recalled that in its resolution 300 (1971), the Council called upon South Africa to respect fully the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Zambia. On that occasion the Council warned South Africa that, should it violate the sovereignty or territorial integrity of Zambia, the Council would meet anew to consider the situation in greater detail in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter.

30. The fact that the Council should have been compelled to meet again to deal with the acts of aggression of South Africa proves, on the one hand, that South Africa does not have the least intention of abiding by the injunctions of the Council, and, on the other, that the measures adopted to date by the Council have proved ineffective in curbing the racist authorities of Pretoria.

31. The Council cannot remain impassive when the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a State Member of the United Nations are violated by another State. We believe that it is all the more imperative for the Council to fulfil its duties, since the victim of these acts of aggression is a young African State which does not have the means to defend itself. We also believe that the *raison d'être* of the Organization is precisely to defend the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Member States which are the victims of acts of aggression.

32. True, acts involving the use of force by South Africa against Zambia are not overt acts, as was the case with the acts of aggression against Angola. Furthermore, South Africa has not yet dared to attack Zambia openly, but we do not believe that the Council should wait until that happens.

33. We believe that the Council should not remain silent in the face of the acts committed on 11 July. To act otherwise would be tantamount to encouraging the Pretoria racists. We must not therefore wait until South Africa endorses these acts, or until such time as isolated acts of aggression turn into a general conflagration in southern Africa. The Security Council must now take the measures necessary to prevent such a possibility. In so doing, the Council would be exercising one of the principal functions of the United Nations—namely, that of taking effective collective measures to prevent and remove threats to international peace.

34. Acts involving the use of force by South Africa against Zambia have been committed from the Territory of Namibia. The use of that Territory, which has international status, as a base for attacks against neighbouring countries shows once again that the maintenance of the vestiges of colonialism and the policies of racism and *apartheid* constitutes a permanent source of tension, of aggression and of conflict and seriously endangers international peace and security.

35. The Security Council, the General Assembly and the International Court of Justice long ago noted the illegal nature of the occupation of Namibia by South Africa. The Council and the Assembly called upon South Africa immediately to withdraw from Namibia its administration and its armed forces. It is undeniable that the illegal presence of South Africa in Namibia flagrantly disregards the will of the Namibian people and its sacred right to decide for itself its own course of political and social development.

36. The United Nations, and the Security Council itself in its resolution 269 (1969), have recognized the legitimacy of the struggle of the Namibian people against the illegal presence of the South African authorities in Namibia and requested all States to intensify the moral and material assistance rendered by them to the Namibian people in its struggle against foreign occupation. Up to this date, South Africa has defied the United Nations and refused to abide by the resolutions of both the General Assembly and the Security Council calling for the immediate withdrawal of its entire occupation administration in Namibia. We therefore consider that on this occasion, too, we should condemn the racist South African régime for its stubborn refusal to leave Namibia.

37. The Romanian delegation considers that the complaint made by Zambia against South Africa is well founded. We likewise believe that the acts of aggression committed by South Africa against Zambia are a threat to the peace and security of the peoples of southern Africa and of the whole world. Consequently, the Council should resolutely condemn the acts involving the use of force committed by South Africa against Zambia. We are convinced that the Council has the duty to take all necessary steps to put an end to the acts of provocation against African

countries committed by South Africa, and to its policy of replacing law by force.

38. It is the duty of the United Nations and of all its Member States to take an unequivocal stand in favour of respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Zambia and to give their support in order to repel the acts of violence committed by the racist régime of Pretoria.

39. At the same time, we must be aware of the fact that, until southern Africa is entirely freed from colonial and racist domination, it will not be possible to establish lasting peace there. For this reason, we believe that it is the duty of the Council to take all necessary measures to ensure the exercise by the peoples of southern Africa of their sacred right to self-determination, independence and national sovereignty.

40. In conclusion, I should like to reaffirm once again at this time the solidarity of my country with the African countries that are waging a brave struggle to defend their inalienable right to an independent existence, and the firm support of the Romanian people for the legitimate struggle of the peoples of southern Africa to free themselves from colonial and racist domination and to organize in full freedom their own lives as fully fledged members of the international community.

41. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Somalia, Mr. Hussien. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make a statement on behalf of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*.

42. Mr. HUSSEIN (Special Committee against *Apartheid*): May I first of all express, on behalf of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and on behalf of my own country, our deep feeling of sympathy for the people and Government of the People's Republic of China in connexion with the natural disaster that has caused great loss of human life and material destruction in that country. May I ask the representative of China to be kind enough to convey the assurance of our solidarity with the people and the Government of China.

43. Mr. President, I would first of all wish to thank you, and through you the members of the Security Council, for giving me an opportunity to make a statement on behalf of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. In the absence of the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman of the Special Committee from Headquarters, the members of the Special Committee have requested me to participate in this debate on behalf of the Special Committee and to convey its serious concern over the continued acts of aggression by the *apartheid* régime.

44. I need hardly inform the Security Council that the Special Committee categorically condemns the aggression committed by the South African racist

régime against the Republic of Zambia. This is one more in a long series of crimes committed by that régime, and it will not be the last unless the Council takes decisive action against that régime.

45. We are aware of the denial by the Pretoria régime, which was repeated by its spokesman here yesterday, but we submit that such denials by that régime deserve no credence. It was not so long ago that the Pretoria régime repeatedly denied its aggression against Angola until its soldiers were captured and brought before the press and television in Luanda.

46. The International Seminar on the Eradication of *Apartheid* and in Support of the Struggle for Liberation in South Africa, organized by the Special Committee against *Apartheid* at Havana last May, recognized that the independent African States in southern Africa had faced threats and attacks by colonial and racist régimes because of their important contribution to the struggle for liberation in southern Africa. The Seminar declared that "any attack on the countries which assist the liberation movements constitutes an attack against the international community" [S/12092, annex I, para. 11]. It urged African and other States to develop the machinery of international co-operation that would allow speedy response to any aggression.

47. On 7 July, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, at its thirteenth session held at Port Louis, Mauritius, adopted resolution AHG/Res.80 (XIII), proposed by Zambia to the effect that any attack perpetrated by the minority régimes of southern Africa against front-line States would be considered an attack against the whole of the African continent. Moreover, I should like to draw attention to General Assembly resolution 3411 C (XXX), which proclaims that the United Nations and the international community have a special responsibility towards the oppressed people of South Africa and their liberation movements. If the front-line countries are hosting the South African liberation movements and supporting the legitimate struggle for liberation of that country, they are doing so not only because they are African nations but also, and more importantly, because they are fulfilling that special responsibility. The South African aggression against Zambia took place within days after the aforementioned resolution of OAU was adopted. This aggression is clearly an arrogant challenge by the racist régime to OAU and to the international community.

48. We do hope that the Security Council will endorse the recommendation of the International Seminar and the resolution of OAU and warn the racist régimes in southern Africa that any aggression by them against independent African States is an aggression against the United Nations, which is totally committed to liberation in southern Africa, and that any such aggression would be repulsed and severely punished.

49. The Special Committee has constantly warned against the enormous military buildup in South Africa and the consequent danger it constitutes not only to the African continent but also to international peace and security.

50. It is relevant to recall that the South African military budget has increased from a mere 40 million Rand in 1959-1960, the year of the Sharpeville massacre, to no less than 1,350 million Rand in 1976-1977, the year of the Soweto massacre. This year's military budget is 36 per cent greater than that of last year and almost double that of the year before last.

51. This rapid militarization, facilitated by serious breaches of the arms embargo, has made the Pretoria régime dizzy with arrogance. A Government member of the South African Parliament, Mr. T. Langley, boasted that—and I am reading from the verbatim record of the House of Assembly debate on 2 February 1976:

“the greatest change for South Africa in the era after its withdrawal from the Commonwealth and in the post-colonial era is that it is the only power in southern Africa today which in any way possesses an appreciable defence force... here in southern Africa, South Africa is a military giant.”

52. With this military power, amassed while the independent African States were devoting their scarce resources to education, health and other development needs, the rulers in Pretoria have been dreaming of establishing hegemony over all so-called Africa south of the Sahara. It may be recalled that the Pretoria régime early this year moved an amendment to the Defence Act defining South Africa as “Africa south of the Sahara” for the purposes of action by its Defence Force. After condemnations by African States and the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, the amendment was revised and camouflaged to authorize the régime to send its military forces anywhere in the world to suppress any armed conflict and any terrorism which that régime considered a threat to South Africa. I am referring to the Defence Amendment Act enacted in March of this year.

53. Since the defeat of its aggression in Angola, the arrogance of the South African régime has been reinforced to even greater proportions. It has greatly increased military operations inside Namibia and on the borders of Namibia and has also launched attacks against the black people of South Africa which culminated in the massacre at Soweto and those which followed it. The Special Committee is therefore not surprised at the acts of aggression committed against Zambia.

54. May I recall that the Special Committee has repeatedly pointed out that the South African propaganda about its desire for détente and dialogue with African States is a cover for repression at home

and aggression abroad. It is now clear for everyone to see in its true colours.

