

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-SIXTH YEAR

1590th MEETING: 8 OCTOBER 1971

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1590)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Complaint by Zambia: Letter dated 6 October 1971 from the Permanent Representative of Zambia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10352)	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.

FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND NINETIETH MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 8 October 1971, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Guillermo SEVILLA SACASA (Nicaragua).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Argentina, Belgium, Burundi, China, France, Italy, Japan, Nicaragua, Poland, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1590)

1. Adoption of the agenda.

2. Complaint by Zambia:

Letter dated 6 October 1971 from the Permanent Representative of Zambia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10352).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Complaint by Zambia

Letter dated 6 October 1971 from the Permanent Representative of Zambia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10352)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have received letters from the Permanent Representatives of Zambia, the United Republic of Tanzania, Nigeria, South Africa and Kenya, in which they asked to be invited to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion of the item on the agenda for this meeting. The letters of the representatives of Zambia [S/10358], the United Republic of Tanzania [S/10357], Nigeria [S/10359] and South Africa [S/10360] have been distributed. The letter of the representative of Kenya will be distributed in due course.

2. In accordance with the provisional rules of procedure of the Council and with past practice in such cases I shall, with the consent of the Council, invite the representatives of Zambia, the United Republic of Tanzania, Nigeria, South Africa and Kenya to participate in our debate, without the right to vote.

3. Since the representative of Zambia is the first speaker on my list, I invite him to be seated at the Council table. I likewise invite the representatives of the United Republic of Tanzania, Nigeria, South Africa and Kenya to take the places reserved for them in the Council chamber, on the

understanding that they will be seated at the Council table when they wish to speak.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. V. J. Mwaanga (Zambia), took a place at the Council table; and Mr. I. Elinewinga (United Republic of Tanzania); Mr. O. Ariko (Nigeria); Mr. H. Muller, (South Africa); and Mr. J. Odera-Jowi (Kenya) took the places reserved for them.

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Zambia to open the debate on this item.

5. Mr. MWAANGA (Zambia): Mr. President, I wish, first and foremost, to thank you most sincerely and, through you, the members of the Security Council for having speedily responded to our request contained in document S/10352, dated 6 October 1971, to convene urgently a meeting of the Security Council.

6. I take this opportunity to register my delegation's sincere pleasure and satisfaction on your assumption of the high office of President of the Security Council for this month. I had the pleasure of working with you on the Council for one year, and I can testify with confidence that you will bring your Latin wisdom and wealth of experience to bear on this Council. Apart from anything else, you represent a country with which my country maintains the best of relations. We regard you as a true friend of Zambia and of Africa as a whole and, indeed, an apostle of freedom, human equality, justice and peace; and that is why it gives me added pleasure to pay you a fitting tribute.

7. This august Council is meeting at our request to consider a series of systematic and premeditated violations of the sovereignty, airspace and territorial integrity of Zambia by the armed forces of the fascist white minority Government of the Republic of South Africa. This is a grave situation involving none other than the same axis of the racist and fascist white minority régimes of southern Africa which, in accordance with the dictates of their unholy alliance, not only act in concert, but also—perhaps for tactical reasons—alternate their criminal acts directed against independent African States.

8. On 5 October 1971, at 1930 hours Zambian time, units of the South African Army entered Zambia illegally at Katima Mulilo in speedboats and helicopters, allegedly pursuing invisible freedom fighters who, they assumed, had entered the Caprivi Strip in the United Nations Territory of Namibia, through Zambia. The South African armed forces spent some time inside Zambia looking for those invisible

freedom fighters and, on satisfying themselves that they were on a wild-goose chase, shamefully retreated to their military base at the Caprivi Strip. Military experts call this policy "hot pursuit", or the "doctrine of anticipatory counter-attack", or "carrying the war into enemy territory", and so on. We have been aware of South Africa's aggressive designs from the time early in 1968 when Mr. Vorster, the Prime Minister of South Africa, stated that he would "hit Zambia so hard that she will never forget it".

9. The usually pro-Vorster and pro-*apartheid* newspapers of South Africa have quoted Mr. Vorster as having told a convention of the Transvaal organization of his ruling Nationalist Party that the South African Government would pursue freedom fighters "all the way to Lusaka", the Zambian capital, if necessary. His all-white audience is reported to have warmly applauded Mr. Vorster's dramatic announcement, thus signalling their approval of his aggressive intentions. I have press dispatches from many news agencies and newspapers representing all shades of opinion, but I will refrain from quoting them because our case is not based on mere press reports. It is a well-documented factual account, which represents a true picture of the sad events which have been taking place on our border with Namibia, involving the occupation forces of the Pretoria régime. The world press, with a few usual exceptions, has for the past two days been reporting the bitter disagreements which have arisen between Mr. Vorster and the South African press over what he is supposed to have told his Nationalist Party Convention in Transvaal. We could very well have made use of some of the interesting editorials which appeared yesterday, 7 October 1971, in the *Rand Daily Mail*, the *Cape Times*, the *Johannesburg Star*, and so on, accusing Mr. Vorster of double-talk. We are not interested in seeking vantage points. We are not interested in scoring propaganda victories. We are only interested in telling the Security Council the truth as we know it.

10. Despite denials yesterday by Mr. Vorster, the South African Prime Minister, and Mr. Lourens Muller, the South African Police Minister, I have been authorized to state categorically and truthfully that at a diplomatic briefing which was held in Pretoria for a few selected ambassadors of Western countries, Mr. Vorster specifically mentioned Zambia as the country penetrated by South African armed forces. This information was communicated to the Government of Zambia by one of the friendly Western countries which were represented at the diplomatic briefing. The name of this friendly Western country will not be disclosed for the purpose of this debate; suffice it to say that this country maintains diplomatic relations with both Zambia and the Pretoria régime.

