

UNITED NATIONS

8060/10



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FIRST YEAR

UN LIBRARY

JUL 16 1985

1948th

UN/SA COLLECTION

MEETING: 30 JULY 1976

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1948)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
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

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.

1948th MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 30 July 1976, at 3.30 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/1948)

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 5.10 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 decisions taken at previous meetings [1944th to 1947th meetings] I shall now, with the consent of the Council, invite the representatives of Zambia, South Africa, Botswana, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guinea, Liberia, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mozambique, Qatar, Sierra Leone, Uganda, Yugoslavia and Zaire 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 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), Mr. Mogami (Botswana), Mr. Acosta (Cuba), Mr. Ahmed (Egypt), Mr. Ibrahim (Ethiopia), Mr. Doukouré (Guinea), Mrs. Brooks-Randolph (Liberia), Mr. Rasolondraibe (Madagascar), Mr. El Hassen (Mauritania), Mr. Chissano (Mozambique), Mr. Al-Obaidly (Qatar), Mr. Blyden (Sierra Leone), Mr. Mwangaguhunga (Uganda), Mr. Mujezinović (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Umba di Lutete (Zaire), took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: In addition, I have received a note verbale from the Permanent Mission of Mauritius requesting that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mauritius, Sir Harold Walter, be invited to participate in the debate in his capacity as current Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). I therefore propose that the Council agree, in accordance with the usual practice, to invite him to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote.

At the invitation of the President, Sir Harold Walter (current Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity), took a place at the Security Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT: The Council will continue its consideration of the question before it.

5. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): Mr. President, may I start by extending to you my congratulations and those of my delegation on your nearing the end of your month as President of the Security Council.

6. On a more serious note, however, may I, before I turn to the item on our agenda, join other delegations in extending our deepest sympathy to those who have suffered in the terrible earthquakes at Tangshan in China, and I would ask the Chinese delegation and people to accept our condolences.

7. On a happier note, I want to welcome to our midst the Foreign Ministers of Zambia, the United Republic of Tanzania, Mozambique and Mauritius. They represent countries which are deeply involved in the unfolding pattern of events in southern Africa, and we all know how heavy is the responsibility which

they carry. My own Government has worked closely with theirs and with the Government of Botswana in an effort to resolve the problems which still confront us all in Southern Rhodesia and in Namibia. I wish to assure the Foreign Ministers that we shall continue to do so. I believe that our objectives are the same, namely, self-determination and majority rule as soon as possible.

8. On this occasion, however, I do not want to dwell at length on the problems of Southern Rhodesia or of Namibia, which lie somewhat outside the main thrust of our debate. In any event, we shall have a chance to discuss the situation in Namibia in depth in the near future. I shall only make two general points. First, my Government considers that South Africa is in unlawful occupation of Namibia, and that the Territory cannot and must not be used as a base for any attacks on neighbouring African countries. Secondly, we continue to believe that a peaceful solution is possible, and by that I mean the negotiation of a genuine independence for the Territory. We do not believe that war or, indeed, increased guerrilla activity, is either inevitable or desirable. We do believe that independence may not be too far away and that now is the time to attempt to reconcile the various currents of Namibian opinion.

9. The Foreign Minister of Zambia in his address to the Council talked about the need to establish in southern Africa "a just order and the respect for human dignity" [1944th meeting, para. 17]. This is surely the heart of the problem. The Government of Zambia is uniquely qualified to make this appeal to us. We all admire President Kaunda's total commitment to the cause of multiracialism which, if I may say so, has stood out like a beacon in the otherwise sad story of much of southern Africa. For many years Zambia has shown great restraint in a hideously difficult situation. We all know how exposed Zambia is geographically to economic pressures and how great its sacrifices have been. Zambia has suffered more than most countries from the application of economic sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. It deserves the full and the continuing support of the world community. I am glad that my own country, in conjunction and together with the European Community, has been able to assist it in some degree.

10. We are considering here a complaint by Zambia against South Africa. The Foreign Minister of Zambia gave us disturbing details of the raid on Sialola and of earlier incidents this year. The representative of South Africa [1944th meeting] told us that his Government had no knowledge of the raid and had not authorized it. But whether it was authorized or not, we are satisfied that such an attack took place. We therefore associate ourselves with those who have condemned South Africa's action and we deeply regret the loss of life and the violation of Zambian territory. We urge all concerned to ensure that these incidents are not repeated. This is a crucial stage in the history

of southern Africa. I agree entirely with the representative of South Africa when he said that peaceful solutions are still possible. They will however require great statesmanship on South Africa's part, and a readiness by that country to accept what for it was once quite unacceptable. Such solutions will also require, I must add, a like degree of restraint, statesmanship and flexibility on the part of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). But the more incidents there are such as the one at Sialola—whoever is responsible for them and for whatever reasons they occur—the greater will be the obstacles in the way of negotiation and the attainment of a just settlement.

11. Mr. HAMMARSKJÖLD (Sweden): May I be permitted first to associate my delegation most sincerely with those speakers who have expressed their sympathy to the representative of China for the severe natural disaster which has struck his country.

12. I should also like to join those speakers who have acknowledged the presence here of the Foreign Ministers of Zambia, the United Republic of Tanzania, Mozambique and Mauritius—a presence which still further underlines the importance of our proceedings.

13. The Security Council has already gathered no less than four times this year to take a position on South Africa's racist and aggressive policies. In January, the Council expressed its condemnation of South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia [resolution 385 (1976)]. In March, the Council dealt with South Africa's open aggression against the People's Republic of Angola, and it condemned that aggression [resolution 387 (1976)]. In June, after large-scale killings of African people, including school children and students demonstrating against racial discrimination in South Africa, the Council strongly condemned the South African Government for its resort to massive violence [resolution 392 (1976)]. Now the Council is meeting at the request of the Republic of Zambia concerning recent repeated South African violations of Zambia's territory, which culminated in an incursion on 11 July, causing the death of 24 people. These different events have one thing in common: their origins can be found in the inhuman *apartheid* policy of the Pretoria Government.

14. Turning to the item before us today, the Zambian complaint concerning South African incursions into its territory, we note that as early as in 1971 the Council, in resolution 300 (1971), called upon South Africa to respect fully the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Zambia and declared further that if South Africa renewed its violations of Zambian territory, the Council would meet again. As is clear from the report we heard some days ago by the Zambian Foreign Minister, Mr. Mwale [1944th meeting], South Africa has not complied with that call from the Council.

15. Mr. Mwale reported not only one but a long series of violations during this year by South African

military forces. By far the gravest of these incursions took place on 11 July in a SWAPO transit camp, 30 kilometres into Zambian territory. As of now, 24 people have been reported dead, and 45 injured.

16. The Swedish Government strongly condemns South Africa's renewed violation of the territory of Zambia, an independent and sovereign State and a Member of the United Nations. My delegation can therefore give its full support to the draft resolution [S/12/58] just presented to us. It contains a strong and unambiguous condemnation of South Africa's armed attack against Zambia.

17. Over the years my Government has, both in the United Nations and in other forums, clearly expressed its rejection of the unacceptable *apartheid* policy of the South African Government. On numerous occasions it has also condemned South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, and has given political as well as material support to SWAPO, which is leading the liberation movement in Namibia. My delegation expressed its views on the matter in the debate in January on the Namibia question, and we intend to do likewise in the forthcoming debate on the same subject.

18. My delegation would take great satisfaction in seeing a unanimous condemnation by the Council of South Africa's armed attack against Zambia. We have always been of the opinion that sustained international pressure against the internal as well as the external policies of the South African Government is of vital importance to bring about the necessary changes. A unanimous vote by the Council would be a forceful reminder to the Pretoria Government of the reaction of the world community on South African policies.

19. Mr. ABE (Japan): May I first of all express our deep grief and sorrow on the terrible calamity which recently struck the country of our Chinese friends in the area of Tangshan in northern China. In the name of the Japanese delegation, I should like to extend our profound condolences and great sympathy to the delegation of the People's Republic of China.

20. This time the Security Council is seized of a complaint by Zambia against South Africa. The presence in the present series of meetings of the Council of the four distinguished Foreign Ministers—namely, the Foreign Ministers of Zambia, the United Republic of Tanzania, Mozambique and Mauritius—to whom my delegation extends its whole-hearted welcome, shows how deeply the African countries feel about the case now before us.