55. I would recall that the Security Council has been obliged repeatedly to consider flagrant violations of the Charter and acts of aggression by the racist régime in South Africa. The Special Committee has constantly stressed the imperative need for mandatory action under Chapter VII of the Charter. In the absence of such action, the South African régime has consistently scorned and defied the resolutions of the Council. It has challenged the authority of the Council and the principles of the Charter with impunity, in the firm assurance that no further action would be taken by the Council. I need refer only to the resolution adopted by the Security Council in March [*resolution 387 (1976)*] on the South African aggression against Angola and the resolution adopted on 19 June on the Soweto massacre [*resolution 392 (1976)*], both of which were immediately rejected by the South African régime.

56. If this pattern continues, and the Pretoria régime is protected from any sanctions, there is a danger that it will intensify racist oppression at home and aggression abroad. The aggression against Zambia is a pointer in this connexion.

57. The Special Committee against *Apartheid* hopes that the Council will, in the words of Zambia's Foreign Minister [*1944th meeting*], “live up to its responsibilities”. We believe that the appropriate action that could force Pretoria to come to reason would be the application of the mandatory measures set forth under Chapter VII of the Charter. It is our firm conviction that any action short of the mandatory measures will be tantamount to fruitlessness.

58. It is our hope that the Council will not only condemn South African aggression against Zambia but will also impose a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa, as requested by the General Assembly [*resolution 3411 G (XXX)*]. In our opinion, that is the least the Security Council should do at this stage of the development of the situation in southern Africa.

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

60. Mr. AHMED (Egypt): I should like to express on behalf of my delegation our sincere thanks to you, Mr. President, and to the members of the Security Council for the opportunity afforded to us to participate in this debate. I should like also to extend to you, our sincere congratulations not only on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month, which has almost ended, but also on the clever, diplomatic and elegant way in which you have conducted the Council's proceedings during one of its most delicate and difficult periods.



61. May I take this opportunity also to welcome the presence among us today of the Foreign Ministers of Zambia and the United Republic of Tanzania.

62. I should like also to associate myself and my delegation with the words of solidarity and sympathy addressed by the President of the Council to the delegation of the People's Republic of China in connexion with the losses in life and property sustained yesterday as a result of the damaging earthquake.

63. The subject under discussion is the complaint by Zambia of repeated incursions and aggressions by South Africa against Zambian villages and citizens, and hence the violation by South Africa of Zambian sovereignty and territorial integrity. Egypt feels impelled to participate in this debate in support of Zambia's complaint because, as an African country, Egypt considers such a violation to be an aggression not only against Zambia but also against the African continent as a whole. Egypt and indeed all other African and, for that matter, non-African countries cannot allow this infringement of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a law-abiding sister African country to go unchecked—the more so since the aggressor is certainly not a newcomer to this dock. South Africa is one of the rare examples of international recidivism; during the past 30 years it has given ample evidence of its incorrigible and obstinate determination to trample underfoot the principles of the Charter, the decisions of the Security Council, the authority of the United Nations, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

64. Egypt's policy, as was just reiterated by President Sadat on 23 July 1976, has always been and remains one of complete commitment to the cause of African solidarity and the completion of the process of African decolonization, especially the earliest possible attainment of independence by the peoples of Namibia and Zimbabwe, and indeed all other African peoples under domination. It is also a policy of complete commitment to the liquidation of the practices of *apartheid* and racial discrimination, wherever they may exist.

65. The case before the Council today is very disturbing in more than one respect. Take, for instance, South Africa's record. The South African Government's violations of human rights have been an item continuously before the United Nations ever since the Organization's inception.

66. South Africa is the régime which holds the shameful record of having been condemned in more than 50 resolutions of the General Assembly and a score of resolutions of the Council, including one imposing an arms embargo [*resolution 181 (1963)*]. In fact, South Africa is second only to Israel—its ally and supporter—in this game or hobby of collecting United Nations condemnations.

67. Indeed, the South African Government's acts of aggression against its neighbours are reminiscent of

the so-called long-armed reprisals of Israel, South Africa's staunchest friend and ally, against Israel's neighbours, near and not so near. Nor does the similarity end there: it extends to encompass both countries' abhorrent laws and practices.

68. South Africa indeed has built up a long record of acts of aggression and incursions even against Zambia itself. Need the members of the Council be reminded of their admonition to South Africa concerning its aggression against Zambia in October 1971? In fact, the Security Council decided in 1971 to remain seized of the complaint by Zambia of South Africa's incursions and aggressions and to take up the matter anew should such attacks be repeated [*resolution 300 (1971)*]. That is the situation now before us.

69. South Africa has done it again, and the Security Council finds itself confronted with the same culprit, its very same cynical attitude, and the same victim.

70. South Africa, with its long list of defiances of and challenges to the authority of the United Nations and the Security Council's decisions, as well as the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on Namibia,<sup>1</sup> now adds insult to injury by resorting—exactly as it did in October 1971—to the cynical and alarming subterfuge of denying any knowledge of or any responsibility for the incursions and reprisals which have given rise to Zambia's latest complaint.

71. Those members of the Council who objected to the expulsion of the racist régime of South Africa from the United Nations advanced the argument that expulsion was not the most effective course to be taken then in dealing with such a culprit, and that the United Nations ought to continue to build its persuasive pressure upon South Africa, moving step by step until right had triumphed and equality and justice had been achieved. That was in October 1974. Yet South Africa's pronouncements and actions have frustrated the hopes and desires even of its well-wishers.

72. All the calls of the General Assembly and the decisions of the Security Council and of various other United Nations organs and bodies with regard to granting independence to Namibia and ending *apartheid* and discriminatory practices, as well as ending South Africa's incursions, aggressions and strong-arm methods against its neighbours, have heretofore fallen on deaf ears. That is why Mr. Botha's words yesterday before the Council had a hollow and a cynical ring to them.

73. The overwhelming majority of the United Nations membership was impelled—after a long period of patient endeavours—to decide that such a Government was not worthy of the honour of membership in the Organization. Thus the General Assembly, in its resolution 3207 (XXIX), called upon the Security Council to review the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa. The Council was not able

to adopt a resolution on this matter because of the veto cast by three of its permanent members, and the Council is accordingly still seized of the matter.

74. Yet the South African Government has become so isolated and so brazenly defiant of the authority of the United Nations that the General Assembly, at its twenty-ninth session, found it necessary not to recognize the credentials of the South African Government as truly representative of the people of South Africa.<sup>2</sup> How could it be otherwise when the South Africa régime is still imposing *apartheid* and racial discrimination by brute force over the majority of the population, resorting to massive killings of the black African population, so that the Windhoek and Sharpeville slaughters have been reproduced and even multiplied in Soweto as recently as June 1976?

75. This is the unique and alarming record of the country which today stands accused by Zambia—and by Africa—of repeated aggressions against Zambia's population and villages and against its sovereignty and which, to top it all, now pretends to be unaware of any wrong-doing. The record of South Africa speaks for itself; and so does the record of Zambia, which we all know to be a wise, moderate and peace-loving Member of the United Nations as well as a member of OAU.

76. Even the Western European Powers which, traditionally, have had strong economic or political ties with the régime in South Africa, have been compelled to recognize the failures and the illegality of South Africa's policies, be it *vis-à-vis* Namibia or its *apartheid* practices or its support to the racist régime of Rhodesia. Recently, the European Economic Community (EEC) issued two declarations: the Luxembourg Declaration of 23 February and the Declaration of the European Council of 2 April, in which the 9 members of EEC advocated the right to self-determination and independence of the peoples of Namibia and Rhodesia.

77. The press recently reported that diplomatic endeavours were afoot to try to impress upon Mr. Vorster the urgent need for South Africa to stop supporting the Smith minority Government in Rhodesia directly or indirectly and to put more pressure on Mr. Smith to reach a negotiated constitutional settlement with the country's black majority. On the question of Namibia, the same endeavours envisaged that South Africa should set an early date for its withdrawal from the Territory and allow political activists—notably of SWAPO—a hand in formulating a constitution. Apparently, all this has led nowhere.

78. The Organization of African Unity is not engaged in a political fight against the South Africa régime just for the sake of fighting. Certainly nothing would please the African States more than to see a peaceful solution to South Africa's problems with the members of OAU. We would certainly welcome South Africa's

paying heed to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on Namibia<sup>1</sup> and to the repeated calls of the United Nations for setting an early date for South Africa's withdrawal from Namibia. We would certainly welcome and hope for South Africa's mitigation of its most abhorrent and cruel laws and practices of *apartheid* and racial discrimination with a view to the emergence of a more harmonious, more egalitarian and more healthy and humanitarian society in South Africa where both the black majority and the white minority could live in harmony and justice. We would certainly welcome the abandonment by South Africa of the racist and bankrupt minority régime in Rhodesia by way of bringing the necessary pressure to bear on this white racist minority to enable it to see the light and to heed the calls of sanity and the dictates of justice. We would welcome all this, if it were possible, in order to obviate the need for and the resort to the only alternative left for the oppressed, the downtrodden and the desperate to take. But is this possible?

79. Soon after Mr. Vorster's rounds of diplomatic talks in Germany in June 1976, on 11 July, a platoon of troops from South Africa, with air support, attacked and bombed the village of Sialola in the Western Province of Zambia, about 30 kilometers inside Zambia's territory. We are informed by Zambia that 24 persons were killed and 45 seriously injured.

80. How should we take the South African Government's protestations of good will and peaceful intentions which we heard from the representative of South Africa yesterday before the Council? How can we take them seriously? How can we take seriously South Africa's pretence to seek peaceful solutions through dialogue with its neighbours when we see that, barely two weeks after the much touted diplomatic rounds of meetings in Germany, barely a few months after EEC's appeals and urgings to South Africa to mend its ways, all those efforts have led nowhere and that South Africa still resorts to the same old reprisals and strong-arm techniques for the same reasons and with the same flimsy denials?