11. This is not the first time that South Africa has systematically and deliberately violated our territorial integrity with impunity. I will now give the Security Council a chronological list of some of South Africa's wanton violations of my country's sovereignty, airspace and territorial integrity:

(1) On 26 October 1968, a Zambian national was illegally arrested by the South African security forces near the Caprivi Strip.

(2) On 6 January 1970, a South African military aircraft violated Zambian airspace by deliberately flying over Zambian territory from the Caprivi Strip.

(3) On 11 January 1970, a South African military aircraft violated Zambian airspace by flying from the Caprivi Strip military base over Zambian territory up to Sesheke District, Boma.

(4) On 15 January 1970, a South African military aircraft violated Zambian airspace by flying over Zambian territory at Katima Mulilo, inside Zambia.

(5) On 19 January 1970, a South African military helicopter violated Zambia's airspace by flying over Zambian territory around the Sesheke District bordering the Caprivi Strip.

(6) On 21 February 1970, one red boat from the Caprivi Strip with three South African soldiers illegally landed at Katima Mulilo Pontoon harbour in Zambia.

(7) On 22 February 1970, a white South African in a red police speed-boat came to the harbour at Katima Mulilo at a point where both banks of the Zambezi River are in Zambian territory.

(8) Two days later, on 24 February 1970, a South African "WENELA"-marked aircraft violated Zambian airspace by flying over the Zambian Immigration and Customs Office at Katima Mulilo. A few minutes later, a South African military aircraft and a helicopter flew along the border on patrol. I wish to point out that WENELA is a South African agency which recruits cheap slave labour to work in South Africa.

(9) On 27 February 1970, yet another South African military helicopter violated Zambian airspace by hovering on Katima Mulilo Government school, inside Zambian territory.

(10) A day later, on 28 February 1970, a South African police speed-boat came into the Pontoon at Kasane on the western bank of the Zambezi River inside Zambia.

(11) On 3 March 1970, a South African aircraft also owned by the WENELA Company in the Caprivi Strip violated Zambia's airspace at Katima Mulilo by flying over Zambian territory from the Caprivi Strip.

(12) On 14 April 1970, a South African DC-3 aircraft with WENELA markings violated Zambia's airspace at Sesheke. It had originated from the Caprivi Strip military base.

(13) On the same day, 14 April 1970, two South African soldiers in Land Rover Registration No. ECZ 18 crossed into Zambia at the Zambia-Caprivi border at Katima Mulilo. Still on the same day, two white South African armed soldiers in a Vannet, Registration No. G.476, violated Zambia's territory at the Zambia-Caprivi border.

(14) On 28 April 1970, a South African military helicopter violated Zambian airspace by flying over the

immigration post of Katima Mulilo. The helicopter flew at a very low altitude, thereby terrifying Zambian villagers.

(15) On 23 June 1970, a South African aircraft with WENELA markings violated Zambian airspace at Katima Mulilo at the border with the Caprivi Strip.

(16) Two days later, on 25 June 1970, a South African military aircraft flew over Sesheke, inside Zambia, from the Caprivi Strip.

(17) On 7 July 1970, a South African DC-3 aircraft flew over Katima Mulilo residential compound which is inside Zambian territory.

(18) On 26 July 1970, a high-altitude aircraft belonging to the South African Air Force stationed in the Caprivi Strip violated Zambian airspace.

(19) On 8 August 1970, a South African military aircraft flew twice over the Katima Mulilo residential compound inside Zambian territory.

(20) On 4 March 1971, two South African soldiers entered Zambia on foot at about 1600 hours at Katima Mulilo. They interviewed Zambian nationals and inquired about the movement of the Zambian paramilitary police. One of them was arrested and prosecuted. His friend managed to escape.

(21) Two days later, on 6 March 1971, 12 South African soldiers in uniform crossed into Zambia at Katima Mulilo in the Sesheke District.

(22) On 9 May 1971, two South African soldiers crossed into Zambia in a military Land-Rover at Katima Mulilo.

(23) On the same day, 9 May 1971, a South African military boat, Registration No. VASBYT 305034, was found on the Zambian side of Zambezi River near Sesheke. South African army personnel later claimed it, saying that they had run out of petrol during what they called "patrols".

(24) As already noted, on 5 October 1971, at about 1930 hours, Zambian time, units of the South African army entered Zambia at Katima Mulilo using speed-boats and helicopters allegedly pursuing freedom fighters whom they assumed to have entered the Caprivi Strip through Zambia.

12. That is a sad catalogue of serious incidents conducted by an occupation force across international frontiers against Zambia—a small, peace-loving country whose only crime is that:

(a) Through no fault of its own, it happens to border the international territory of Namibia, which is currently under an illegal white minority régime based in Pretoria;

(b) It believes in a policy of non-racialism;

(c) It is uncompromisingly opposed to the so-called dialogue with South Africa and the so-called outward-looking policy;

(d) It firmly believes in the principle of the inalienable right of the peoples of southern Africa and Guinea-Bissau to self-determination and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV);

(e) It is firmly opposed to white supremacy;

(f) It is a faithful Member of the United Nations and strictly adheres to its obligations under Article 25 of the United Nations Charter.

13. This is the nature of the problem. It is obvious that South Africa is feeling the pressure of the liberation movements, and is now desperately trying to let off steam on Zambia.

14. I have been instructed to state in no uncertain terms that the Government of Zambia accepts no responsibility whatsoever for the activities of the Namibian freedom fighters inside Namibia in their just struggle to resist South Africa's occupation and oppression. Today Zambia is in a state of undeclared war with South Africa and other white minority régimes which form the unholy alliance.

15. The root cause of our deep-seated differences with South Africa is undoubtedly *apartheid*. Furthermore, we have consistently opposed South Africa's policy of creating client States, of making Africa its own sphere of political and economic domination. The white man in South Africa has been preparing and continues to prepare for war and for the continuation of his political policy by other means.