21. The basic approach of my country as a member of the Council to the issues brought before it is to consider those issues with objectivity and fairness, and in particular to show the maximum comprehension of the positions of the various parties involved. I feel that such an approach is a correct one for the Council itself.

22. I admit that it is easier to speak than to act; I admit that it is sometimes very difficult for the Council to maintain such an approach when members have the feeling that the interests of their countries are involved in the issues. Sometimes—and unfortunately very often these days—their feelings become aroused to such an extent that, though not involved directly in those issues, they sometimes behave more like royalists than the king himself. Such a phenomenon is, in my view, harmful to the work of the Council.

23. We also know only too well that there have been a number of cases on which the Council was unable to take effective action. What I should like to emphasize here is the approach with which the Council has tried to discharge its duties, rather than the seeming success or failure with which it has had to terminate its consideration. I say this because, if the Council takes up the approach that I have recommended—namely, that of objectivity, fairness and comprehension—it is most likely that today's failure will become tomorrow's success. This is at least the basic approach of my delegation in the present debate.

24. The complaint by Zambia was lucidly and amply explained by Mr. Siteke Mwale, the Foreign Minister of Zambia, a few days ago in the Council [1944th meeting]. According to him, on 11 July 1976, a South African military aircraft, flying from the south-east to the north-west, hovered over and dropped armed men in Sialola, 30 kilometres inside Zambian territory, who, in turn, attacked the transit camp of SWAPO and planted land-mines around the camp. This armed attack resulted in 24 people dead and 45 others injured.

25. In reply to the complaint by Zambia, the representative of South Africa [*ibid.*] stated that the South African Government had no knowledge of an attack on a village at Sialola on 11 July, and that it had at no time authorized attacks on Zambian villages. Naturally, we around this table of the Security Council were not witnesses to the incident and we have no evidence that the particular statement by the representative of South Africa is contrary to the facts. None of us was there on the spot at the time when the incident occurred. But simply because of this, should we take the statement by the South African representative as conveying the truth?

26. The Japanese delegation has been left with the impression that the statement by the representative of South Africa was very unresponsive to the complaint and that it has failed to give a clear picture indicating that South Africa was not involved in the incident.

27. Furthermore, if it is true that the South African Government had no knowledge of the incident Zambia has complained about, we may wonder if the South Africans had any knowledge, either, of a similar case that happened shortly before or after 11 July; because, from what we have heard from both Zambian and South African sources, there seems to have occurred

a number of border violations on different dates even since the beginning of the year. If the South African Government never authorized such acts, can we assume that such acts were conducted without the authorization of the South African Government?

28. If the South African Government intended to deny that any armed incursion by South Africa did take place, its representative should have stated so and provided us with detailed facts supporting this —by, for example, explaining the movements of the South African army during that period, as was mentioned by the representative of Liberia two days ago [1945th meeting].

29. As a matter of fact, the representative of South Africa admitted in his statement that a number of incidents have happened on both sides of the frontier. If the South African Government never attempted or authorized armed incursions into Zambia, did the representative of South Africa mean to say that all these incidents were incursions from the Zambian side towards the South African side? With all due efforts on our part to understand the situation as it actually occurred, we are left with certain important points unanswered.

30. Therefore, my delegation could not help concluding that things must have happened as Zambia has complained, contrary to the statement made by the representative of South Africa. Then there should be no doubt that the armed attacks by South Africa constitute a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Zambia, and the United Nations cannot but condemn this. The South Africans must be called upon to desist henceforth from all similar acts and from the use of the international Territory of Namibia as a base for launching armed attacks against Zambia.

31. In this connexion, it would be particularly relevant to point out that the principal cause of such situations is deeply rooted in South Africa's *apartheid* policies, which are universally held in contempt by the international community, and also in South Africa's illegal holding of Namibia.

32. Therefore, my delegation strongly urges South Africa seriously to reflect on the international situation surrounding the country, to desist from its entirely erroneous political measures, and to seek a solution through which all people in Africa can enjoy fundamental human rights and come to live together in peace, harmony and prosperity.

33. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mauritius, the current Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity, Sir Harold Walter.

34. Sir Harold WALTER (Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity):

Mr. President, I would like to thank you, and through you the members of the Security Council, for having given me the opportunity of supporting the just and unchallengeable cause of Zambia, my sister State of the Organization of African Unity, in my capacity as Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity. I have chosen the French language as my vehicle of expression today to emphasize the French concept of the universality of man and its connotation of *le plein épanouissement de l'homme*. The last time I addressed you, Mr. President, I commiserated with you. Today it is with pride and pleasure that I congratulate you on the skilful and masterly way in which you have conducted the debate during the few days that I have had the privilege of watching you. I will sum it up: an iron hand in a velvet glove.

(The speaker continued in French.)

35. First of all, I should like to take this opportunity to address my condolences to the Government and the people of the People's Republic of China in the time of trial through which they are passing.

36. I should also like to transmit my condolences and my sympathy to the President and people of the Republic of Madagascar because of the misfortune that has cruelly attacked them.

37. This is an age of tribulation. I return here, following my statement before the Security Council the other day [1943rd meeting], in the hope that, in spite of everything, it will bring about some understanding among States. This is an age of tribulation for the continent of Africa, where we see wars breaking out as if they were natural occurrences and where we see hatred and violence wreaking their destruction. It is an age of tribulation, where pompous meetings discuss the limited or unlimited use of thermo-nuclear forces in the next war.

38. The nations protest, OAU meets in an effort to bring back reason. But the major interests, or what are called thus, are indifferent to protestations. *Quousque tandem, Catilina?*

39. Nothing is more tragic than to listen objectively to the history of the recent events between South Africa and Zambia when those events arouse half-extinguished passions. The sources are abundant, perhaps too abundant, and there is a host of witnesses.

40. We have a series of accounts, mainly of dramas now taking place between two countries, when one of those countries should understand the other and show a spirit of good-neighbourliness. Yet, unfortunately, one finds nothing better to do than to attack the other: it is still a case of the stronger against the weaker. So beware of a just reversal of roles. He who lives by the sword shall die by the sword.

41. In this exalted tribunal composed of members of the world community, the sacred custodians of peace, the aggressor's claim that it is defending its so-called civilization has already been used enough in trying to justify its blindest crimes. It forgets that it is thus laying bare the evil deeds perpetrated in the name of an already disfigured and outdated ideal.

42. Of course, many of you still remember Sharpeville. It is now only the morrow of Soweto, of Sialola, and what is going to happen now? Thirteen other attacks have taken place since January 1976. The remainder is better left untold, for history to record in its black pages. And now this aggression the Council is considering. What a shameful and degrading catalogue of oppression, repression and crime! An exalting spectacle, indeed! And this is what the Fascist South African régime calls peaceful dialogue. That is the point we have reached. To oppose with unjust violence a peaceful people which asks only to live and build a nation, that is the watchword of *apartheid*, which calls upon God, Joan of Arc and patriotism to help it.

43. All South Africa's neighbours—Namibia, Angola, Zambia—are under the yoke of this hideous monster and are constantly threatened by it. There has not been a word of pity for the victims imprisoned without trial, not even a call to order to the killers and assassins. That is what is described as the "defence of civilization" in the twentieth century.

44. May I admit that, as a witness to all these horrors perpetrated in the name of freedom, and as a Christian, I was doubly horrified. First, I was overcome with shame for our human race and secondly, with anxiety and concern for our black peoples. All I can do is console myself with the certainty that it is not *apartheid* which is right. But it is to you, members of the Council, that all the peoples of Africa are appealing and it is from this pulpit that we wish to demonstrate clearly to the eyes and ears of the world what justice should be and what human dignity should be.

45. Noting this state of affairs with repugnance, I can categorically state that South Africa is tragically mistaken and is acting out of step with the age in which it is living. Nor are we completely free of this confusion and this inversion of historical chronology. Each one of you members of the Council should, as of now, shoulder his responsibilities.

46. It is true, however incredible it might seem, that the Vorster régime is reactivating the myth of omnipotence. It is also true that South Africa is capable of reducing the whole of black Africa to ashes with its arsenal of murderous weaponry and its nuclear-weapon potential. Let our mother country awaken and close her ranks. But will South Africa be able to bend the will of a people of such determination as the African people? That people has come out of

oblivion; it wishes to make its voice heard and its voice will be heard. While others have taken centuries to create united states—be they of America, of Russia or of Europe—in a few years you will have to deal with a United States of Africa, the foundations of which are being laid today.