81. Zambia's Minister for Foreign Affairs has told the Council [*1944th meeting*] that the Sialola incident, in which South African aircraft participated, was the latest of 14 wanton acts of aggression against his country by South Africa this year alone. Yet the South African régime's representative had the audacity to tell the Council—exactly as he told it in October 1971—that they were not aware of any South African attack on Zambia on 11 July and had not authorized any such attack.

82. In October 1971, when Zambia was subjected to a similar wanton aggression by the Pretoria régime, the Security Council adopted resolution 300 (1971), which called upon South Africa "to respect fully the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Zambia;" and declared that in the event of South Africa violating

the sovereignty or territorial integrity of Zambia, the Security Council [would] meet again to examine the situation further in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter." After the adoption of that resolution the representative of Zambia at that time stated before the Council:

"I must state that the Council has done us a lot of injustice by giving South Africa such a mild reprimand

"...

"It is our understanding that the resolution which has just been adopted, and particularly paragraph 3, is an indication that in the event of any further violation by South Africa of our territorial integrity, our airspace and our sovereignty, the Security Council will meet again to consider further measures, not excluding measures under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter." [1592nd meeting, paras. 40 and 45.].

83. South Africa gives no excuse for its latest acts of aggression against Zambia other than its worn-out pretence of ignorance of any such incidents. Indeed, the South African representative went on yesterday to impute those incursions and air raids against Zambia to irresponsible African subversive elements and to "the unsettled nature of the situation in southern Africa". [1944th meeting, para. 63] Why is it unsettled? The representative of South Africa conveniently disregards the responsibility of his own Government. He further made an emotional appeal for "trust" and "conciliation" in order to achieve and preserve peace. Peace on what basis? Peace and oppressive and inhuman *apartheid* laws and practices can hardly coexist. Trust and conciliation can barely germinate and flourish under the South African police's heavy-handed exploits against the population of Soweto and other townships in South Africa or under South African incursions against its neighbours.

84. The South African representative's intervention of yesterday is in contradiction with the acts of his own Government, and was indeed a brilliant display of South Africa's mockery of Zambia, of Africa, and indeed of this Council. The wolf tries to don the skin of a lamb; but can the leopard change its spots? Hardly ever.

85. I would submit that, before the Council, before the United Nations and the Charter, Zambia stands as a law-abiding and peace-loving Member of the United Nations and a member of OAU, whose only guilt in the eyes of South Africa may be that it is sympathetic to the cause of the freedom of the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia—a guilt shared by the great majority of United Nations Members, which is also in harmony with the various United Nations resolutions and decisions.

86. Zambia is a young African country that has bravely incurred many economic sacrifices and difficulties to help implement a United Nations boycott against the racist minority régime in Rhodesia, yet another ally of South Africa. Under no circumstances, and under no pretext or subterfuge, can it be allowed that South Africa or Rhodesia should be permitted to conduct reprisal raids deep into Zambia's territory and go unpunished or uncondemned because Zambia's sympathies lie with the intents and purposes of the Security Council decisions and the General Assembly resolutions on Namibia, *apartheid* or Rhodesia.

87. On the other hand, in the dock, before the Council, the minority Government of South Africa, a lawless yet self-righteous, ruthless yet cynical régime, stands accused of subterfuge, of diversionary tactics and of defiance of the authority and resolutions of the United Nations. South Africa stands accused of repeated acts of aggression, against its neighbours as well as against the black majority of its citizenry because they dare hope to find a way out of the hateful, oppressive and inhuman laws and practices of the white minority racist Government of Pretoria.

88. And so long as the actions and performance of the South African Government against its neighbours and black population speak louder and ring truer than the words of their representative yesterday before the Council, South Africa cannot be given the benefit of any doubt.

89. There is no doubt that the Council should have a free hand to condemn aggression, especially when it is a case of repeated acts of callous premeditated raids, air strikes and reprisals—even though cynically denied—not only against a small neighbour, but against the very authority of the Council, and against the authority of the Charter of the United Nations. No flimsy pretext, no subterfuge and no cynical and hollow protestations of peaceful intentions should be used this time by South Africa or its friends to protect it from a well-deserved condemnation; for it can be done only at the expense of the authority and the respectability of the United Nations and its Charter.

90. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Zaire, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

91. Mr. UMBA di LUTETE (Zaire) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I am a newcomer in this great family of diplomats of the United Nations, but might I nevertheless, since I have not yet had a chance to do so, extend to you, on behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf, my warm congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of one of the most important United Nations bodies. My country, the Republic of Zaire, maintains with your country, Italy,

ties of fruitful co-operation which might serve as an example for the world. I am therefore pleased to see a worthy and true son of that country presiding over the work of the Council. Many preceding speakers have had occasion to emphasize the delicacy and, above all, the difficult nature of your task, but all took pleasure in recalling the natural abilities and qualities of Italian diplomats; and I note that everybody made particular reference to your personal abilities, which are certainly an important guarantee of the success of your work. May I therefore convey to you, even though your term of office is approaching its end, my best wishes for the successful conduct of our deliberations under your enlightened guidance.

92. I wish now to perform the sad duty of associating myself with the message of solidarity that you addressed to the people of China in connexion with the loss of human life as well as the considerable material damage suffered by the People's Republic of China as a result of the recent earthquakes affecting an extensive area of that country.

93. I am speaking in this debate on the issue now before the Council for four reasons.

94. First, my country, Zaire, is firmly opposed to all forms of aggression. It so happens that a sister country, Zambia, has been attacked and, as we know, has suffered losses of human life as a result.

95. Secondly, Zambia is a country with which my country enjoys fraternal, privileged relations. We have a common border, and in certain parts of the country we speak the same language. Our people on both sides of the border are of the same stock. Thus, for more than one reason, what is of interest to Zambia is of concern to my country, Zaire.

96. Thirdly, Zambia belongs to the group of third-world nations, to the non-aligned group, as well as to the African continent, of which my country is a part.

97. Fourthly, this is a question that concerns freedom fighters and, therefore, decolonization. For a long time now, we had believed that these decolonization problems were coming to an end. However, we have been disappointed. My country considers this problem of the freedom fighters as a sacred cause, and therefore it is of personal concern to us.

98. Scarcely a fortnight ago, under your presidency, Mr. President, the Council had before it a complaint submitted by Africa and the Republic of Uganda in connexion with Israel's violation of Uganda's territorial sovereignty. Less than a week after that Israeli airborne operation, the Council was called upon to consider incidents of a similar nature and equal gravity, since Zambia, another State Member, has complained of aggression by South Africa.

99. I need not dwell on the facts themselves; they were stated yesterday quite clearly, precisely and concisely by the Zambian Minister for Foreign Affairs [1944th meeting].

100. Faced with these grave accusations, the representative of South Africa was obviously ill at ease and upset yesterday [*ibid.*]; he did not deny the facts but merely pleaded ignorance of them. But, as was emphasized yesterday by the representative of Mauritania, there is nothing surprising or new about this tactic, which consists either in denying the facts or in distracting the attention of the Security Council in order to prevent it from fully assuming its legitimate responsibilities.

101. Hence, what trust should we really place in the statements of the representative of South Africa? Only a few months ago, South Africa attacked Angola, and, until some of its soldiers were captured, it consistently denied any South African presence in Angola. We now know that there was a South African presence in Angola, and, as in the case of his previous statements, I do not think that we should have any faith in his recent statements.

102. Everybody knows what happened thereafter. South African army aircraft were clearly observed in that SWAPO camp. Where, then, as the representative of Mauritania asked [*ibid.*], could these phantoms have come from? In any event, they must certainly have been the phantoms of Vorster and his executioners. And now, what would have been the result of this inquiry that South Africa proposed? I wonder, and I believe everyone here in the Council must be wondering as well.

103. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zambia has cited an impressive list of acts, provocations and incidents for which South Africa is responsible. South Africa does not deny this, and yet it has continued to attack and commit aggression against Zambia.

104. Yesterday those who were in this chamber heard the obscure and nebulous statement of the representative of South Africa. Judging by his words, his good will cannot be doubted. His country is full of good faith. Just leave it to South Africa and everything will turn out all right. I believe that the speakers who have preceded me have demonstrated, brilliantly and at great length, that such statements are not even worth considering. So let us forget about that statement. There is nothing in it to discuss, and nothing in it to refute.

105. But I also wonder whether the representative of South Africa genuinely believed what he was saying. What is this gesture of good will? What gesture of good faith has South Africa ever made to the international community? The only things the Pretoria régime knows are contempt, arrogance, the strong-arm policy, the policy of bravado and of repression.

106. There is another symptomatic fact that I should also like to point out and that was also pointed out by the preceding speaker. Which are the countries that have most often been summoned before the Council? Which countries have most often been called before the Council to answer complaints that they are violating the principles of the Charter and are not respecting the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, or the advisory opinions International Court of Justice? I do not think I need name them. Concerning the answer there can be not the slightest shadow of a doubt, for, as my colleague, the representative of Egypt, has emphasized, South Africa holds the record, having been condemned 50 times in the various bodies of the United Nations. This is no idle reflection. It illustrates clearly, in any case, the attitude and behaviour of certain States, such as South Africa, which specialize in the systematic violation of the principles of the Charter and the relevant resolutions of United Nations bodies.