16. The military strategy of the racist régime falls into at least two main categories. First, the régime has adopted a military posture aimed at keeping the white-dominated southern portion of Africa intact, while simultaneously pushing the régime's military defence line far to the north, thus creating a system of buffer States around itself. Secondly, it has built a major military base in the Caprivi Strip in the northernmost tip of Namibia, nearly 1,000 miles from its own borders with the international Territory of Namibia, for the sole purpose of internal repression and suppression in Namibia and of striking at neighbouring independent African States opposed to its criminal policies.

17. We believe that the Security Council, given its special responsibility under the United Nations Charter to maintain international peace and security, has an inescapable duty to take appropriate, corrective and meaningful measures to put an end to these violations which could well lead to a full-scale war.

18. It will be recalled that on 20 March 1969 I informed the Security Council about South Africa's frequent violations of Zambia's airspace and territorial integrity. [1464th meeting, para. 49.] In addition to the violations I have already tabulated, it is important for me to state that South Africa has been interfering in our internal affairs by, among other things, financing reactionary opposition parties inside Zambia with a view to destroying the unity of the Zambian people. However, having lamentably failed, it has now embarked on a programme of direct military action against Zambia in the hope that it can influence the policies of the Government. I wish to state that our opposition to

apartheid in all its manifestations is total and uncompromising.

19. My country desires nothing but peace and stability on its borders, and it is unrealistic to talk about peace with South Africa until the major problems of *apartheid* and race are resolved. Race and its twin sister, colour, threaten the peace and stability of the African continent as a whole. The spectre of a racial conflict on a global scale, and the consequences for the world, cannot but be frightening for all peace-loving nations. It is necessary to examine briefly the nature of this conflict with South Africa.

20. In our view the conflict is, first, one of colour; and, secondly, one of religious fanaticism based on certain misconceptions about the nature of man, which became a unifying force within the white community—a community of the “chosen”, with a destiny which only white people are privileged to have. Fear of competition from the black majority felt by the poor whites of South Africa and Namibia was the main reason for discrimination and *apartheid*; but since then it has turned into a ruthless struggle for the survival of the white race in southern Africa. The result has been a chain reaction of fear breeding fear, suspicion, prejudice, hatred; and then, as the screw of *apartheid* is tightened, the inevitable racial war must surely occur. Through a blind obsession the South African authorities have flouted and suppressed all moral, legal and scientific arguments to sanction white superiority. *Apartheid* is thus a dangerous rationalization of an ideology which is protectionist in purpose but defeatist in fact, and destructive in the final analysis.

21. As members of the Security Council, you have assumed crucial positions of leadership in the international community. You must have the courage to exercise not only paramount but responsible authority over our affairs. Leadership, to be worth exercising and asserting, must be genuine, responsible, and in the interest of those over whom it is being exercised. Your leadership, without wider morality, is brutal leadership and is not worthy of the human society. You, as leaders of our Organization, must be told in no uncertain terms that successful leadership does not merely call for political ingenuity and clever manipulation of awkward situations, nor the scoring of diplomatic victories and the inflicting of defeats; it calls, above all, for the mustering of all moral stamina, courage, honesty, and a dedication to face the truth and to shape and steer the ship of humanity perpetually on its proper course to safety, stability and peace for the progress and happiness of all. Never before in history have these qualities of leadership been more in demand than today when the world is so delicately balanced between survival and destruction.

22. We have stated our case objectively and without any emotion. Our country is the object of aggression committed by the South African occupation authorities in Namibia. We hope that in considering our complaint the Security Council will draw a distinction between the aggressor and the victim of aggression. In the past, the Security Council has been rightly accused of taking action in the form of arranging cease-fires between the countries already at war. This is obviously a highly unsatisfactory state of affairs, and

our complaint affords the Security Council an opportunity to prevent what is bound to be a racial war. This problem is so important to us that we reject in advance any verbal and meaningless statements of support from members of the Council. We shall judge your friendship and belief in the principles of the United Nations Charter by the manner in which you finally cast your votes.

23. We know that it has become fashionable for the Security Council to send fact-finding missions for purposes of “verification”, in order to satisfy the doubting Thomases who have subsequently been unable, anyway, to support the unanimous findings of its own fact-finding missions. While these missions have performed a useful function, they have cast serious doubts on the integrity of the Governments which have lodged the complaints. Nevertheless, should the Council be thinking in terms of sending a visiting mission to Zambia, I have been authorized by my Government to state that Zambia would welcome it and accord it all the necessary assistance, on the clear understanding—I repeat, on the clear understanding—that it will also be given uninhibited access to Namibia. For unless the visiting mission visits both countries, namely, Zambia on the one hand and the international Territory of Namibia on the other, no balanced report would emerge, because the mission would come back only with the Zambian side of the problem.

24. In conclusion, let me make it quite clear that we have confidence that the Security Council, the custodian of the conscience of the international community, will take a decision which will help assure and guarantee the freedom, independence and security of small and weak States such as Zambia. We have not come here to ask favours, but only to ask that justice be done. The Security Council’s decision will go a long way towards resolving the crisis of confidence from which this Organization is suffering. We are confident that this will help bridge the wide gap between promise and accomplishment.

25. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am grateful to the representative of Zambia for his cordial words about me. I take them as an expression of the courtesy which is so characteristic of the noble people of Zambia and of its worthy representative, who is held in such high esteem by all of us.

26. I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter, dated 7 October 1971, signed by 44 representatives of African States, supporting Zambia’s request for the convening of this meeting in connexion with its complaint set forth in (document S/10352). The letter in question will be distributed in due course.

27. The next speaker on the list is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Republic of Tanzania. I invite him to be seated at the Council table and to make his statement.