47. Whatever the outcome may have been in Viet Nam and in other conflicts of the same kind, there is a twofold lesson to be learnt: on the one hand, there is the risk of a war of national liberation whenever the great Powers make no commitments; and, on the other hand, the aggressor suffers an immeasurable loss of prestige and moral authority, far more than it does of men or money.

48. True, South Africa does have the material resources to keep under arms a body of a half-million men, if it so wishes, without imposing privation upon its population and without even slowing down the progress of its economy. This tragic war bears witness to the country's enormous resources. It also reveals the threat posed to the unity of a nation which calls itself democratic by the bad conscience of some of its people and the barbarity of that country's conception of humanity.

49. It is difficult for us to know just how far racial tension can be aggravated. In the last few years, South Africa has not only acquired the conventional weapons it needed but has also now a nuclear potential, and military equipment suitable for other forms of conflict. Total war, using nuclear bombs or conventional weapons, between adversaries who are unequally matched would be catastrophic for all and we could then fear that the apocalyptic predictions we have heard might one day come true.

50. That is a serious situation. Even the mourning, ruin, tears, bloodshed, torn flesh and millions of deaths caused by seismic movements have not exceeded the horrors caused by the evils of *apartheid*. On the Zambian frontier there are human beings—or persons in the guise of human beings—who deliberately choose as their victims innocent men and children. With an insolent and cowardly "courage" they are throwing human life into the balance against the achievement of their ambitions.

51. Certainly, there exist—to the same of the human species—colonialist countries, and how powerful and voracious they are. Indeed, in their international policy, their finest words are only inflated lies that grossly camouflage the appetite of these great carnivores. One wonders why they exist. No one believes them anymore, and everyone sees clearly shining, behind the flags they brandish, the rows of pointed teeth of jackals.

52. Yet the word "coexistence" exists, and South Africa—which calls itself developed and civilized—does not have that word in its vocabulary: the

coexistence of two Powers or two groups which can agree that the existence of one does not require the disappearance of the other. If peaceful coexistence is to last, there must be a balance in the arguments that impose mutual respect and the safeguarding of national sovereignty. Unfortunately, that philosophy is held only by truly civilized nations, not by a barbarous nation that is conditioned by *apartheid*.

53. Unfortunately too, thanks to its military superiority, South Africa benefits from a freedom of strategic action that neighbouring regions do not have. But that is nothing new. After all, thanks to the co-operation of the racist nations, thanks to the passivity of the great Powers, the Vorster régime is able to indulge itself to the full in its machiavellian leanings.

54. We, the peoples of the world who wish prosperity for posterity, have the duty to ensure respect for the rights of the oppressed against the aggressors, whoever they are and from wherever they come. The human being is the son of God, and therefore we are all equal.

55. South Africa has no right to attack Zambia. That is the first principle of good behaviour between contiguous nations. Nor has South Africa even the right to maintain its presence in Namibia. The United Nations, as everyone here knows, has ruled against this type of serfdom over peoples exercised by a suzerain. The feudal era is gone. Would anyone wish to see it re-established in the twentieth century? The hands of the clock cannot be turned back. History is irreversible.

56. If all economic solidarity—above all trading in arms—and even all moral solidarity are not refused in a struggle waged against the maintenance of a colonial régime, where, then, is human justice? Where are the principles that we have been asked and are still being asked to heed? No one can easily avoid that kind of logic, which creates a deep malaise or even deep pain. But if a sense of common interest does not suffice to convince States to co-ordinate their action, is not an act of faith needed to imagine the swing of national independence to universality? The ineluctable choice is in our hands—between tragedy and universal killing, on the one hand, and peace and prosperity for all, on the other. It is to ensure the triumph of one of these frauds of *apartheid* that bombs are raining on Zambia.

57. All of us here have the duty to demand respect for the sovereignty and independence of the Namibian people and forcefully to call for the withdrawal of South African troops from the territories of others—in the present case, Namibia.

58. In order to improve—as it thinks—its position, South Africa has gone so low as to try to capture the neighbouring regions. That, it must be admitted, is an initiative combining piracy and hooliganism. It

has dishonoured and discredited the liberation movement. Internationally, it is playing a card that is steeped in fresh blood. It is giving the entire world the horrible impression that all the jackals of the world can come and eat their children and, in addition, they will be given a piece of sugar. What ignoble cowardice. The success of this kind of person says a great deal about the spiritual vacuum of our age.

59. The word “Country” is one of the most majestic words spelled with a capital letter. It is a divinity protected by lightning like the Ark of the Hebrews. Whoever dares to violate it is committing a sacrilege against it and the security of those whose task is the maintenance of social order. It is the heritage of a nation. Would you wish to give a helping hand to such an invader of what is most sacred to a people?

60. We have a heavy responsibility—you have a heavy responsibility—as regards the fate of Africa. Law and morality are perforce interlinked. A positive law in force must necessarily be based on moral values which more or less define good and evil, justice and injustice, what is permitted and what is prohibited. The facts are there, and you have taken note of them. Therefore, draw your own conclusions.

61. In the life of nations, and more particularly in the stormy moments in the life of nations, when those nations feel the need for liberty, the citizens keenly sense the importance of that law which is inscribed in the Declaration of Human Rights and which is most precious; for when the time of trial comes, all others will depend on it. Let us fight for law and human dignity, for the safeguarding of independence and the respect for national sovereignty. Thus, like judges, condemn this inhuman and barbarous act unreservedly and unconditionally. May the draft resolution now before you unreservedly and unconditionally receive unanimous support. May this meeting bring us closer to the spirit of understanding, closer to the ideal of brotherhood, closer to the blessing of peace.

62. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mauritius for the kind words he addressed to me. I must say that I was very touched by his use again of Latin sayings and maxims, only a few weeks after the preceding debate in the Council, which cannot but warm the heart of a Roman.

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

64. Mr. DOUKOURÉ (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, exactly 18 [1940th meeting] days ago the delegation of Guinea expressed to you from this same place and in this same room the feelings of sincere friendship which unite Italy, your country, and Guinea and paid a sincere tribute to your qualities as an experienced diplomat called upon to assume the

presidency of the Security Council. We now find ourselves confronted with similarly dramatic circumstances for Africa, since the racist Pretoria régime has effectively dug its claws into the sister Republic of Zambia.

65. Before coming to the heart of the matter, my delegation wishes to discharge a brotherly duty *vis-à-vis* the delegation, Government and people of Madagascar. We have just learned with sorrow and consternation of the sad loss suffered by the Malagasy people. It is with sorrow and consternation that we learned of the demise of our brother Joel Rakotomalala, the Prime Minister of Madagascar, who died in a helicopter accident. Colonel Rakotomalala, whose death occurred today in the region of Dsanganan Ganeve, about 100 kilometers south of Tananarive, will remain for us the example of a conscientious and dedicated worker committed to the service of the Malagasy socialist revolution and of militant Africa.

66. May we request that our heartfelt condolences be conveyed to his family and to the brotherly people of Madagascar. May we also express our feelings of solidarity with the Chinese people, whose country was struck by a violent earthquake.

67. Allow me also to thank the representative of Zaire for his statement of 28 July [1945th meeting], which recalled the warning issued by Guinea in the Council, when we declared, quoting Mr. Jim Hoagland:

“To Afrikaners, the parallels are as obvious as they are embarrassing to the Israelis. They and the Israelis are essentially white, Europeanized peoples who have carved their own nations out of land inhabited by hostile, non-European majorities that would destroy the two nations if Afrikaners and the Israelis listened to the United Nations and depended on world opinion. Their religions are similar, each being a ‘chosen people’...

“C. L. Sulzburger, the astute foreign affairs columnist for *The New York Times*, reported in 1971 from Johannesburg that the Israeli 1967 tactics are given major attention in South Africa’s military manoeuvre schools.” [1940th meeting, para. 41.]

Later on we said:

“May we not wonder whether a secret South African mission was not to learn, in this new school of 4 July 1976, the art of invading Luanda, Maputo, Conakry or—tomorrow perhaps—Algiers?” [*Ibid.*, para. 42.]

68. There is a saying that an alert man is worth two men. We may well wonder what is in store for the Council, alerted two weeks before the opening of the debate on the aggression by South Africa against Zambia.