107. I really wonder why South Africa continues to be a Member of the United Nations. I also wonder how the other Member States can continue to endure the presence of a State which does nothing but mock and scoff at the Organization. And yet, on thinking it over, among the underlying causes of this state of affairs is one that was mentioned during the debate devoted to the Israeli aggression against Uganda. In this very Council, the representative of Israel said that he was accusing the Council, the United Nations and the international community of flabbiness, of opportunism and of collusion. This is a serious accusation and certain members of the Council had occasion to stress this. Yet I am bound to say that the representative of Israel was right on this point, and I am going to show why.

108. How, if this is not so, can we explain why the Council, when dealing with the matter of the violation of the territorial integrity of Uganda by Israel, saw fit simply to adjourn without even pronouncing a condemnation as a matter of principle? At the time of this debate, certain speakers—and I am thinking now of the representative of Guinea [1940th meeting]—were shocked and expressed the fear that unless the international community, and particularly the United Nations, voiced universal disapproval of such acts, an extremely dangerous precedent could be set. The representative of Guinea even added that, given the fact of Israel's dealings with South Africa, we should expect that one of these days South Africa will fall into step with Israel. And I think that the representative of Guinea had a good point there, since the Israeli intervention took place during the night of 3 July and one week later South Africa committed aggression against Zambia when its airborne troops attacked a peaceful village in Zambia. This, then, is the outcome of the conspiracy, complicity and indifference, to say the least, of certain Members of the Organization.

109. But even more serious for the Council is the fact that, as far as South Africa is concerned, this is not the first time. South Africa is an unrepentant recidivist. It is in the habit of committing aggression and murdering shamelessly. It casts scorn on the United Nations. And yet, the mass media, which usually lash out when someone touches a single hair of the head of persons from certain countries, say almost nothing. You yourselves saw a short while ago when the Council was considering the complaint of Uganda, this chamber was filled with people. There was even applause. Why? Because they were celebrating the Israeli exploit. But now that 24 Zambians have been killed, 45 have been wounded and 16 are missing, the press hardly says a word. Look at this room: it is almost empty. Even certain Members of the United Nations are fed up. Is it for shame at what South Africa is doing? No, it is because of indifference. What do they care if the United Nations is being mocked? What does it matter if so much blood is being shed? It is only the blood of poor people, the blood of Africans, the blood of black men, so what does it matter?

110. But the time has come, I think, to ask and to keep asking a question that has already been asked several times. Would South Africa have dared to attack a village or a town of that group of countries we all know? And if South Africa actually did so, what would have happened? When such serious matters and incidents have been brought to our attention in the Council, what have we found? Very often the accused countries have a pretext, namely that it was a matter of self-defence, of the right of pursuit, of a state of emergency. For the first time, thank God, South Africa has not even dared to invoke the so-called right of pursuit or the right of self-defence. Perhaps it has finally realized that ultimately it is the freedom fighters and the countries which give aid to the freedom fighters that are really acting in self-defence. Because basically what South Africa is doing is committing aggression against these countries, for anyone who puts himself in the wrong can never claim to be acting in self-defence. We know that the United Nations, the General Assembly, and the International Court of Justice have declared the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia to be unlawful. South Africa therefore has no right or claim to remain in Namibia. The same applies to the minority régime in Salisbury, which continues to rule over our brothers in Zimbabwe.

111. It was with joy and pride that I listened yesterday [1944th meeting] to the profession of faith of the Foreign Minister of Zambia. In substance, he said: that when South Africa destroyed our villages, when it attacked us, when it killed the freedom fighters, it believed it could intimidate us, but no, that on the contrary, all it was doing was strengthening our courage because we knew that we were defending a sacred cause. He said that the cause of freedom was not negotiable and that all Africans said this, and

not only Africans, but all men who loved justice and freedom had the imperative duty to support those fighting for liberty. He said that Zambia would always do its duty whatever happened and whatever it might cost. Those were fine words to hear, and they must be encouraging to all freedom fighters. They honour their author; they honour Zambia; they honour Africa; and, finally, they honour the international community.

112. As regards the Security Council, the body responsible for the maintenance of peace, this affair must convince it that as long as there are illegal minority racist régimes in southern Africa there will be no possibility of peace. Yesterday it was Zambia and Angola; tomorrow it will perhaps be the United Republic of Tanzania. It may be Botswana; it may perhaps be Lesotho. And why not Zaire? Why not Benin or any other African country?

113. All this must stop. South Africa has caused sufficient trouble for United Nations bodies. As the Zambian Foreign Minister said yesterday, the Council must at least show its solidarity with Zambia and with the freedom fighters by unequivocally condemning the South African aggression. When the Zambian Foreign Minister goes home he should at least be able to take to his people a message of hope that the sacrifices of that people are not in vain and that they are supported in their struggle by the international community. The Security Council would thus simply show the continuity of its progressive policy in the field of decolonization.

114. As I said just now, and as many other speakers have said, the United Nations has already declared illegal the South African presence in Namibia and recognized the legitimacy of the struggle of the freedom fighters. That is the least the Council can do—not to mention reparations for damage caused by the aggression. I am convinced the Council will act accordingly, and that it will take all the necessary measures to give true effect to the many resolutions of the United Nations on Namibia and Zimbabwe. That, then, is the desire I express from the bottom of my heart, and I am sure that all men who love justice and peace share that desire.

115. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have just received letters from the representatives of Ethiopia Madagascar and Uganda, in which they request to be invited to participate in the debate in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure. Accordingly, I propose, in accordance with the usual practice of the Council and if there is no objection, to invite those representatives to participate in the Council's debate without the right to vote.

116. I invite the representatives of Ethiopia, Madagascar and Uganda to take the places reserved for

them at the side of the Council chamber on the understanding that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table when they wish to address the Council.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Ibrahim (Ethiopia), Mr. Rusolondraibe (Madagascar) and Mr. Mwangaguhunga, (Uganda) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

117. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Liberia. I invite her to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

118. Mrs. BROOKS-RANDOLPH (Liberia): Mr. President, may I take this opportunity to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of July.

119. On behalf of the Government and people of Liberia, I should like to convey to the representative of China and, through him, to the Government and people of China, our deepest sympathy and condolences on the losses they have sustained because of the recent earthquake.

120. Mr. William R. Tolbert Jr., President of the Republic of Liberia, has instructed me to intervene in this debate in support of the Government of Zambia and strongly to condemn the constant violation of the territorial integrity of the Republic of Zambia by the racist Government of South Africa. We also condemn any violation by South Africa of the territorial integrity of other independent countries in southern Africa.

121. In his statement to the Council yesterday [*ibid.*], Mr. Siteke G. Mwale, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Zambia, made a comprehensive analysis of the diabolical acts and designs of the white minority racist régime of South Africa in its aggression against his Government, in particular the aggression of 11 July 1976.

122. In his reply to the statement of the Foreign Minister of Zambia, the so-called representative of South Africa said:

“At the outset I wish to state that the South African Government had no knowledge of an attack on a Zambian village at Sialola on 11 July 1976. The South African Government at no time authorized and would not authorize attacks on Zambian villages.” [*Ibid.*, para. 48.]

In the view of my Government, the categorical denial by the representative of South Africa regarding this matter raises very serious questions.

123. I should now like to address myself to the Government of South Africa through its representative in this chamber.

124. Is the Government of South Africa willing to accept and co-operate fully with a fact-finding mission of the Security Council regarding this matter? Is the South African Government willing to make available to that fact-finding mission all relevant information on its troop movements during this period?

125. Numerous resolutions of the Council have declared illegal South Africa's presence in Namibia. Consequently, no part of the territory of Namibia can be used by South Africa as a staging-ground either to violate the territorial integrity of the Republic of Zambia or to attack Namibians fighting for the liberation of their country.

126. If it was all right for European countries to fight for the liberation of their countries from the iron clutches of the Nazi occupation, why should it be wrong for the heroic people of Namibia to fight for the liberation of their country from the illegal racist régime of South Africa?

127. In conclusion, I request of the South African representative a reply to the question I raised a moment ago regarding a fact-finding mission so that this factor may be taken into consideration in any draft resolution that might be adopted on the question before the Council.

128. May I further tell the South African régime, as I have done in the Council before, that the hands of the clock cannot be turned back. To kill liberators or people struggling to liberate themselves is simply to sow a seed that will bring back even more. They shall rise again and again until all of Africa is free.

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

130. Mr. ACOSTA (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): At a previous meeting my delegation congratulated you, Mr. President, on the efficient way in which you have been conducting the work of the Security Council and applauded the cordial and respectful relations existing between Italy and Cuba. I would repeat those sentiments today. My delegation wishes to express to you, Mr. President, and to all the members of the Council its gratitude for having been given the opportunity to speak in this debate, without the right to vote.

131. We wish also to express our condolences in respect of the victims of the earthquake that struck the People's Republic of China yesterday.

132. The situation that has brought us here today, albeit dramatic, is not new. For over 15 years the Security Council and other United Nations bodies have been considering and condemning the racist, aggressive, expansionist and hence intolerable character of the South African régime. Much has been

said; the number of resolutions is voluminous; and the international community's cry of protest against the brutal system of *apartheid*—which constitutes, as shown by the present agenda of the Council, a threat to the Governments and peoples of Africa and, even more, to international peace and security—is loud and clear.