28. Mr. ELINEWINGA (United Republic of Tanzania): Mr. President, my delegation is grateful to you as well as to the members of the Council for the opportunity afforded us to address the Council on this grave and serious matter.

29. The Ambassador of Zambia, who preceded me, has already presented in eloquent terms a detailed report

pertaining to the aggression committed against his country by the South African racist régime. At the very outset I should like to make it quite clear that this cowardly attack and provocation against Zambia is considered by my Government as an attack not only against that sister Republic but also against my own country and against the entire African continent. Hence Zambia's complaint is Tanzania's complaint. It is also and above all Africa's complaint.

30. This is not the first time that an African State has complained to the Council, nor is it the first time that Africa has come to appeal to the Council to exercise its responsibilities as conferred on it by the Charter. Indeed, as this Council is meeting to deliberate on the latest aggression by South Africa against the Republic of Zambia, it already has before it reports of its Mission to the Republic of Guinea¹ and of its Mission to Senegal² concerning Portuguese aggression against those two sister African Republics. Furthermore, the Council is still seized of the consideration of the illegal occupation of Namibia by the South African minority régime.

31. In his letter to the President of the Security Council [S/10352], the Permanent Representative of Zambia has already informed the Council of the numerous violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of his country by South African forces. In the statement he has just made, the Zambian representative has given further elaboration of this serious menace to his country's security and independence. It is clear that these violations conform to a well-calculated and co-ordinated plan by the racist régime of South Africa and the colonial authorities in Lisbon against the Republic of Zambia and independent African States, particularly those bordering on the Territories under colonial and racist domination. In this connexion the Council will not fail to take note of the fact that harassment, provocation and serious threats to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of African States have now become the normal behaviour of the Pretoria and Lisbon authorities.

32. Ultimatums against Zambia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the People's Republic of the Congo, Guinea, Senegal and the United Republic of Tanzania are issued daily by these fascist authorities. A year or so ago the international community must have been alarmed by the arrogant threat made by Mr. Vorster against the Republic of Zambia in particular.

33. By their latest armed incursion into the territory of Zambia, the South African racists have made good their aggressive and warlike threats against that sister State. It is indeed ironical that Mr. Vorster's minority régime should treat with contempt the sacred principle enshrined in the Charter of our Organization on the inviolability of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of a Member State. However, that should not come as a surprise to the international community. For, after all, a régime which dehumanizes the majority of its own population, subjecting

them to untold miseries and systematic repression, can hardly be expected to abide by international norms and morality. The truth is that the régime in Pretoria has more than distinguished itself as an outlaw thriving in the constant violation of all the purposes and principles that the United Nations stands for. Mr. Vorster's régime and the Charter of our Organization have always been known to be strange bedfellows.

34. Thus, in analysing the true nature of the obnoxious system of South African *apartheid* exemplified in the whole scale of massive violations of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of the non-white population in South Africa itself, the illegal occupation of Namibia coupled with the transplanting of the *apartheid* system in that international Territory, and the aggression against the people of Zimbabwe and Mozambique by South African military forces operating in those Territories, the aggression against the Republic of Zambia is part of a continuous process. It is clear that that process confronts the international community, and more particularly this Council, with a serious challenge. Failure to act swiftly and speedily now can only sharpen the confrontation, with untold repercussions not only to the peace and security of the region but indeed to international peace and security. For let there be no underestimation of the determination and the resolute commitment of those who are now in the clutches of racist and colonial domination to free themselves and attain self-determination and human dignity. Let there be no illusions as to the determination of free Africa to defend jealously its freedom and independence and to support unreservedly the just cause of those of our brothers who are still languishing under inhuman oppression and exploitation. Mr. Vorster and his fellows can attack Zambia, as their security forces have indeed already done. But it would be the height of absurdity and self-delusion to imagine that such attacks can compromise the iron will of the Zambian people to defend their freedom and independence.

35. Zambia, like Tanzania, and indeed like many other African States, may not be a powerful nation. Our resources may be limited. But one thing which we have in abundance is our unqualified love for our freedom and independence, and our belief that this freedom is indivisible. It is important that those who cherish dreams as well as illusions of re-colonizing the African continent should ponder this cardinal truth. Africa will defend its honour and freedom, and in southern Africa we are committed to support until final victory the struggle of our suffering brethren.

36. The attack on Zambia is a challenge to Africa's honour and dignity, and needless to say that continent's unequivocal support of and solidarity with the Zambian people and Government will find its expression in concrete terms. The question, however, is: what about the responsibility of this Council, in which the peoples of the world place their hopes for the preservation of international peace and security?

37. I referred earlier in my address to the sharpening confrontation. The situation is both dangerous and explosive. Yet this is not the first time we have drawn the attention of this Council, and that of the General Assem-

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Special Supplement No. 4.*

² *Ibid.*, *Special Supplement No. 3.*

bly, to the grave problems of southern Africa. Eminent African Heads of State have repeatedly warned of the impending serious conflagration unless the situation is immediately checked. In response to those genuine and realistic expressions of concern, we have been confronted with an attitude of virtual apathy on the part of some of the permanent members of this Council, allies and supporters of the racist and colonialist régimes in Africa.

38. Those major Powers have not only failed to live up to their responsibilities as befitting permanent members of the Security Council, but, through their diabolical policies of fraternization with and their active military, economic, political and diplomatic support for those very repressive and aggressive régimes, have contributed in no small measure to the further aggravation of the tension in the area. And, adding insult to injury, Africa's expressions of grave concern at this serious threat directed against our continent have been depicted, at best, as alarmist.

39. Let this despicable and cowardly incursion into Zambian soil by South African security forces serve as an eye-opener to those who profess complacency over the explosive situation in southern Africa. Let it awaken the conscience of those who were still in doubt as to South Africa's aggressive designs. But, above all, this situation should provide a proper opportunity for the Security Council to re-examine its position vis-à-vis southern Africa.