69. Out of love one might spare a pet animal suffering from rabies, so long as it does not represent a threat to the safety of the neighbours. You can all see that South Africa is a pathological case, for there is no lack of symptoms of neurosis. Mr. Botha, the representative of the Republic of South Africa, declared:

“At the outset I wish to state that the South African Government had no knowledge of an attack on a Zambian village at Sialola” [1944th meeting, para. 48].

Either South Africa committed this aggression while it was asleep—which would amount to sleep-walking—or the massacre at Sialola was perpetrated unconsciously.

70. Allow me to give my diagnosis, poor psychiatrist that I am, and to conclude that sleepwalking and the unconscious state are expressions of mental pathology—in other words, madness. To put in the hands of such a madman any weapon, whether it be a pen-knife, a pistol or a machine-gun, a Mirage aircraft or a nuclear reactor, is to show the scant regard in which the neighbours of such a madman are held.

71. The Guinean delegation ventures to believe that those who arm South Africa are aware of their acts and understand this. Let them not reproach us for wishing to kill with a stick, if necessary, the rabid beast they have in full awareness let loose in the crowd.

72. The Africa of today has had enough of the ignominious practice of *apartheid*. The imperialist press can be very loquacious when, in a few days, it manages to publish a book entitled *90 Minutes at Entebbe*. It is quite ready to cry scandal when Africa refuses to pin Olympic medals on to the shackles of slavery which bite into its neck and wrists. It is silent about the Soweto massacres; it is silent when Africa unmasks the schemes plotted by imperialism against the sovereignty of our States. It is loquacious when, in Dublin, the Ambassador of the United Kingdom suffers a regrettable accident. But it is silent about the murders at Sialola; silent about the South African attacks against Mozambique, Angola and Zambia; silent when, before the Security Council, Africa reveals the underlying reasons for the barbarous acts of piracy perpetrated against us.

73. The position of the revolutionary people of Guinea is clear. The Supreme Leader of our Revolution Comrade Ahmed Sékou Touré, explained it recently in Conakry, when he stated the following, published in the *Horoya*, No. 2228:

“In South Africa, the imperialist offensive progresses from escalation to escalation. Thus those who still speak of dialogue can see spread before them the dialogue begun in South Africa. Vorster, their friend, is in the process of massacring thousands and thousands of our brothers and sisters in South

Africa. We say 'No' to such a policy of resignation and indignity.

"Africa has suffered too much; it has been humiliated too much, and has been exploited too long. It is now our duty to defend ourselves. Thousands of Africans have died under torture. Those of us who are alive embody and express their hatred of *apartheid*, imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism. The crime committed is so heinous that even the imperialist Powers raise their voices in condemnation of the attitude of South Africa, their bridgehead in Africa. The newspapers, radio and television in the United States of America, in France, in the United Kingdom, in West Germany, and in all the Western countries are crying out against *apartheid*. This is at the very time when unworthy, corrupt, anti-African African Governments still support *apartheid* against Africa. Thus Africa must defend itself, and we must be among those who invite the African States to assume their responsibilities by defending the cause of justice and freedom in South Africa against the partisans of *apartheid*. Paradoxically, only *apartheid* is spoken about! It is like speaking of the smoke without mentioning the fire. Or speaking of the shadow, but not of the object casting that shadow. The determining cause here is colonial domination. That is the real cause of the racial discrimination of which our brothers in South Africa are the victims. Africa must intensify its fight, adopt a radical position, be willing to die a little for the sake of safeguarding our dignity. And in that struggle, Europe, America and the other continents cannot all unanimously dissociate themselves from Africa, which is indispensable to them. They must choose between Africa, its freedom and dignity, and the racist minorities and the colonialists in South Africa. If a position is firmly taken by OAU along these lines, there is no doubt that all countries such as the United States, France, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany, as well as the socialist countries, will choose Africa and immediately abandon *apartheid* and its partisans.

"... In southern Africa, we must liberate Namibia and Zimbabwe and bury *apartheid* so that the black majority can exercise legitimate power over its own territory. As will be recalled, it was after the war of 1914 to 1918 that the German colonies were placed under the trusteeship of certain Powers. The League of Nations thus gave South Africa trusteeship over South West Africa—in other words, Namibia. Thus it was that France came to exercise the same trusteeship power over part of Togo and part of Cameroon. Finally, the United Kingdom was given the trusteeship of Tanganyika, part of Cameroon and part of Togo.

"Let us now look at the geopolitical map of Africa: All these countries are now independent, except for Namibia. The United Nations met, and

withdrew South Africa's trusteeship over that Territory. The Security Council pronounced itself in favour of the independence of Namibia. The OAU also met and pronounced itself in favour of the independence of Namibia. All international organizations have already decided along the same lines. But South Africa refuses to respect this will of the peoples. It imposes force and does not heed reason. It does not understand the sense of historic justice. What can we do? We too can use force to put an end to *apartheid*.

"They say that South Africa has the atomic bomb. So what? Africa will still be living long after *apartheid* and its partisans have been buried.

"There will not be two victories, only one: that of the peoples. And all the Powers that know that Africa is determined to take up the challenge and defend its cause will hesitate to support South Africa. And if out of obduracy they were to do so, that would not prevent us from assuming our responsibility with honour and dignity until the final victory of Namibia is won.

"... There is a permanent conspiracy against Africa. We must denounce it, and Africa must defend itself at all times. The countries of America and Europe, whether they be from Western or Eastern Europe, have all declared, and rightly so, that African problems concern first and foremost the peoples and Governments of Africa...

"We have but one solution left: to fight.

"Dignity is not given as a present; it is won; freedom is not offered as a gift; it is won; progress is not given away; it too is won.

"Africa must defend its dignity, and we have but one solution, as we have said before: to fight. Indeed, all continents, with the exception of Africa, have at least one permanent member on the Security Council enjoying the right of veto. Only Africa is missing from the number of permanent members of the Security Council that enjoy the right of veto. The United Kingdom, the United States of America, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and all countries, Catholic or Protestant, respectful of the religious principles of their countries, speak of God. But can they say that there is an American heaven, an English heaven, an African heaven? There is just heaven. There is no discrimination in the eyes of God. The Church makes no distinction; there is no discrimination in Islam as regards either heaven or hell.

"We have long been asking for the abolition of the right of veto, but this we have not achieved. Now it would appear normal for an African State also to be a member of the Security Council. That country would exercise, on behalf of the African continent,

the right of veto in order to protect the higher interests of the African continent.

"We shall then see imperialism in action, because each Power says that it is not imperialistic. It is those that oppose our proposal to grant a permanent seat on the Security Council to an African State that will reveal themselves to the world as imperialist, racist, colonialist, neo-colonialist, and anti-African Powers."

74. A number of representatives and observers would like to help us expose the militant supporters of *apartheid*, the racists, who find such a proposal unthinkable—those who, without realizing it, also practise *apartheid*.

75. Africa is the arena where the fate of the world will one day be played out. The South African State is important. It is natural that the highly developed Western countries that have vast interests in South Africa should be the very ones which guarantee the survival of the racist minorities by providing Pretoria and Salisbury with the military assistance they require.

76. The policy of the United States concerning South Africa, for example, has changed with the different Presidents occupying the White House. In the days of President Kennedy, the United States almost adopted an anti-*apartheid* position. With Mr. Nixon we saw the supply of arms to South Africa.

77. Two journalists, Jack Anderson and Tad Szulc, have revealed the existence of files compiled in 1969 concerning the United States policy in South Africa. According to those files, Mr. Nixon's Administration, in pursuing its option known by the name of "Tar-Baby", called for tolerance of the white régimes of southern Africa. With regard to the construction by the United States of America of the Diego García base for the militarization of the Indian Ocean, there was an open dispute between the Central Intelligence Agency and the State Department, on the one hand, and the Department of Defense and Presidents Nixon and Ford, on the other. For further details we recommend a reading of "Why we are in Johannesburg", of September 1974, from the pen of Mr. Szulc.

78. There is no logical reason to expect that the Western Powers and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) will abandon the idea of militarizing the maritime route round the Cape of Good Hope; hence their sympathy for South Africa requires no demonstration. The provision of nuclear reactors to Pretoria does not exculpate the authors of an action so unfriendly towards Africa. More than 200 major United States companies account for one fifth of all foreign investments in South Africa. Economic interests have blinded many countries, and thus we see the fatal error of choosing Pretoria and *apartheid* over Africa as a whole.