133. Scarcely a month ago it was necessary to bring the South African régime here and put it in the dock because of the bloody massacre in Soweto and many other places, where students and other persons had risen up against oppression. The news coming from Johannesburg shows clearly that rebellion inside the country is on the rise and that the police and the racist army have increased their desperate and useless acts to drown that rebellion in blood.

134. Today the Council has had to meet once again to examine another act of aggression by the South African régime. We are not surprised at this new attack, directed this time against an independent and progressive State of Africa: the Republic of Zambia.

135. This year there have been 14 acts of armed aggression by racist South Africa against the people and Government of Zambia. The most recent act—that of 11 July—was committed in the village of Sialola, in the Kaunga-Mashi region of the Western Province. Without justification, South African troops committed an incursion into that area, which is 28 to 30 kilometres inside Zambian territory, and, supported by the air force, they attacked and bombed the village and the SWAPO transit camp, killing 24 persons and wounding 45.

136. That act of aggression, as denounced in the statement made before the Council by the Foreign Minister of the Republic of Zambia [*1944th meeting*], constitutes a flagrant violation of the territorial integrity of Zambia and a threat to international peace and security. So flagrant is this offence that yesterday the representative of South Africa, in his statement to the Council [*ibid.*], resorted to the oft-repeated statement that his Government was ignorant of events of which it undoubtedly was the protagonist.

137. Not content with launching a platoon of racists against Sialola, the Vorster régime gave "appropriate use" to the arms of its reactionary air force. We say "appropriate use" because the international community knows full well that for this purpose South Africa receives military resources from the Western Powers. It produces arms and receives them in order to perpetuate the shameful system of *apartheid*, to combat the liberation movements, to try to strangle internal resistance, and to attack other African States of the region, as was shown in Zambia's denunciation.

138. The delegation of Cuba condemns with profound indignation this Fascist and racist aggression against a sovereign, progressive, non-aligned State.

139. Not long ago the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries, meeting at Algiers from 30 May to 2 June, expressed its repudiation of the South African régime and gave voice to its serious concern at the support being given to the racist minority enclave by the imperialist Powers. The solemn declaration by the Co-ordinating Bureau at Algiers has acquired new validity today in the light of the events we are considering.

140. Faced with these facts, it is imperative that we analyse, if only briefly, the roots of this putrid régime, its effects and its prospects.

141. The system of *apartheid* was created parallel with the establishment of the cold war by imperialism in 1948, and went hand in hand with the emergence of the aggressive North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) bloc and the so-called brink-of-war policy, the provocations in Berlin and the installation of a series of bases and military pacts against the Soviet Union and the socialist community. The South African *apartheid* régime made a good combination with the imperialist strategy of throttling the revolutionary national liberation movement and established itself as the policeman of reaction in Africa.

142. Eighteen million blacks have been confined to the worst land, within the framework of a brutal system of discrimination and repression which exploits them like true slaves, turning them into the cheapest labour in the world.

143. Mr. Botha, in his statement of 19 June last [1930th meeting], was daring enough to supply fallacious, prefabricated figures established by the régime he represents. He forgot, however, to point out that a black worker doing the same work as a white worker receives a salary that is, 10 to 20 times lower. Neither did he say anything about the heavier work which is assigned to blacks. He forgot to point out that in the country the difference in wages between a black and a white can be over thirtyfold, nor did he say that between 1948 and 1973 over 10.5 million Africans had been brought to trial and gaoled as a result of the brutal system of law created by the architects of *apartheid* to oppress them.

144. To this we must add that the military budget of South Africa for the year 1975—1976 amounts to 1,300 million Rand, equivalent to 18 per cent of the overall budget and 3 per cent of South Africa's gross national product. These military expenditures constitute, moreover, a 36 per cent increase as compared to the previous budget.

145. One might well ask why at this point in time so despicable and inhuman a régime is still maintained alive. The answer is very simple. On the shoulders of the black masses of South Africa we find sitting not only the leaders in Pretoria but also—and I would emphasize this—the transnational monopolies of

imperialism, which daily draw fabulous profits from them. By way of illustration, suffice it to say that over 200 United States corporations account for one-fifth of their foreign investments in South Africa.

146. In short, it is the international alliance of imperialist monopolies that supports and upholds the South African régime. It is the product of this alliance which places in the hands of the Pretoria racists atomic reactors, helicopters, modern aircraft—in short, weapons of every kind for purposes of aggression. These are the same weapons that were used to massacre the patriots in Soweto and other places, the same which a few months ago were defeated by the heroic action of the Angolan patriots, the same which today are used against the Republic of Zambia and threaten all the peoples and Governments on that continent.

147. It is important to say that undoubtedly the heinous system of *apartheid* has already entered into an unavoidable stage of definitive crisis from which not even the best imperialist medicine men can save it, and they will not be able to save it because the crisis of South Africa is a reflection of the crisis of colonialism and neo-colonialism on the African continent. The victories of the peoples of Guinea-Bissau, Angola and Mozambique bear this out.

148. In Soweto unarmed people faced their oppressors with sticks and stones in their hands; in Angola the invasion by the South African régime was triumphantly repulsed, thus destroying forever the myth of white racist supremacy; and in Namibia and Zimbabwe the national liberation movement is being strengthened.

149. In this process so critical for the régime of *apartheid* and its supporters, the role of the international community, through its militant solidarity with the sovereign and progressive States of Africa and the national liberation movements, acquires special importance. That is why today, in the face of this new aggression by the South African régime against the Republic of Zambia, the Cuban delegation, representing its Government and people, endorses the strong protest of that fraternal people and all the Governments members of OAU.

150. There is much African blood in our veins from the slaves brought to the American continent from Africa.

151. Cuba hopes that the Security Council will vigorously condemn this new racist aggression and repudiate the presence of the South African régime in Namibia. We request that it do so. Cuba hopes that the Council will adopt effective measures against the South African régime and requests that those States which provide South Africa with weapons and which encourage it with the development of diplomatic relations and support it through investments and



trade relations put an end to such ties, thus complying with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations.

152. In making this appeal, Cuba is loyal to its principles and is merely reciprocating with militancy for the solidarity evidenced towards it in its struggle against imperialism.

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

154. Mr. RASOLONDRAIBE (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, allow me to express my delegation's great satisfaction at seeing you presiding over the Security Council. The close and cordial relations between Italy and Madagascar lead me to hope that under your diligent, wise and well-advised leadership the Council will be able, after examining the Zambian complaint, to take a decision that will give grounds for hope that Africa will experience an era of peace and security and, above all, of justice and liberty.

155. At the same time, I should also like to address to you personally and, through you, to the other members of the Council, my delegation's thanks that its request to participate in this debate has been granted.

156. I wish also to associate myself with the message which you addressed to the delegation of the People's Republic of China, expressing our condolences over the loss of human life and the material damage caused by the recent earthquake which affected a large area of China.

157. The facts brought to the attention of the Council by the Foreign Minister of Zambia Mr. Mwale [*1944th meeting*], are by now too well known for me to risk inconveniencing the Council by repeating them; and much as I might have liked to, I could not have presented them with as much eloquence and authority as was done by the member of the Zambian Government who is honouring us by his personal participation in this debate, for which we convey our sincere thanks to him.

158. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar condemns the illegal racist régime of Pretoria for the repeated acts of aggression committed against the Republic of Zambia, a friendly country with which we have long-standing ties based on solidarity in struggle and on common aims as regards the total liberation of Africa. In fact, my country considers any aggression committed against any African State as an aggression against itself, against its own sovereignty and territorial integrity; and this is true, whoever the victim may be: the Comoros, Somalia, Angola, Mozambique, Uganda or Zambia—to mention only the countries that have been the subject of Council debates this year.

159. The acts of premeditated violence committed by the Pretoria régime on 11 July in the village of Sialola, 30 kilometres inside Zambian territory, are viewed with extreme gravity by my delegation, if only for the number of victims involved. I wish to take this opportunity to convey to the Zambian Government and, through it, to the bereaved families the sincere condolences and heartfelt sympathy of the people and Government of Madagascar.

160. These acts of violence are serious and must be condemned, because they constitute a serious and flagrant violation of international law and of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations—an Organization to which the Pretoria régime should no longer belong, I might say. That paragraph, I need hardly recall, prohibits "the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations".

161. The criminal raid on Sialola is serious also because of its purpose, since it was directed against the Namibian nationalists fighting under the banner of SWAPO for the realization of their inalienable rights and for the liberation of their country, which has been illegally occupied by the Vorster Administration in defiance of the decisions of the United Nations and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice.<sup>1</sup>

162. The tragic incident of 11 July is also serious because it is not an isolated or exceptional act, but part of a long series of attacks carried out by airborne troops equipped with sophisticated weapons against a State, Zambia, whose only crimes are having a common frontier with Namibia, being opposed to racial discrimination, white supremacy and minority régimes, and being in favour of majority rule and self-determination in Africa. During the Council's debates in October 1971 [*1590th to 1592nd meetings*], the representative of the Zambian Government informed us of 24 violations of his country's sovereignty by the racist South African régime. Yesterday, Mr. Mwale gave a list of 14 other violations perpetrated since the beginning of this year—that is, an average of two per month.