40. Therefore, while taking appropriate measures to overcome effectively this latest challenge posed by the *apartheid* régime, the Council should also start to consider very seriously the most effective ways to avoid the blood bath now looming very large on that part of our continent. There is no longer time for half-hearted measures, nor for ambiguous resolutions which are subject to violation by the very members whose primary responsibility it is to maintain international peace and security.

41. Here we should like once again to launch a solemn appeal to those allies of South Africa and the colonial authorities in Lisbon to desist from their misguided policies of aiding and abetting the aggressors. We urge them to opt for freedom and human understanding, rather than collaborate in the enslavement of the African people. We urge them to put principles before considerations of short-term policy interests and profits. We urge them to be on the side of justice.

42. Our solemn appeal is addressed especially to the three Western permanent members of the Council—the United States, the United Kingdom and France—since they have the unenviable privilege of being the principal supporters of the Pretoria and Lisbon régimes by pumping economic and other assistance to them, which without the slightest doubt has enabled Mr. Vorster and Mr. Caetano not only to pursue ruthlessly and efficiently their repressive and oppressive machinery against subjugated African people in South Africa, Namibia, Angola, Guinea (Bissau) and Mozambique, but also to indulge in such adventurous and dangerous exercises as the naked aggression against the Republic of Senegal and the latest aggression against the Republic of Zambia.

43. My Government wishes at this juncture to highlight particularly our serious concern over the continued supply of arms to those régimes. We have repeatedly pointed out not only that the arms sales to South Africa constitute a violation of the arms embargo resolution adopted by this Council [282 (1970)] but, above all, that such sales constitute direct assistance to the *apartheid* régime, enabling it to perfect its oppressive and repressive machinery internally, as well as to launch aggression against independent African States. This Council is not unaware of the ingenious explanations given by those who prefer to shy away from their responsibilities and obligations in an attempt to justify the continued sale of arms to South Africa.

44. The falacious concept of arms for internal repression as distinct from arms for external aggression is too well known to the Council, and indeed I need not elaborate further. We have consistently maintained that to sell arms to South Africa is to increase its capability to commit aggression both against its own people and against independent African States, as in the case of Zambia this time. The attack against Zambia is an eloquent vindication of our position—if such a vindication were really needed. To continue arming South Africa following this incident against Zambia and then profess friendship for the Africans would be the cruelest mockery of logic and reason.

45. The ruling circles of South Africa today are desperate men. That desperation has been caused by their inability to crush completely the mounting tide of resistance by the oppressed people both in South Africa and in Namibia. For no régime, no nation, however powerful or ruthless, can put off for ever the quest for freedom. The South African authorities are now beginning to reap the fruits of their years of systematic inhuman subjugation of people. Steadily but surely the Namibians are rising to the demands of the hour. The people of South Africa of all shades of colour—blacks as well as whites—are resisting the régime. Witness, for example, the current desperate persecution of church leaders, as evidenced by the trial of the Anglican Dean of Johannesburg.

46. Thus the problem is within Namibia and within South Africa itself. The struggle is between the oppressed Namibians and the oppressed Africans in South Africa, on the one hand, and the fascist régime of Pretoria, on the other. To divert attention from what is happening in its own country, and also in the international Territory it illegally and forcibly occupies, the South African régime is searching for hypothetical external enemies. Currently Zambia would seem to have suited its objective; hence the invasion of Zambian territory. But desperate men of history have been known to do desperate things, and Mr. Vorster and his collaborators should not be regarded as exceptions. That is why my Government is seriously concerned at this latest attack on Zambia, and that is why we submit that this Council will be failing its responsibilities under the Charter and before world public opinion if it fails to condemn this latest aggression of the South African authorities and to take appropriate measures to avoid its recurrence in similar incidents.

47. The Security Council must not fail to draw the appropriate conclusion concerning the bases from which

South Africa has mounted its invasion of Zambian territory. For it is no secret that the South African forces that committed this attack against Zambia operated from Namibia, an international Territory to which South Africa forcibly clings despite the decisions of this Council and of the General Assembly.

48. Thus the Security Council is faced with a clear situation, a double crime: the continued illegal occupation of an international Territory and the use of that Territory by the South African minority régime to violate the territorial integrity and sovereignty of a Member State of this Organization. My delegation expects that, when the Security Council concludes its deliberations on the question of Namibia in the light of the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice on the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia,³ it will take due account of the dangerous way in which the international Territory is currently being used by the South African racist usurpers and will take decisive measures to end that occupation, thereby eliminating the possibility of that Territory being used for aggressive designs.

49. Suitable and effective measures are also urgently required to eliminate the inhuman system of *apartheid*, and also the Portuguese colonies and Portuguese wars in Africa. Such measures would enable the nations and people of Africa to live in their traditional peace and brotherhood.

50. One cannot fail to observe that South Africa has chosen this moment, when the Security Council is discussing the continued illegal occupation of Namibia, to use that Territory for its aggressive designs against Zambia. No better demonstration of contempt for this Council could be projected. Seldom has the international community witnessed a greater display of arrogance.

51. The Republic of Zambia, which is the victim of this latest criminal act of the South African racists, not only is entitled to the support and solidarity of the international community but also and above all deserves our appreciation and gratitude. For the people and Government of Zambia have faithfully adhered to the decisions and resolutions of both this august Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations. Zambia not only is committed to the protection of its independence and the dignity of its people but has constantly opposed the inhuman policies of *apartheid* and colonialism in southern Africa—policies in regard to which both the Security Council and the United Nations General Assembly have declared their opposition in no unequivocal terms.