79. The delegation of the Republic of Guinea is not unaware of the designs of those who protect South Africa in deed while condemning it in word. We are not deceived by simple condemnations. South Africa laughs at our resolutions. As proof of this, South Africa has been declared the world champion in the Olympic contest in condemnations for serious violations of the Charter of the United Nations.

80. We have shown how Israel and South Africa are Siamese twins who will only have us wasting the time of the Council because they feel they will go unpunished.

81. We knew that South Africa was going to echo the chant of terrorism against Africa and, in its turn, invade Zambia, Angola and Mozambique.

82. We respect the Council and its members. We respect it so much that we have always accepted resolutions expressing condemnation. Permit us now to be somewhat more demanding in asking the United Nations for the real and immediate liberation of Namibia and the restoration to Africa of all its rights, including its most lawful right, that of opposing those who mock it and trample upon it.

83. If it is true that all nations are equal in the United Nations, if it is true that the use of force for political ends is a violation of the Charter we all should respect, it would seem that Africa is not yet in possession of all the means it should enjoy. Every continent occupies a permanent seat at this table and has at its disposal the weapon called the veto—except Africa. It is time justice was done to us. We have heard the confessions of the wolf turned shepherd.

84. During the debate on the Israeli aggression against Uganda, we were edified by the way in which our problems are treated. The delegation of the Party-State of Guinea took note of the South African statement on the avoidance of war. That war can be avoided if those who have the right of veto decide at once, this very day, to abolish the *apartheid* régime and the rule of the racial minorities in southern Africa. But how many declarations of intent, how many professions of faith have we heard, that were never honoured!

85. South Africa mocks us, it casts scorn on the Council, it flouts the resolutions we adopt. There are more than 50 resolutions which it is violating without a qualm. Thus we should realize that mere condemnation has no effect on South Africa and that it above all will not listen to the United Nations, as we demonstrated on 12 July [1940th meeting].

86. So what is to be done? We must take concrete action, by choosing first of all the total liberation of Africa, thus promoting the exercise by Africans of their inalienable rights. For that purpose, the capitalist Powers, South Africa's natural allies, must imme-

diately discontinue all aid, of any kind, to the South African Republic. The African countries must stop all attempts to engage in a dialogue with the Vorster régime, because we now have flagrant proof of what a dialogue in the Israeli style, or in the style of Pretoria, means. All the developed nations must refrain from recruiting in our States leaders committed to the betrayal of Africa. Finally, the United Nations must intervene in a practical fashion, even militarily, with the liberation movements for the liberation of Namibia. We believe that the Security Council could perform this task not only by taking steps to condemn the Pretoria régime for its aggression against Zambia, but also by taking all the requisite measures to ensure compensation for the damage done by the Fascist soldiery. We believe, above all, that the United Nations will finally clear itself of the insult aimed at it by Zionism and *apartheid*, which have labelled it an ineffectual and useless organization because of its flabbiness, its opportunism and its collusion.

87. The truth of the Entebbe affair has been ignored. Perhaps the South African aggression against Zambia could also be ignored. But everyone knows that "the snake-charmer always ends up being bitten".

88. May I be allowed to express, on behalf of the militant people of Guinea, our firm solidarity with the fraternal people of Zambia. We assure them that our support for the liberation movements will be unflagging.

89. The people of Guinea stand by the statement made by President Kenneth Kaunda at the thirteenth Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity held in Mauritius a few days ago:

"Africa is a dynamic continent. Consequently, when faced with the problems of the war against racism, there must be a determination on our part to win; when we are faced with divisive issues we must seek solutions in unity, which requires self-defence."*

90. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Zambia, on whom I now call.

91. Mr. MWALE (Zambia) As I am speaking for the first time since the sad news of the devastating earthquake in the People's Republic of China, I wish to associate my delegation with the sentiments and condolences expressed by you, Mr. President, and other speakers in connexion with the tragic death of many Chinese nationals and the destruction of property caused by the earthquake. We are all the more saddened because of the deep affection that the people of Zambia feel for the people of China and because of the very close relations existing between China and Zambia. Hardly a fortnight ago, the people of China,

the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia, and indeed their friends and well-wishers around the world, rejoiced together during the handing-over ceremony of the great Uhuru Railroad, Zambia's lifeline to the sea. The railway line is a monumental symbol of the close and brotherly relations between the Chinese, Tanzanian and Zambian peoples. It is therefore with a deep sense of genuine grief that I would like to ask the Chinese delegation to convey to the Chinese Government and people the condolences of my delegation over the national disaster that has struck China.

92. My delegation has also learned with great shock and deep regret of the death of the Prime Minister of Madagascar. We admired him as a wonderful African statesman, whom we shall greatly miss. We offer our deep sympathy and heartfelt condolences to the Government and the people of the Republic of Madagascar, and to the bereaved family.

93. Now that the debate is almost over and the Security Council is about to consider and decide on the draft resolution before it [S/12158], I feel I should make a few comments in order to underline again the importance my Government attaches to this meeting, and to leave no doubt in anybody's mind as to the Zambian position on the aggression committed against us by the racist white minority régime of South Africa.

94. We have listened with great attention to all the statements made in the general debate. We are most grateful to all our friends, members and non-members of the Council, who have given us enthusiastic and unqualified support. We also most sincerely appreciate the role played by our friends, particularly the non-aligned members of the Council, in connexion with the draft resolution now before the Council. This group of countries, led by the very able and articulate representative of Guyana, Mr. Rashleigh Jackson, has done a commendable job in the very difficult negotiations which have taken place over the last few days. Throughout, they have enjoyed our fullest confidence. We owe them a debt of gratitude.

95. We hope that the draft resolution now before the Council, sponsored by the friendly delegations of Benin, Guyana, the Libyan Arab Republic, Pakistan, Panama, Romania and the United Republic of Tanzania, will commend itself to unanimous adoption. I must say very frankly that it is a draft resolution which represents the minimum which we in Zambia are prepared to accept. We accept it with great reluctance. We would certainly have preferred a stronger resolution.

96. Our position remains that the overall question of Namibia cannot be divorced from any realistic consideration of the South African act of aggression against Zambia. That act of aggression was a direct consequence of South Africa's continued illegal

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

occupation of Namibia. It was committed using Namibia as a base and, indisputably, for the purpose of perpetuating South Africa's continued illegal occupation of the Territory. Therefore, as far as we in Zambia are concerned, continued South African illegal occupation of Namibia was the basic cause of the aggression, and culmination of the illegal occupation of Namibia would be the only guarantee against similar acts of aggression in the future.

97. Since such acts of aggression against us are bound to recur for as long as South Africa persists in its illegal occupation of Namibia, we feel that the Council has a duty to act against South Africa beyond mere condemnation. If, each time we come to the Council to complain about South African aggression against us, the Council limits its action to condemnation only, I fear the racists in Pretoria might become so saturated with condemnation that in their sick minds condemnation will come to mean commendation. But equally serious will be the fact that the Council—which, because of its special responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations, is the hope for the security of small and weak countries like mine—will surely have failed to be useful.

98. In the light of the foregoing, my delegation would have preferred a categorical and unequivocal undertaking by the Security Council at this meeting that, in the event of repeated aggression by South Africa against Zambia, it will have no alternative but to resort to the application of the full force of Chapter VII of the Charter and punitive action against those white minority racist outlaws. Such a warning is necessary now, so that the clique in Pretoria does not regard our coming to the Council as a mere ritual.

99. Those who argue that the situation in southern Africa does not constitute a serious threat to international peace and security are, I must say in all candour, at the very least not being objective in their assessment. Their recognition of this fact may come too late, for there can be no question that the continued existence of the racist white minority régimes in southern Africa, coupled with their belligerent attitude towards independent Africa, will in no time lead to a racial conflagration the scale and horrors of which have not been experienced anywhere. It is now time for the Security Council to act decisively. Tomorrow may be too late.