163. The fact that a State systematically resorts to violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of another State in order to achieve its national objectives is sufficient to cause it to lose all legitimacy—assuming it had any in the first place. The Vorster régime never had any legitimacy, and the objectives it is pursuing in attacking Zambia are illegitimate as well.

164. The fact that the representative of Pretoria chooses to lie about the incident of 11 July does not alter the situation at all. This lie cannot disprove the fact that his régime harbours hostile intentions towards the independent African countries in passing a law permitting the dispatch of South African expeditionary forces to any point south of the Sahara—in Zambia

or elsewhere. That lie of his will not make us believe that it is Martians who periodically come to sow death and destruction in Sialola and in the neighbouring areas of the Caprivi Strip. There are only two explanations: either Pretoria has lost control over its troops illegally stationed in Namibia and those troops are now becoming dangerous to everybody, including the Pretoria régime itself, or the intervention in the territories of neighbouring African countries has become such a routine matter that these troops no longer need the green light from Pretoria before carrying out their raids. In either case, the dangers to the sovereignty and security of neighbouring States cannot be minimized.

165. It is time that the Council stopped wanting two contradictory things. It is time that, in the spirit of resolution 300 (1971), it showed its determination to ensure the sovereignty, integrity and security of Zambia and stopped tolerating the presence of South African armed forces illegally stationed in the Caprivi Strip and throughout Namibia, for purposes inimical to the independent African countries. It is time that the Council stopped proclaiming its support for the principle of independence for Namibia while tolerating its occupation by South Africa and the use of its territory as a base for aggression against neighbouring African countries. It is time we stopped pretending to support SWAPO and its legitimate claims if the Council is going to continue to close its eyes to the persecution and massacre of Namibian nationalists by South African troops in Namibia itself or in foreign territory, such as Zambia.

166. In the circumstances I have just described, the Security Council has the duty to demand the withdrawal from Namibia of the South African troops responsible, among other crimes, for repeated acts of aggression against the Republic of Zambia. Such a measure, if adopted and followed up, would satisfy Zambia's security requirements. Such a measure does not imply the use of armed force by the United Nations or its Members, even though it is not on the list of measures—which in any case is not restrictive—in Article 41 of the Charter. Such a measure is in keeping with the law because, not exercising any sovereignty over Namibia, South Africa cannot maintain any armed forces there. Moreover, such a measure, I need hardly say, cannot run counter to any decision that the Council may adopt once it has examined, as it will in a few weeks' time, the question of Namibia as a whole.

167. In his statement yesterday, the Zambian Minister for Foreign Affairs called on the Council to honour the commitment it had entered into when it adopted its resolution 300 (1971). He asked for effective and energetic measures against South Africa. The measure I have just mentioned can and must be one of them.

168. I would not wish to continue my statement without associating myself with what the Foreign Minister of Zambia said yesterday before the Council:

“The central issue, therefore, is black majority rule in Namibia and Zimbabwe, and the destruction of *apartheid* in South Africa. As long as the white minority racist régimes continue to exist in the region, the international community will witness repeated acts of aggression by these régimes against independent African countries... peace and security in southern Africa will remain precarious, and international peace and security will be threatened.”  
[1944th meeting, para. 24]

169. Clearly, if the Council has the duty, as a result of this debate, to take a decision that will render justice to the demands of Zambia, that decision must also take into account the responsibility that this body bears for the maintenance of international peace and security. In southern Africa this requires that Namibia and Zimbabwe be liberated at once and that *apartheid* be wiped out.

170. We are all too familiar with the tricks that the South African régime is capable of and therefore we cannot be unduly surprised at the tactic it has chosen to use during the present debate. Do we need to recall that the most flagrant example of these tactics occurred in San Francisco, when the South African régime signed the Charter of the United Nations while at the same time reserving to itself the right to apply its policy of *apartheid* at home? Its offer to engage in dialogue and its so-called policy of détente with regard to the independent African countries have turned out to be only empty promises designed to pull the wool over the eyes of world public opinion; promises which, moreover, are contradicted by its interventions in Angola and Zambia. We firmly believe that, in the present case, the Pretoria régime has acted against its well-understood interests by publicly revealing the extent of its impudence and effrontery—something which will be felt above all in those circles which still dare to hope for some hypothetical contribution on the part of South Africa to a peaceful development of the situation in southern Africa.

171. To the representatives of those circles I wish to address myself specifically by recalling that if there is to be any peaceful evolution in that region, the conditions laid down by independent Africa to that end are to be found in the Lusaka Manifesto<sup>3</sup> and the Dar es Salaam Declaration on southern Africa adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity at its ninth extraordinary session in April 1975. South Africa rejects those conditions. When we invited them to negotiate with the African population of Azania, the racists of Pretoria replied with the massacre at Soweto. South Africa apparently does not wish to negotiate with us under threat; but this is precisely the experience it has forced the Zambian Government to undergo, except that the threats have been carried out. My delegation is certain that the Council will unanimously condemn this mode of action.

172. I would not wish to conclude this statement without referring to the broader problem that worries the militarily weak countries, particularly those of Africa, as a result of the Council's failure to take a decision on Uganda's complaint, whose similarity to the case at present under consideration does not need to be demonstrated.

173. Starting from the idea that the territorial inviolability of States has always been and remains one of the essential and universally recognized principles of international law, we are disturbed at the practices and theories invoked by Israel and South Africa in an effort to legitimize or legally justify their infringements on the sovereignty and integrity of Arab or African States. In our view, the territorial sovereignty of any country, large or small, must be respected, and we do not believe that there is any reason whatsoever that can render legitimate or admissible any violation, even of a temporary nature, of this principle. Scrupulous respect for the principle of territorial sovereignty today constitutes one of the guarantees for the maintenance of that peace and justice for which we constantly strive. We are sure that the Council will wish to guarantee that the decisions it takes in the future will keep the scope of that principle inviolate.

174. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. O. T. Emvula, Deputy Chief Representative of the South West Africa People's Organization. In accordance with the decision taken earlier by the Council under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

175. Mr. EMVULA (Deputy Chief Representative of the South West Africa People's Organization): Mr. President, distinguished members of the Security Council, let me express my delegation's sincere gratitude for having been given the honour of speaking before you. We have deep respect for this august body because it has a great responsibility to mankind. My delegation believes that ultimately a decisive step will be taken on an issue of specific concern to us.

176. Since this is the first time SWAPO has appeared before the Council during the term of your service, Mr. President, I wish to congratulate you on behalf of the people of Namibia and on behalf of Comrade Sam Nujoma, the President of SWAPO, and on my own behalf, on your assumption of that very responsible office so important for upholding justice and peace, which are the basis of the Charter of the United Nations.

177. I want also to avail myself of this opportunity to express our shock and heartfelt grief at the bad news we have heard concerning the disaster that has happened in China. We wish to extend our condolences to the people, to the Government and the Party of China.

178. This is the fourth time in less than seven months that the highest authority of the United Nations has found it necessary to convene to consider crimes of the most condemned criminal régime in the world, namely that of South Africa.

179. In January of this year, the Security Council sat to consider the crime of the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by the *apartheid* régime. At that time the Council [*resolution 385 (1976)*] called upon that régime to withdraw from and to cease henceforth using the international Territory of Namibia as a springboard for aggression against neighbouring States.

180. In March the Council was again called upon to consider South Africa's military aggression against the People's Republic of Angola. The Council [*resolution 387 (1976)*] then condemned South Africa's invasion of the People's Republic of Angola and demanded that the *apartheid* régime scrupulously respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country. It also demanded that South Africa desist from utilizing Namibia to mount provocative or aggressive acts against the People's Republic of Angola or any other neighbouring African State.

181. Before the dust had settled, however, this body was again urgently convened, last month, to discuss the massacre of school children at Soweto and other places in South Africa itself, perpetrated by that notorious régime.

182. Today the Council is again sitting to consider the most recent flagrant act of aggression against the Republic of Zambia. On the eleventh of this month, the repugnant racist régime of South Africa, once again using the illegally occupied Territory of Namibia as its staging base, launched an unprovoked attack by air and land against the village of Sialola in the Western Province of Zambia, killing at least 24 people and seriously injuring 45 others.

183. On the same day Mr. Agostinho Neto, the President of the People's Republic of Angola, disclosed that three villages in southern Angola had been attacked and burned down by the same racist South African forces of aggression, again using Namibia as their launching base.

184. All these acts of aggression are being committed at the very time when the armed struggle being waged by the People's Liberation Army of Namibia under its vanguard party, SWAPO, has reached new proportions resulting in the opening up of new military fronts and operational areas in central and southern regions of Namibia and the consolidation of previously contested areas of military operation in northern, north-western and north-eastern regions of Namibia.

185. Because of its dismal failure to match and contain the determined forces of SWAPO, the *apar-*

heid régime and its occupation forces of aggression have resorted to flagrant armed attacks in neighbouring independent African States and to harassment, torture, murder, rape, arrest and detention of SWAPO political cadres and sympathizers at home.

186. Most of the atrocities perpetrated by the South African terrorist forces do not come to the knowledge of the world because the régime has banned any reports on them in its attempt to present to the world a mask of peacefulness in Namibia and general acceptance by the Namibians of its ugly occupation. But the reality is poles apart from the propaganda South Africa presents to the world.

187. On 29 August 1975, two uncontrolled, irresponsible, occupationist terrorist soldiers raped the half-blind 75-year-old Mrs. Nailenge of Ongenga and seriously assaulted her 85-year-old husband, Mr. Paulus Nailenge. The two old victims spent more than a month in hospital. Since then, incidents of that nature have become common occurrences in northern Namibia.