52. In the process, Zambia has had to make immense sacrifices and constantly to resist policies of outright intimidation, political and economic blackmail and even direct aggression perpetrated by the colonial and racist régime. Indeed, Zambia more than any other single African country has to bear the great burden of Africa's quest for emancipation by preferring freedom to servitude, struggle to appeasement, principles to capitulation.

³ *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 16.*

53. Before this Council Tanzania pays a tribute to the people and Government of Zambia, and before this distinguished gathering we reaffirm our country's resolute and unshakable support for and solidarity with our brothers of Zambia. And we urge the Security Council: the minimum it can do—if only in recognition of Zambia's loyal services to the United Nations and to the world community as a whole—is to demand that the territorial integrity and sovereignty of that country be fully and scrupulously respected.

54. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

55. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): Mr. President, I wish to draw your attention to the fact that you referred to a letter in support of Zambia's complaint as having been signed by 44 African States. That letter has not yet been distributed, but I should like to note that five of the signatories are non-African States, as well as my own. I should like that to be clear.

56. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am informed by the Secretariat that the letter referred to by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic is now being distributed.

57. The next name on the list of speakers is that of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa. I invite him to be seated at the Council table and to make his statement.

58. Mr. MULLER (South Africa): Mr. President, I should like to thank you and the members of the Council for the opportunity to participate in this debate. I shall confine myself to the merits of the Zambian charges and shall ignore the purely political attacks on my country, which are clearly irrelevant.

59. The representative of Zambia alleges that on Tuesday, 5 October 1971, South African forces illegally crossed into Zambian territory. Now, incidents did in fact occur in the Caprivi Strip on that and the previous day. The following are the basic facts.

60. On 4 October members of the South African police force were patrolling near the border between the Eastern Caprivi and Zambia when their vehicle was blown up by a landmine. Four of the occupants were very seriously injured. On the following day, when other members of the police force were investigating the incident, another landmine exploded, killing one of the police officers concerned.

61. The trail of four persons was found leading from the direction of the Zambian border to the location of the landmines and back again in the direction of the Zambian border.

62. My Prime Minister has repeatedly and publicly warned in the past that the South African Government will not tolerate attacks upon our people or the people of South West Africa from across the borders of the Republic or of the Territory. No country, he has pointed out, can permit hostile persons or forces to attack with impunity its territory or territories under its control.

63. The Prime Minister of South Africa stated that steps were therefore being taken to pursue the culprits, and that the pursuers would defend themselves if they were to be attacked.

64. In point of fact—and I am authorized so to inform the Council—the South African police forces did not in the event cross the Zambian border. They followed the trail left by the four persons to where it disappeared within the area of the Caprivi Strip and then returned to their stations. At no time, therefore, was the Zambian border in any way violated. A public statement issued by the responsible South African Minister yesterday afternoon in this connexion reads as follows:

“With regard to certain reports to the effect that the border guards were still engaged in pursuing terrorists, I wish to state clearly that all members of the police are at their bases and carrying on with their normal duties.

“After the landmine explosions, follow-up operations were naturally carried out by the South African police; but they did not in the process enter the territory of any foreign State.”

I must therefore categorically reject the allegations of the representative of Zambia. No proof whatsoever has been advanced by him in support of his allegations. He has, in an attempt to substantiate his allegations, referred to reports in certain South African newspapers. My Prime Minister has publicly stated that those reports, which appeared in both Government and Opposition newspapers, placed unwarranted or unauthorized interpretations on remarks which he had made. Those reports are therefore irrelevant to the allegations, especially in circumstances in which the responsible Minister subsequently categorically denied that the Zambian border had been violated.

65. The representative of Zambia has also referred to incidents which have occurred in the past. Instances of unauthorized border crossings and trespassing on airspace have indeed occurred in the area of the Zambian Eastern Caprivi border; but both sides have been responsible, not only South Africa. These crossings are unintentional, caused by the twisting river boundary between Zambia and the Caprivi Strip and the fact that the border is not always in mid-stream. In the case of aircraft, they occur because the planes, owing to the wind direction, have to cross the border in the course of normal take-off and landing procedures. Indeed, this happens frequently in the case of Zambian aircraft taking off from Sesheke in the direction of Caprivi.

66. I may mention that in notes to the South African Government of 23 October 1969 and 5 May 1970, Zambia complained of eight violations of airspace by South Africa. On the other hand, Zambia, between November 1969 and July 1971, violated South West African airspace on no fewer than 12 occasions: on 19 November 1969, 3, 4, 7, 13, 16, 22 and 31 December 1969, 11 January 1970, 5 February 1970, 11 September 1970 and 27 July 1971.

67. In spite of all the unauthorized crossings on the part of Zambia, the South African authorities still allow

Zambians to cross the Caprivi border freely, without passports, for hospital treatment on the South West African side of the border.

68. From what I have said, it will be clear that the charges of the Zambian Government are entirely unfounded and, indeed, frivolous.

69. There are, however, other incidents which have occurred, incidents of a far more serious nature, which involve the deliberate violation of the territorial integrity of South West Africa. I refer to the infiltration of armed bands across the border from Zambia into the Caprivi. They cross the border in order to cause death and destruction. Today's complaint involved just such an armed incursion. This year alone, mines exploded on five occasions: on 22 May, 4 October, 5 October when two explosions occurred and 7 October.

70. At whose door is the responsibility for those incursions to be laid? The answer will be clear when I tell the members of this Council that these armed bands operate from camps situated in Zambia, that they shelter and are given shelter on Zambian soil, that they receive the support of the Zambian Government.

71. There are several of these camps in Zambia, some of them within striking distance of the Caprivi border. We have asked Zambia to take all steps necessary to prevent armed incursions from Zambia into South West Africa. But, as members will see, there has been little if any response from Zambia. Is it any wonder, then, that my Prime Minister felt called upon to issue the statement he made the other day?