100. Let me now make it quite clear that, as far as Zambia is concerned, there can no longer be any question of dealing with South Africa. Together with other front-line States we have done our best to foster peaceful change in southern Africa in accordance with the Lusaka Manifesto¹ and the Dar es Salaam Declaration on southern Africa adopted by the Council of Ministers of OAU in April. I wish to say that we made contact with South Africa specifically with a view to bringing about the independence of Zimbabwe and Namibia and the destruction of *apartheid* in South

Africa itself. These contacts ended at Victoria Falls. They failed because of the intransigence and delaying tactics of the illegal régime of Ian Smith. I am proud, however, to say that we have a clear conscience and are irrevocably committed to supporting armed struggle for the liberation of southern Africa, knowing full well that we have left no stone unturned on the road towards a peaceful solution.

101. During the period in which we attempted peaceful change, South Africa was given ample opportunity to show its good intentions. However, instead of demonstrating good will, South Africa stepped up its acts of aggression against Zambia. These culminated in the wanton murder of the largest number of people killed to date in our territory by South African armed forces. This certainly cannot be testimony of a South African commitment to the peaceful solution of the problems of southern Africa.

102. At this juncture, let me also state categorically that at no time did Zambia exchange notes with the racist régime of South Africa over border incidents and violations, as alleged by the representative of South Africa on 27 July [1944th meeting]. The lack of a Zambian reply to the so-called South African inquiry regarding the aggression of 11 July, which he admits, is itself proof that we have had no dealings with the South African racists. Even at the time of the negotiations for peaceful change, there was no question of Zambia discussing border incidents with South Africa. The racist régime of South Africa naturally took advantage of the occasion to complain about the activities of liberation movements, particularly SWAPO. Our reply at that time was that the best way to prevent the activities of the liberation movement was to remove the basic causes of the conflict. In other words, that majority rule should be granted to Zimbabwe and Namibia and *apartheid* should be destroyed in South Africa itself. To this day, that remains the crux of the matter. Indeed, to this day that remains Zambia's uncompromising stand.

103. Let me fully associate my delegation with the important comments made yesterday by Mr. Jaipal, Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia [1946th meeting], in connexion with the proposal of the representative of Liberia for a Security Council fact-finding mission and the reply of the representative of South Africa contained in document S/12157. The reply from the representative of South Africa states that: "The authorities of the areas concerned have been consulted and have indicated their willingness to co-operate fully." That is an obvious reference to the puppet chiefs of Namibia and South Africa's military establishment in the Territory. It is yet more proof of the intransigence of the South African régime and its determination to maintain its stranglehold on Namibia. That such a shameful communication has been sent to the Security Council at all is in itself an insult to the Council. South Africa has once again demonstrated its lack of seriousness in connexion with

the question of Namibia and its utter contempt for the authority and prestige of the Council.

104. Zambia has nothing to hide, and it has already catalogued all the necessary details pertaining to the incidents that gave rise to this particular complaint against South Africa. It must be emphasized that the area around Sialola and, indeed, the entire length of the border between Zambia and Namibia has been extensively mined by the racist régime of South Africa. Therefore, any fact-finding mission will have to carry out its work at its own risk, as Zambia cannot guarantee the safety and security of the mission's members.

105. Finally, the Council's positive and effective decision will go a long way towards helping Zambia in its difficult role of observing the United Nations resolutions pertaining to the liberation of Namibia and Zimbabwe and to the eradication of *apartheid* in South Africa.

106. Mr. LECOMPT (France) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, at the outset I should like to tell you how pleased we have been to see you leading our work, in this difficult month of July, to such a successful conclusion.

107. I would say also how happy the representative of France was to hear Sir Harold Walter addressing the Council in French and even Latin, languages which he speaks so well.

108. My delegation now has the sad duty of expressing to the representative of the People's Republic of China, my friend and neighbour at this table, the deep sympathy of the Government and people of France at the cruel fate that has befallen the province of eastern Hopei. We know that the Chinese people are courageously facing the serious losses in human life and property caused by the recent earthquakes. We ask the representative of China to transmit to his authorities our condolences and sincerest wishes.

109. Finally, my delegation wishes to express to our colleague from Madagascar its shock at learning this morning of the tragic death of the Prime Minister. France and the French people have too many past and present ties of friendship and solidarity with Madagascar for me not to share most particularly the mourning of the people of Madagascar and to associate myself with the cablegram sent to Tananarive today on behalf of the Council.

110. I turn now to the item before us. The discussion that began on Tuesday last has made it possible for us to hear almost 40 speakers, including several African Foreign Ministers. One of them was the Foreign Minister of Zambia, who clearly and sincerely set forth his country's complaint against South Africa. A Zambian village and a SWAPO camp were bombed

on 11 July last. Many persons were killed or wounded. A violation of Zambia's territorial integrity took place. That evidence and what we have been told about other incursions are the major facts before the Council. They are facts of which we must specifically take account.

111. Of course, I wish to be objective and not to overlook the views expressed by the representative of South Africa [*1944th meeting*], views of which my delegation has taken note. Nevertheless, I must say that for a long time, there had been a danger that the Caprivi Strip and the entire northern border of Namibia would become the scene of serious incidents. It had also been clear for some time that Zambia might be caught up in the dangerous current of political tensions in the region. It was just as clear—alas, it was almost in the very nature of things—that if the situation were not remedied, the Council would again be faced with facts characteristic of the tensions to which I have just referred.

112. And so we come back to the deep reason for our debate: the completely abnormal situation of the people of Namibia. My delegation has frequently set forth its position on this point and will revert to it in detail during the debate to take place in the Council at the end of August. It understands why many representatives wished to state here, in connexion with the deadly raid on Sialola, a truth as undeniable as it is simple: there would not have been any violation of Zambia's sovereignty if Namibia were exercising the true self-determination and independence that, on 23 February last, the nine countries of the European Community urged that Namibia and its people and the people of Rhodesia should exercise.

113. Like the peace-loving and justice-loving African countries, France wishes, in this debate as in others, to express two basic concerns. On the one hand, it cannot but be alarmed at the failure to put into effect in Namibia the necessary process of self-determination through a democratic consultation of its inhabitants, under United Nations control. On the other hand, it must deplore the fact that South Africa is isolating itself so much from the other African countries, and particularly from its neighbours. The wall of injustice separating it from the region of which it should naturally be a part is the main obstacle to the establishment of peaceful relations in southern Africa. In that respect, we are only too well aware of the important role played by the internal tensions created by the indefensible system of *apartheid* in the worsening of the situation. Indeed, hardly a month ago we set forth the political and technical limits that France has established for itself in order to take into account the more and more justified concerns of Africa.

114. In Africa, nothing can be done without the Africans, and above all the Africans. France for its part is entirely convinced of that fact. It hopes that

South Africa will abandon a unilateral policy that is without any future, will listen to the legitimate claims of the men of Africa and will very rapidly take the necessary measures.

115. My delegation expresses its thanks to our non-aligned colleagues for their efforts and their spirit of compromise. We would of course have liked the text submitted to us for decision to contain slightly different formulas—for example, in regard, as I said just now, to the imperative need for the people of Namibia to accede to independence through the exercise of its inalienable right to self-determination. That principle is, it is true, accepted and recognized by our international community as a whole. We shall no doubt revert to it in our forthcoming debates. What we regard as most essential is to be able today to give the Government and people of Zambia evidence of support equal to the confidence evidenced by President Kaunda and Foreign Minister Mwale in deciding to appeal to the Security Council. We understand Zambia; we sympathize with it in its trials; we recognize the legitimacy of its cause. It is in the forefront of all the countries of southern Africa that are suffering from a situation that the Government of Pretoria must remedy by taking without delay the measures demanded by the United Nations, including the Security Council.

116. The PRESIDENT: Since there are no other names inscribed on the list of speakers at this final stage of our debate, I should now like to make a statement in my capacity as representative of ITALY.

117. The item on our agenda, the complaint by Zambia against South Africa, is indeed not new to me personally, for I believe I am the only representative sitting in the Council now who took part also in the debate held in October 1971 at the request of Zambia, for a reason not different from the one that prompted its present complaint. May I say that this circumstance fills me with a feeling more of sadness than of anything else.

118. We have met in fact to consider nothing else than a new act of aggression by South Africa against the Republic of Zambia, an act which took place nearly five years later only because of the continuation of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, a most deplorable situation that should long since have ceased to exist.

119. Indeed, I believe I am recollecting correctly when I say that in October 1971 all of us round this table shared the feeling and the confidence that Namibian independence would come about soon. Unfortunately, those expectations did not materialize—not even half way. It is only too obvious that if South Africa had simply complied with its duties, fulfilling its obligations towards the international Territory of Namibia, the regrettable incident we are dealing with at present would not have occurred.