188. In the same month of last year, the illegal occupationist régime of South Africa conducted a general sweep in the wake of the assassination of puppet Chief Elifas of the Ovambo Bantustans. That resulted in the torture, trial and subsequent sentencing to death of Aaron Muchimba and Hendrik Shikongo. The trial itself was by its nature and substance illegal and totally unfair since it degenerated into the shameful trial of SWAPO as an organization. The representative of the International Commission of Jurists has confirmed that the trial was a mockery of justice.

189. On 10 June the Reverend Cornelius Nghishitende was killed at a village of Epinga, from which the people were forcibly removed by the racist army. His one-year-old son and the Reverend Haukongo were seriously injured. This was done because of their opposition to the removal of villagers.

190. On the weekend of 11 July, the forces of occupation killed a 13-year-old boy near Ondangua while he was looking after cattle.

191. Those are only a few of the hundreds of acts of terror.

192. While the illegal occupationist régime of South Africa was illegally condemning the Namibian compatriots to death, it also engaged itself in the destruction of Namibia's natural ecology and the human habitat along the northern border areas. Villagers have been forcibly removed from Ruacana, on the Cunene River, through Okalongo, to Engela, through Epinga and Ohauwanga, right to Nkurenkuru, on the Okavango River; then, from Andara, through Singalamwe, to Katima Mulilo, on the Zambezi.

193. Thousands of families were uprooted, leaving behind them their ripe farm crops and property.

They were relegated to concentration camps called protected villages on the desert peripheries, where men and beasts face untold suffering and misery. It is in that process that scores have been murdered and hundreds have lost their limbs or have been permanently crippled in their stoic effort to resist this forcible removal from their ancestral lands.

194. Namibia has been turned into a den of misery. Everywhere people are mourning. Mothers are losing their children, who are being killed, while looking after cattle or when going to or coming from schools, by the roaming racist terrorists, who number more than 50,000 in the northern area of Namibia alone. Pregnant women are assaulted; mothers and their babies on their backs are sewn together by the racist bullets.

195. Searching for information about the movement of SWAPO freedom fighters, the forces of occupation break into people's houses and kidnap, torture and interrogate them. More often than not, such action has resulted in the death or permanent injury of many, many Namibians.

196. SWAPO has irrefutable evidence on every single act of terror I have mentioned and many others. It has facts about the ugly reality of the present Namibian situation which contradict what the representative of the forces of terror said yesterday in an attempt to hoodwink the Council.

197. The people of Namibia are weary of the continued illegal presence of the South African colonial régime in Namibia, but nobody in an effective position seems to take their plight seriously.

198. On the eve of the Kissinger-Vorster talks in West Germany, the churches in Namibia having the widest contact with the people wrote a letter to Mr. Kissinger in which they said:

"We are convinced that the vast majority of the black people of our country fervently desire that the South African police, army and administration should rapidly leave this Territory... the discriminatory political policies which have been so callously implemented here... [and the] ever-increasing rule of terror which has been inflicted on the people—especially arbitrary arrest, indefinite detention and brutal torture—... have destroyed human dignity and bedevilled relationships within the family and community and totally alienated the black population."

199. It should therefore be obvious that the pious presentation to which the Council was subjected yesterday by the spokesman of the most untruthful and hypocritical régime was calculated to blindfold, manipulate and confuse world public opinion to the point where it believes that racist South Africa now intends to withdraw from Namibia. This applies also

to the denial of that régime's aggression against Zambia.

200. Yesterday South Africa introduced itself here as a sort of innocent victim of the world—the very attitude of a wolf in sheep's clothing. That was a manoeuvre to hijack attention from facts before the Council. South Africa has had no change of heart that would justify that move. If anything, the régime has become more dangerous. What South Africa has brought to Namibia is some window dressing and callous repression—repression which has had repercussions in neighbouring States.

201. The so-called constitutional talks in Namibia are and remain nothing other than an instrument of colonialist racist South Africa to impose its evil schemes of bantustanization in disguise and perpetual white minority domination of the majority of the people of Namibia. The so-called Turnhalle is totally controlled by the same reactionary National Party of South Africa. It is a shameful undertaking and a collection of useless puppets, some of whom the régime had to give new suits and shoes which they were to wear for the first time in their lives. In fact, they decided to carry those shoes into the hall because they did not fit.

202. This Turnhalle exercise has been rejected by Namibia, and I wish to quote the tribal group recognized by South Africa which has rejected participation in the Turnhalle. This is from the *Windhoek Advertiser*—the only English newspaper in Namibia—of 21 July:

“A move to include dissident groups in the Damara delegation to the constitutional conference suffered a serious setback here today when the Damaraland Advisory Council rejected the Turnhalle as a farce.

“Meanwhile, a Windhoek-based faction of the Damara Tribal Executive announced that it would not participate without United Nations supervision.

“The Chairman of the officially-recognized Damaraland Advisory Council (DAC), Mr. Justus Garoeb, said the DAC regarded all decisions taken in the Turnhalle as invalid and not applicable to South West Africa. As far as the DAC was concerned, the Damaras were not represented. The delegation, under Mr. E. Christy, was ‘a South African-inspired group, who are there in a personal capacity’.

“Mr. Garoeb said the DAC had received no invitation from Mr. Christy. Even if it had done, it would have summarily refused it. The Turnhalle would have to make changes of principle if Damara groups were expected to participate. In addition, an invitation would have to come from ‘a qualified, responsible instance, not from a group of chancers’.

“...

“It demanded freedom and independence for South West Africa with its territory intact and democratic rights and equality for all inhabitants, irrespective of their race, colour or ethnic origins.”

203. The racist representative has laboured to convince the Council by deception that the so-called constitutional talks have brought changes in Namibia. Of course, they have helped South Africa to entrench itself militarily in Namibia; of course, they have caused more deaths in Namibia. But the change the Namibians want is total withdrawal of the occupationist régime.

204. We are aware that the culmination of the so-called constitutional talks is meant to be the creation, probably by the end of next month, of a puppet government in Namibia headed by a puppet black prime minister camouflaging a real, white prime minister, who will be his deputy. Such a government will leave defence and foreign affairs in the hands of Pretoria, or it will have agreed by then that the racist forces remain in Namibia at its ‘invitation’. That, of course, will facilitate the aggressive activities against independent African countries.

205. The acts of terror and international gangsterism to which I have referred, taking place at a time when South Africa is expected to comply with Security Council resolution 385 (1976), are calculated methods used by the illegal régime in its attempt to impose the results of the so-called constitutional talks—or the Turnhalle, as it is called—on the Namibian people. Like any devil, South Africa knows full well that it will never succeed in imposing its ugly schemes and machinations upon the people of Namibia behind the Turnhalle smoke-screen as long as SWAPO of Namibia, their vanguard party, is strong and dynamic, as it is.

206. As a matter of fact, all the criminal acts committed by the occupationist régime of South Africa against the Namibians, and against SWAPO supporters in particular, have been aimed at the physical elimination of SWAPO so as to frustrate its efforts for the decolonization and true liberation of Namibia. For only SWAPO threatens the evil plans of South Africa. My delegation therefore appeals to the Council not to be misled by this most delinquent régime. The South African racist régime has always been and will continue to be an aggressive, expansionist and dangerous régime as long as definite steps are not taken by the international community to force it to abandon its evil designs. The régime wants to continue its colonial presence in Namibia and to use Namibia in its aggressive designs.

207. Occupation of Namibia by racist South Africa is central to the tension in the region, and the ending of that occupation will promote the achievement of peace there. We have asked to participate in these

debates specifically because our country is being used by the belligerent, expansionist régime to violate the airspace and territorial integrity of independent African States.

208. The South West Africa People's Organization of Namibia is for the upholding of international law; it is for total respect for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and for human rights in general, as formulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It is for respect for the sovereignty of countries and the inviolability of their territorial integrity.

209. It was indeed mostly unarmed Namibian compatriots who died in the racist raid on the village of Sialola in Zambia. We believe that the aggression was an act of international terrorism, in contravention of international law, and it must be condemned.

210. South Africa is our enemy because it occupies our land. We are justified in regarding South Africa as our enemy. And South Africa regards us as its enemy because we make it difficult for South Africa to carry out its evil plans. If this wanton act by South Africa is not to be condemned, must we, as enemies, take each other on wherever we meet? Must I take on this enemy whom I find in New York?

211. South Africa, by its actions and practices, is not for the principle which we and the Security Council stand for. It has repeatedly violated the territories of Angola and Zambia. The racist representative argued here yesterday that his régime did not have knowledge of the actions of its aggressive forces towards Zambia. That is right, I guess. For he and his régime did not need to know, because his régime enacted a law this year giving its racist generals a green light to roam and sow death and destruction anywhere in Africa south of the Sahara, without recourse to their parliament at Cape Town.

212. He argued also that Zambian citizens have violated South African territory. But South Africa has no common border with Zambia. If the racists mean that Namibia is South Africa, then that, together with other facts, only confirms that South Africa does not want an inch of Namibia but wants and has annexed the whole of it. That is why SWAPO continues to fight. We are Namibians, not South Africans. It is the South African racist régime which we are fighting in Namibia, not in South Africa. Once they are out of Namibia, the war will stop. So if they are as peaceful as their representative claimed yesterday that they were, if they want understanding and conciliation and not recrimination, why do they not quit our country? Why do they militarize Namibia with impunity? Why do they kill Namibians? Why do they misuse our country?