72. It is the policy of the Government of South Africa to avoid border incidents and violations of the airspace of neighbouring countries. I can assure the Council that every reasonable precaution is taken to guard against occurrences of this nature. But I must state clearly in this Council that in the case of incursions of terrorists, we do not compromise. We have a duty to protect the inhabitants of South Africa and South West Africa against acts of terrorism, and we shall do everything in our power to prevent the commission of such acts or to apprehend the culprits.

73. Mr. SIMBANANIYE (Burundi) (*interpretation from French*): The situation created by the recent violation of the national sovereignty of the Republic of Zambia by the forces of Pretoria has added to a long series of attacks directed against innocent and independent countries. The gravity of that sad event, the active African solidarity, the links which have always been cordial between the Republics of Burundi and Zambia, the mandate given to the *Ad Hoc* Sub-Committee on Namibia—of which our Permanent Representative, Ambassador Terence, has twice been elected Chairman—are reasons which compel us to make a statement in the General Assembly at a later date so as to concentrate on the urgent debate imposed by South Africa.

74. Mr. Vorster's threat against Zambia, a peaceful country, at the very time when the Security Council is seized of the problem of Namibia, illustrates a boundless scorn for the United Nations and its organs. What is worse, the

régime which he governs gives evidence of its incorrigible and obstinate determination to trample underfoot the principles of the Charter, in particular Article 2. It is therefore beyond doubt that the advocates of *apartheid* are determined to add fuel to the flames. Whereas all United Nations organs—from the General Assembly to the International Court of Justice through to the Security Council—have agreed to condemn the inhuman acts perpetrated against the non-white inhabitants of South Africa and Namibia, as well as the attempts at annexation of that international Territory, Pretoria merely lets its expansionist appetite grow. Thus the surfeit of arrogance and effrontery has led the racist Government to extend its fury to sovereign States on our continent.

75. Reprimanded as it has been on all sides, both by its enemies and by its friends, because of its impertinent refusal to comply with international commitments, with decisions and resolutions of the Security Council, which call on it to evacuate a Territory which falls under international jurisdiction, that régime is determined to obfuscate the present situation. Furthermore, its delaying tactics are intended to obstruct the progress of the deliberations on Namibia. Mr. Vorster, drunk with military power, allows himself to violate the sovereignty of an independent country. In its profound delusion, the Government of Pretoria pretends and claims that the explosion in which one policeman met his death and others were wounded was caused by Namibians sheltered in Zambia. This is yet another pretext for its annexationist appetite.

76. Namibians, whether refugees or fighting for freedom, are fully entitled to recover their human rights, their possessions and their honour which have been despoiled by the foreign occupiers. The liberators of their homeland of Namibia do not operate exclusively from abroad. Despite the tyranny imposed on their country, those valiant champions of human dignity succeed in carrying out their liberation action within the Territory itself. Resistance by the citizens whose inalienable rights have been violated will continue and become more intense against the occupying Power as long as the violent illegal military occupation of Namibia lasts. This legitimate resistance cannot in any case be imputed to Zambia.

77. No doubt the Government of Pretoria, increasingly overwhelmed by the synchronized initiatives of the protagonists of independence, hastens to vent its anger on a scapegoat and thus disguise its powerlessness—which is obvious—to muzzle a people seeking national sovereignty.

78. While South Africa, armed to the teeth, brandishing its missiles against independent African States, is none the less incapable of annihilating the liberation movements, how dare it penalize Zambia, which has no call to become a shield for Pretoria against those who are carrying on a nationalist struggle?

79. On several occasions members of the Security Council have been seized of similar cases of acts of aggression committed by South Africa. Today when we were nearing agreement to implement the numerous resolutions of the Security Council regarding Namibia, our attention is deliberately distracted by South Africa, because we are com-

elled to examine the new situation created by South African aggression against Zambia an independent country which is an honour to Africa and to the international community.

80. Once again South Africa has placed our Organization back to the wall. We must close ranks to bring the people out of the ghettos. We must defend the noble principles of freedom, liberty and justice, for which millions of human beings have given their lives. Nor can we forget how we fashioned crowns of glory for whites and non-whites alike who fell side by side on the battlefield when freedom-loving men rose up against nazism. Solidarity must be the same now as in the past.

81. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to revert to the statement made a few minutes ago by the representative of Syria, and to inform the Council that the signatories of the letter include, in addition to the African States, the following six countries: Barbados, Guyana, Malaysia, the Syrian Arab Republic, Yugoslavia and Trinidad and Tobago. The text of the letter will be circulated as soon as possible. I hope that this meets the point raised by our colleague from Syria.

82. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): Yes, thank you, Mr. President.

83. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next speaker on the list is the representative of Kenya. I invite him to be seated at the Council table and to make his statement.

84. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya): Mr. President, on behalf of the Republic of Kenya, I take this opportunity to thank you and the members of the Council for allowing me to take part in the deliberations of this august Council on the subject at hand, namely, South Africa's aggression against Zambia. Under your guidance and in the spirit and tradition of justice, objectivity and impartiality for which you and your country are known, I am confident that you will, as a representative of a small country like mine, treat this matter of aggression with the gravity it deserves. My delegation can expect the Council, as the guardian of international peace and security, to assist you fully in this task.

85. Although this meeting of the Council was requested by the representative of the Republic of Zambia to discuss aggression by South Africa, Kenya views aggression on any African State as committed against itself.

86. On Tuesday, 5 October 1971, the South African racist régime illegally crossed, with utter impunity, into Zambian territory; tomorrow it may choose to do the same thing to another African State. That is why Kenya feels so strongly about this action and why it has taken the floor to condemn this vile crime, and consequently requests the Security Council to take stern measures against the South African régime.