120. In this connexion, I should like to recall that more recently, in the statement I made in the Council, on 19 June last, I referred to the action that, together with our European partners, we are in fact pursuing. I said then:

“Together with our partners in the European Community, we are engaged in relentless contacts with the Government of Pretoria in order to convey on each occasion, I assure the Council, our... criticism and open dissent.” [1930th meeting, para. 317.]

The debate which then took place was, as is well known, on the subject of the shocking events in Soweto, but I should like to be clear on this point. The essence of the “critical dialogue” that the European countries are conducting with South Africa aims at radical changes not only with regard to *apartheid* but with regard to Namibia and Rhodesia as well.

121. Having said that, I should like to add that we listened with great interest to the various statements made by several participants in this debate and particularly by the representatives of African States. The Council has indeed been honoured by the presence among us of Foreign Ministers—Siteke Mwale of Zambia, Ibrahim Kaduma of the United Republic of Tanzania, Joaquim Chissano of Mozambique and Sir Harold Walter of Mauritius, the current Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity. By their very presence here they have given us vivid evidence of their state of mind, of their apprehension and of their expectations with regard to the abnormal, turbulent situation prevailing in southern Africa, which gives rise to incidents such as the one we are considering. At the same time, they have thus shown in a most significant way how closely and strongly united are all the members of the OAU in firmly upholding some main principles for their brothers still under alien rule, whatever the price they are called upon to pay. I refer, of course, to decolonization and to the right to self-determination, independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity which are all enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

122. As to the statement by the representative of South Africa [1944th meeting], my delegation was no less surprised and puzzled than other delegations by the position taken from the outset by Mr. Botha. According to his opening affirmation the Government of Pretoria knows nothing about the raid which took place on 11 July and certainly had not authorized it. Should we interpret such a disclaimer as implicitly disapproving of that action, we could draw only one logical conclusion, namely, that the attack must have been undertaken by some military units in the Caprivi Strip on their own initiative and without previous consultations with headquarters in Pretoria. If this is the case, while, on the one hand, we feel somewhat uneasy about the free rein which the South African

military forces or some of them seem to enjoy, we could, on the other, take it as an indication or signal from the central Government in Pretoria that it is more alert and aware of the vital issues at stake for the future of its land than—if I may be allowed to use such an expression—its runaway military.

123. On the basis of this assumption, if correct, we might be led also—however slim our hope—to give more credence to the professed intentions of the Vorster Administration to introduce the necessary and long-awaited changes in its overall policy. And we would like in this connexion to believe that priority will be given in these changes to withdrawal from Namibia. However, I am sure I am right in saying that our patience—the patience not only of our African colleagues but of all members of the Council—has long ago run thin. So I am afraid that, in order to keep alive our belief in the good intentions which Mr. Botha expressed to us in the name of his Government—the last time on 27 July—action this time must shortly follow his words.

124. Turning now to the specific item under consideration, I should like to state simply and firmly our condemnation of the act of aggression by South Africa, as denounced by Zambia, which resulted in a high number of victims and amounts to violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a State Member of the United Nations.

125. I wish at the same time to take this opportunity to convey the deep and sincere solidarity of my Government to the Government of Zambia. I further want to express the appreciation of my Government to Mr. Siteke Mwale, Foreign Minister of Zambia, in particular for the well-known policy which his Government has long maintained with regard to the problems of southern Africa. I should like to assure the Government of Zambia of our awareness of the difficulties they face in maintaining their very responsible position, the more so at a time when the message of peace is once again disregarded by its addressee, the Government of South Africa. In these circumstances, we particularly appreciate the fact that the Lusaka Manifesto¹ has been reiterated in the exemplary address delivered to the Council by the Foreign Minister of Zambia [*ibid.*]. May the voice of reason as expressed by the leaders of Zambia prevail. We urge South Africa, as my delegation did in 1969 at the 1815th plenary meeting of the General Assembly, to seize the hand stretched out by the African countries. If I understand well the feelings voiced by the Foreign Minister of the United Republic of Tanzania [1946th meeting] who has also forcefully recalled the Lusaka Manifesto, and by his African colleagues, who have honoured the Council with their presence and their active participation in our deliberations, they fundamentally share this position. In other words, if I read well the writing on the wall, the outstretched hand has not yet been completely withdrawn, in spite of the erosion of the confidence which prevailed for

some time in some main quarters. To seize this last opportunity requires on the part of South Africa the same quality of statesmanship and vision which the whole world recognizes in President Kaunda.

126. This is also the spirit which has inspired the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document S/12158—Benin, Guyana, the Libyan Arab Republic, Pakistan, Panama, Romania and the United Republic of Tanzania. My delegation has greatly appreciated the spirit of understanding and conciliation the sponsors have shown in order to formulate a text which can command the unanimous support of the Council. In the same spirit, the Italian delegation is glad to support that draft resolution, which was so effectively introduced by our colleague, Mr. Jackson.

127. Speaking now as PRESIDENT, since no representative wishes to speak at this stage, and there are no explanations of vote before the vote, I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution which is contained in document S/12158.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: 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.

Against: None.

Abstaining: United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 1 abstention (resolution 393 (1976)).

128. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote.

129. Mr. SCRANTON (United States of America): Mr. President, may I first say to you how grateful we all are for the leadership you have shown in this month of your presidency; we knew that this would be the case. And may I add, to follow up my comments when you took this office, that I think Leonardo, Michelangelo and Galileo would be proud.

130. Secondly, and very seriously, I wish to convey to the representative of the People's Republic of China the deep condolences of my people and our Government for the victims of this hideous earthquake that has beset his country, and I sincerely hope that he will transmit to his Government and to his people our full sympathy. Furthermore, may I say that we have already noted from the reports in the papers and elsewhere the tremendous courage shown by the Chinese people in these very difficult circumstances.

131. Last, but by no means least, we are very appreciative that the distinguished gentleman from Mauri-

tius—another Foreign Minister—has joined us, and we appreciate enormously his being here on this occasion.

132. The United States delegation has followed this debate with particular interest and concern. As members of the Council know, my Government is involved in a most significant and important effort to assist the nations and the peoples of southern Africa to find a solution to the complicated political and human problems of their region. We were therefore deeply alarmed at the announcement by the Government of Zambia of an incursion into its territory on 11 July. We were deeply distressed to hear of the loss of 24 lives and the wounding of 45 other individuals. We were also concerned that the sensitive and delicate process of consultations concerning southern Africa would be materially harmed by this incursion.

133. Let me state first—and forcefully—that my Government condemns this incursion into Zambia; we oppose unequivocally the violation of Zambia's territorial sovereignty and integrity. We deeply deplore the loss of life and the destruction of property. Further, it is important to record that South Africa has no legal right, in our opinion, to continue to administer the Territory of Namibia; it has no legal right to station troops on Namibian soil. Thus it has no basis to complain of incursions into Namibia. If the South African Government was responsible for this raid and utilized the Territory of Namibia as the base for its operation, then South Africa is clearly in violation of international law.

134. In spite of our very strong views on South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, my Government has a comment on the evidence brought forth during this debate to determine responsibility for the raid of 11 July. The Foreign Minister of Zambia has made a very impressive and well-documented presentation of the outrages to which his country has been subjected. No one has denied that the attack on Sialola took place. The representative of South Africa, in reply, has simply said that his Government has no knowledge whatsoever of this event.

135. In such circumstances, we believe that this was a case in which investigation could have produced a more careful and authoritative statement on the part of this body, and we regret that there was no inclination on the part of the members of the Council to authorize such an investigation, which we think could have resulted in strong Security Council action.

136. As a result, several paragraphs of the resolution just adopted contain language which, in our view, is too categorical in the light of the evidence that has so far been made available here. Secondly—and this is very important to us—the resolution has another major shortcoming: there are currently efforts of a serious nature being made to make progress towards

solutions in southern Africa which the Council has long advocated. We believe that it would be appropriate for a resolution which addressed any issue beyond the immediate incident concerned to have welcomed these efforts, and to have encouraged every possible assistance to them.

137. For those reasons, my delegation abstained in the voting.

138. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): We voted in favour of the draft resolution submitted to the Council by Benin, Guyana, the Libyan Arab Republic, Pakistan, Panama, Romania and the United Republic of Tanzania. As in every resolution based on compromise, we see the merits, but even more the shortcomings of this draft resolution.