213. The representative of aggression disclosed here yesterday that they are in contact with 11 dissident groups from 11 African States, and that the aim of

those dissident groups is to overthrow the Governments of those countries. The Mushala gang was trained by them and is troubling the Republic of Zambia today. We believe that these 11 other groups are or will be involved in subversive activities against their respective countries of origin. This is another threat posed by the South African racist régime towards destabilization in Africa. African States should take note of this. In this respect, the occupationists are also training Angolan reactionary elements as terror gangs that terrorize the Namibians posing as SWAPO fighters in order to bring it into disrepute. This attempt will fail.

214. SWAPO of Namibia has a responsibility to the Namibian people, and Namibia must and will be liberated. The SWAPO Congress at Walvis Bay, in Namibia, has reiterated its confidence in the leadership of Comrade Sam Nujoma, in its recognition of the fact that Namibia's liberation can be brought about only by the efforts made under his leadership. SWAPO is not going to be cowed or intimidated into submission. The racist acts of terror and intimidation will, if anything, only strengthen our belief that the racist occupationist régime is not serious when it proclaims that it has no claim on Namibia, and, therefore, the war of liberation will continue and broaden to face up to the challenges posed by this racist régime.

215. The representative of the terror régime amused us yesterday here when he said that recrimination will only be counter-productive. What, to him, is not counter-productive? He says that the devastation of war must be avoided and that no one should accept it. I would remind him that it is his régime that threw into the dustbin resolution 385 (1976), in which the Council sought to remove the cause of war, namely, by demanding the withdrawal of the occupationist forces from Namibia and the holding of free elections under United Nations supervision and control.

216. At this juncture, I want to thank those countries that have helped us and appeal to these friendly countries to react favourably and assist us in defending the rights of our people in Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa.

217. I find it unnecessary to list the contradictions of the most provocative régime the world has ever known. Rather, I wish to say a word to those who form alliances with this régime.

218. I want to refer to the picture of Israel which is now emerging in the context of southern Africa. The clearing in the area along the northern Namibian border and the intricate defence mechanism there are laid out in the style of the Bar-Lev line along the Suez Canal prior to the war of October 1973. In this respect, it is worth noting that, according to our reliable information, this is being done through the generous assistance of Zionist Israel to the *apartheid* régime, in their concerted efforts to enhance, promote

and consolidate the so-called medium-power State theory planned during Vorster's visit to Tel Aviv.

219. The recent military incursions into the African independent States of Zambia and Angola that took place just a few days after the Israeli raid on Entebbe airport should be seen in this light. It is unfortunate that just today I saw this newspaper—*The Star* of Johannesburg of 24 July 1976—which also alludes to the co-operation between South Africa and Israel and mentions that Israel is helping to train South Africans in guerrilla warfare. That is in order to frustrate the activities of those who are justified in fighting for their rights.

220. It is also of great significance to note that the war machinery employed to commit all the aforementioned acts of terrorism, aggression and international gangsterism has been supplied to South Africa by some members of the Council. The Alouette and Puma helicopters used in the *blitzkrieg* attacks on Zambian and Angolan villages are supplied by France and the United Kingdom respectively. The Buccaneer bombers, the Mirage jet-fighters and the Impalas that daily sow death and destruction among the African people of Zambia, Angola and Namibia have been procured directly, or through licences to build, from the United Kingdom, France and Italy respectively.

221. The régime of South Africa is even now dripping with the innocent blood of Soweto, of Angola and of Namibia and it has degenerated into a psychopathic merchant of death and destruction that will not rest in peace unless it has spilled the blood of the African people. It has become a murder maniac. That is why the régime has enacted that most aggressive legal instrument defining South Africa as the whole of Africa south of the Sahara. Of course, Mr. Vorster himself is a Nazi; he was gaoled for that reason during the Second World War.

222. It is therefore inconceivable and disturbing beyond all reason that the United Kingdom, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and other Western countries should continue to arm South Africa and, worse still, to promote its nuclear technology. One has no alternative but to conclude that any country which flirts with the racist régime of South Africa is an accomplice to all its dastardly acts of terror, murder and aggression. Our humble submission here to them is that they should stop this dangerous attitude towards South Africa.

223. In conclusion, my delegation strongly urges the Council to condemn in the strongest possible terms the wanton acts of aggression against Zambia and other neighbouring countries by the racist South African régime. The Council must condemn again the use of Namibia as a springboard for attacks on independent African States and demand that the Fascist forces immediately leave the Territory of Namibia. Racist South Africa must also be condemned for the

wanton killing of Namibians at home and abroad. Finally, the Council must decide to remove the cancer by the application of relevant provisions under Chapter VII of the Charter.

224. The PRESIDENT: The Council has taken note of the statement made by Mr. Emvula and the personal contribution he wished to make to our deliberations.

225. Mr. LAI Ya-li (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): First of all, allow me to express our warm welcome to Mr. S. G. Mwale, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Zambia, and Mr. Ibrahim Kaduma, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Republic of Tanzania, who are participating in the Security Council meeting personally. In his statement yesterday Mr. Mwale produced an abundance of irrefutable facts to expose and condemn the South African authorities' aggression against Zambia. The Security Council should give serious consideration to his statement.

226. On 11 July, the South African troops, supported by its air force, flagrantly raided and bombed Sialola village in the border area of Zambia, causing heavy losses of lives and property to the Zambian people. Prior to this, the South African authorities had carried out unprovoked attacks on Zambian border areas on more than a dozen occasions in succession. This series of aggressive acts are grave new crimes committed by the Vorster racist régime against the Zambian people and constitute a gross violation of Zambia's State sovereignty and territorial integrity and aggression against Zambia. They are a breach of international peace and security and wanton provocations against the entire African people. The Chinese Government and people express indignation at these acts of aggression committed by the South African racist régime and strongly condemn them.

227. The current aggression committed by the South African racist authorities against Zambia is another revelation of their reactionary nature and a manifestation of their last-ditch struggle. In recent years the national liberation struggle of the people of southern Africa against imperialism, colonialism, racism and hegemonism has been steadily developing in depth, landing the South African Vorster racist régime and its like in unprecedented isolation.

228. To maintain its tottering rule, the South African racist régime is actively employing the counter-revolutionary dual tactics with the abetment and support of the super-Powers. While advertising "racial reconciliation" at home and talking profusely about "dialogue and talks" abroad, it has greatly intensified its barbarous suppression of the South African people and its collusion with the Southern Rhodesian racist régime and kept making military provocations against its neighbouring independent African countries in an attempt to put out the revolutionary flames of the

Azanian people and obstruct the African States from giving support to the just struggle of the Azanian people. On 16 June, the South African authorities created single-handedly the shocking tragic incident of Soweto. Subsequently, they made unprovoked armed attacks on Zambia's border area; a few days ago they again murdered in cold blood unarmed black students in Witbank, in South Africa. To date, it is still forcibly occupying Namibia and even using it as a base for military aggression against neighbouring independent African countries. These heinous crimes and perverse acts of the South African racist régime have totally shown up its counter-revolutionary dual tactics and its hostility towards the broad masses of the African people. This can only arouse the Azanian people to even more tenacious struggles. As pointed out in resolution CM/Res.476 (XXVII) adopted at the twenty-seventh session of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity held recently in Mauritius, "the only effective guarantee for the African people of South Africa against the repetition of massacres is the launching of armed struggle for the seizure of power by the people". With the wide support of the entire African people who are fighting in unity, the development of the armed struggle of the people of southern Africa will certainly hasten the doom of the South African racist régime.

229. Under the leadership of President Kaunda, the Zambian Government and people firmly support the just struggle of the people of southern Africa for national liberation, firmly support the just struggle of the third-world countries and people against imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism and have made important contributions in this respect.

230. To defend their State sovereignty and territorial integrity and render support and assistance to the people of southern Africa in their liberation cause, the Zambian Government and people have carried out unremitting struggles against the provocations by the

South African racist régime and the pressure by hegemonism. We express our admiration for all this. The Chinese delegation firmly supports the just demand put forward by the Foreign Minister of Zambia for a strong condemnation of the aggression by South Africa, and we hold that accordingly the Security Council should adopt a resolution strongly condemning the South African racist régime for its atrocities of aggression against Zambia and demanding the non-recurrence of such gangsterism, and should adopt other necessary corresponding measures in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

231. According to a report from the Hsinhua News agency, a strong earthquake occurred in the Tangshan-Fengnan area in eastern Hopei province, China, on 28 July. Comparatively strong shocks were felt in Tientsin and Peking. At present, the Chinese Government has taken emergency measures to lead the masses in speedily fighting against the effects of the quake and taking precautions against possible future shocks. The broad masses of the people in the stricken area have been organized in a united fight to overcome the effects of the earthquake with confidence. In their speeches at today's meeting, the President of the Security Council and many representatives have extended sympathy to us. In the name of the Chinese delegation, I wish to express sincere thanks for their cordial sentiments, and I will convey their sentiments to the Chinese Government and people.

*The meeting rose at 7 p.m.*

*Notes*

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

<sup>2</sup> *See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Annexes, agenda item 3, document A/9779.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid., Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes, agenda item 106, document A/7754.*