139. This year, the Security Council has already broken the record for the number of meetings it has held. But if, in Montreal, young people, men and women have achieved records which demonstrate what human will and reason can accomplish, the record number of our meetings in itself does not prove that we have attained positive results. A great number of meetings does not always mean that concrete results have been achieved.

140. We were ready to adopt a more decisive, more specific resolution, because we consider the act of aggression against Zambia, just like the internal and foreign policy of South Africa, as a threat to peace and security—not only as a possible threat, but as an actual threat to peace and security in that region of Africa, and perhaps in all of Africa. That is why we would have been ready to adopt, as had been requested before the meeting by a number of African countries, a more concrete, more decisive resolution, condemning the racist régime of South Africa and its actions against its neighbours, against Namibia, and against the indigenous people of South Africa. We would have been ready to adopt a resolution which might have been the last resolution of the Council on the question of the situation in South Africa, a resolution which would have listed concrete measures—broad sanctions and the means for implementing that resolution. We would have been ready also to demand that South Africa withdraw immediately from Namibia. In short, we would have liked to see a resolution that would have helped halt the acts of aggression of the racist South African régime. Therefore, while voting for this draft resolution, we are also aware of its shortcomings. I would express the hope that when we begin discussion of the problem of Namibia at the end of August, the Council will be able to adopt a resolution which will bring to an end the long process that the United Nations has gone through in its discussion of the situation in that vast area; which will put an end to colonialism, racism and *apartheid*; which will terminate the oppression of the indigenous people of that country and that entire region of Africa.

141. We were hoping and expecting that the Council would today most appropriately adopt a paragraph recognizing SWAPO as the legitimate representative of the Namibian people. We were also hoping that the resolution would indicate concrete ways and means of implementing it as a final resolution to bring about a basic change in the situation in South Africa.

142. In voting for the draft resolution, as I say, we are aware of its virtues but we also see its shortcomings, and I hope that the Security Council will succeed in remedying them in the near future.

143. Mr. President, as far as you personally are concerned, I believe everyone here will note with satisfaction that, thanks to your guidance of our discussion of this question, the Council has been able to conclude its deliberations under your Presidency, so that you have not had to pass on to your successor a question of such difficulty and complexity.

144. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): In accordance with the well-known position of principle of the United Kingdom, I would like merely to say that we support the reference to the "struggle", in the fifth preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, on the basis that this is a struggle by peaceful means. We consider that solutions to problems of this kind are best solved by the means set out in Chapter VI of the Charter of the United Nations.

145. Mr. KADUMA (United Republic of Tanzania): First of all, Mr. President, I should like to express my Government's gratitude for the efforts which you have indicated your country and its European partners are seeking to exert with reference to our dealings with South Africa and in an attempt to reverse the contradictions that have constituted a threat to the peace in our region.

146. I should like also to do the same with regard to the Government of the United States for the efforts they are making in this regard. But at the same time I feel that I shall not be doing justice to the Council, and definitely to the principles that my country stands for, if I do not express our disappointment at the way in which the Government of the United States has treated this matter, which in our view is so serious as to warrant the concern of the Council, and particularly so because the aggression that the racist régime has committed against Zambia is an aggression against a State Member of the United Nations which has firmly held, ever since its birth, to the principles of the Organization. I think this is important—the fact that the Republic of Zambia has assumed the responsibility of defending the principles of the Charter only a year after its accession to independence. It is really a miracle that they have been able to survive against these great odds. The Council agreed to assist Zambia in its efforts to implement the sanctions. But, as we

know only too well, the response has not been as good as had been expected of a responsible organization like the United Nations.

147. In our opinion, there would have been no real contradiction between the efforts the United States Government is making to resolve this problem and a vote in favour of the present resolution. Indeed, the resolution was very much watered down, because a number of concessions were made in an attempt to achieve unanimity. In my view, the fact that the United States Government has reserved its position has nullified the very stand it expressed in its statement—namely, that it condemns the acts and policies of the South African Government. Perhaps it is good that we now know the stand of the United States Government. I can only hope that I am mistaken in asserting that its stand is irrelevant. Let me also express the hope that I am mistaken in thinking that the abstention of the United States delegation here will not help the efforts of the United States Government.

148. The PRESIDENT: I thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Republic of Tanzania for his kind references to me and especially for the appreciation he expressed for the efforts my country is making, in close association with all its partners in the European Community, in order to bring about the necessary and long-awaited changes in the overall policy of South Africa.

149. The next speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zambia.

150. Mr. MWALE: (Zambia): I have asked to speak once again merely in order to repeat the sincere thanks and appreciation that I expressed in my statement at the opening of this series of meetings of the Council. My delegation is overwhelmed by the solidarity that has been expressed in the Council by all the representatives of countries with which Zambia has relations.

151. The vote that has been taken has meant a lot to Zambia. We know that we cannot bring back the persons whose lives have been lost. We know that we cannot bring back the property that has been destroyed. But we hope that the vote which the Council has taken will serve as a deterrent so that very soon there will be independence in Namibia and Zimbabwe and, indeed, so that soon this diabolical system of *apartheid* in South Africa will be eradicated.

152. My delegation has taken note of all the kind words and all the deliberations here. We are going back home to report to our Government that we have friends in this important body of the international community. We will go back home to Zambia to assure our people, our peace-loving people, that the world is with us in this just struggle, a struggle which is not only Zambian, a struggle which is not only African, but is a struggle of the world, of all people who love peace, all people who love social justice and fully support the

right to self-determination. We are going back to assure our people that human interdependence does exist. The decision that has been taken here is an expression of that fundamental and, indeed, most important aspect of our way of life on this planet.

153. I would not want to end this statement without once again thanking my colleagues, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs, who have come here, and in particular Sir Harold Walter, who at very short notice flew all the way from Mauritius to participate in these meetings not only in his capacity as Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the OAU but also because Zambia and Mauritius enjoy very, very close relations.

154. Once again I want to assure the Council that President Kaunda of Zambia, the Party, the Government and all the peace-loving people of Zambia appreciate this expression of solidarity.

155. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Madagascar wishes to say a few words in response to the expressions of sympathy that have been conveyed to his delegation. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

156. Mr. RASOLONDRALIBE (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): This morning the Council was informed by Mr. Scranton of the grave helicopter accident that took place today, 30 July, which led to the death of the Prime Minister and Minister of Defence of the Republic of Madagascar, Colonel Joel Rakotomalala. Other important persons were killed in the same accident: Mr. Pierre Rajaonah, Minister of Rural Development and Agrarian Reform; the Chief of Staff of the People's Army and the Director of the Military Cabinet of the Prime Minister. The pilot and the engineer and a journalist of Malagasy radio and television were killed also.

157. I have asked to speak in order to thank you, Mr. President, and, through you, the other members of the Security Council, for the decision the Council took this morning to send a telegram of sympathy to the Malagasy Government. I should like to assure you that the people and Government of my country will

be very sensitive to these condolences. On their behalf I should like to thank the Council. The same thanks go to all delegations that have individually expressed their sympathy to us.

158. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I am sure I am speaking for the members of the Council when I say that we appreciate the gesture of the representative of Madagascar and reiterate our sympathy on the cruel loss suffered by his Government and his people.

159. Mr. CHOU Nan (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): In the name of the Chinese delegation, I wish to extend deep condolences on the tragic death of the Prime Minister of Madagascar.

160. At the same time, I would like to express sincere thanks to the Foreign Ministers of Mozambique, Mauritius and Zambia as well as the distinguished representatives of many other countries for the sympathy they expressed at the morning and afternoon meetings today over the earthquake which occurred in Hopei province, China, and I shall convey their cordial sentiments to the Chinese Government and people.

161. The PRESIDENT: Most if not all participants in this discussion have made very kind remarks indeed concerning the task of the presidency during this month of July. I warmly thank them and in turn would like to convey to all the members of the Council and all the participants in this debate my deep appreciation for their help and co-operation in the fulfilment of my duties as President, which in a few hours I shall be honoured and pleased to turn over to our Japanese colleague, my old friend, Mr. Abe.

162. The Security Council has now concluded the current stage of its consideration of the item before it.

The meeting rose at 7.30 p.m.

Note

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

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

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

如何购取联合国出版物

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

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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