87. The representative of Zambia has already informed the Council that Mr. Vorster's racist régime has committed no less than 24 violations of the territorial integrity of Zambia.

This is a clear manifestation of criminal provocation. It is a clear case of naked aggression and utter disregard both for the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter and for international law, to which South Africa purports to subscribe.

88. Because of the pro-South African stand of certain members of this Council, Kenya holds that they share without any doubt the responsibility for the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia and South Africa's continued contempt for the personality, humanity and independence of the African people. It is in this context that the aggression against Zambia must be viewed.

89. By resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, the General Assembly terminated South Africa's mandate to administer Namibia, and thenceforth Namibia came under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. Therefore, South Africa's occupation of Namibia, as the International Court of Justice has reiterated in its Advisory Opinion of 21 June 1971,⁴ is not only illegal but also invalid, and is an affront to the authority of the United Nations. It must therefore be noted that it is this state of illegal occupation that has led to what appears to be an easily-calculated aggression on a peace-loving Member of the United Nations, namely, the sister Republic of Zambia.

90. Kenya is therefore apprehensive that continued support of South Africa by some big Powers, some of them members of this Council, and those that have been in the vanguard of imperialism and colonization of Africa, constitutes a direct threat to the independence and sovereignty of the African countries. It is not unlikely that collusion to re-colonize Africa could be on hand. It is now up to the international community, especially this Council, to stand firm and vindicate the rights and dignity of the oppressed peoples of southern Africa, Zambia, Namibia, and others. The Council can do this by taking stern action against the fascist régime of South Africa.

91. This Council, by rendering itself impotent when faced with issues and problems of aggression, is playing into the dangerous hands of evil doctrines and forces likely to lead the world into chaos and bloodshed.

92. Only recently this Council was seized of an issue of naked aggression; that is, the Portuguese aggression against the African States of Guinea and Senegal.

93. It is clear that the Portuguese-Rhodesian-South African axis constitutes a serious threat to the dignity of our brothers; it constitutes a serious threat to peace and security in Africa and indeed it poses a threat to the existence of this Organization itself. Therefore, the United Nations, through this Council, must put an immediate end to aggression by taking decisive action against the South African régime.

94. The criminal activities of the fascist South African régime are too well known to this Council and to the international community to require elaboration. Yet it continues to receive both material and moral support from

⁴ *Ibid.*

some members of the Council. The racist régime of South Africa has rightly interpreted this as approval, and will view the Council's inaction with contempt, regarding it as a licence for further aggression.

95. Let this Council and the world know that a warning has been sounded many a time here and in other international forums that the South African racist régime poses the greatest threat to the peace and security not only of Africa but of the whole world. Africans in South Africa may seem helpless in the face of the military power now wielded by the South African racists, but South African or any other arms will not stem the tide of our people's surge forward to independence. Our people will move forward to win their dignity and self-determination. Let the South African racists learn the lessons of Algeria and Kenya. It fills my delegation with agony to be aware that the Africans in South Africa will break the chains of this vile dictatorship only after so many years of oppression and possibly after a blood bath.

96. I should like to quote what my Foreign Minister said last week when addressing the General Assembly:

"... we watch with shock and disbelief the rapidly growing Anglo-French trade in arms with South Africa in contravention of the United Nations position. Such trade amounts to an endorsement of the evil system of *apartheid* by the leading Western democracies. We hold that any move to bolster South Africa militarily is a move to strangulate African nationalism and self-determination, and constitutes a threat to the security of Africa. These arms are bound to be used for internal suppression and for mounting aggression against the free independent States to the North."⁵

97. The words of my Foreign Minister have now been vindicated. We take no credit for crystal-gazing gifts, because the arrogance of the *apartheid* régime, its built-in aggressiveness against black people, and the support it continues to receive from some of the big Western Powers, were bound to lead to this state of affairs.

98. My Government calls upon this Council to take the following measures:

(a) to censure in the strongest possible terms the criminal aggression that has been perpetrated by the racist régime of Pretoria against the peace-loving people of Zambia;

(b) to demand an unequivocal apology from the *apartheid* régime of South Africa to Zambia through this Council for the criminal act of aggression;

(c) to demand that South Africa give a solemn and unreserved undertaking that it will in future scrupulously respect the territorial integrity of the sister Republic of Zambia and of all other sovereign independent African States in southern Africa.

99. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I highly appreciate the kind words addressed to me by the representative of Kenya.

⁵ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1949th meeting, para. 23.

100. The next speaker on the list is the representative of Nigeria. I invite him to be seated at the Council table and to make his statement.

101. Mr. ARIKPO (Nigeria): Mr. President, I am grateful to you for allowing me to participate in this debate. Your readiness to entertain this complaint and to make provision for the debate is another indication of your commitment to world peace and the protection of minorities. I take this opportunity to express special thanks to you.

102. It has become imperative for me to intervene once again, for the second time within a week, in your proceedings. When I had the honour to speak last week, [1587th meeting] it was on the question of South Africa's refusal to withdraw from Namibia. Today we are confronted with another aspect of this same problem, but a more serious aspect in that South Africa has perpetrated an aggression openly from the territory of Namibia against the territory of a sovereign State, the Republic of Zambia. Mr. Muller, the South African Foreign Minister, only a few minutes ago confirmed the reports carried by both Government and Opposition papers in South Africa, to the effect that the Prime Minister of South Africa had announced that South African military forces had been ordered by him to penetrate into Zambian territory, allegedly in pursuit of Namibian freedom fighters operating in the Caprivi Strip. He went on to say that if the pursuers were attacked on Zambian territory they would defend themselves, adding that South African soldiers would, if necessary, penetrate all the way to Lusaka, the capital.

103. Mr. Muller did imply that this statement had been made, although he said that the interpretation put on it by both Government and Opposition papers was irresponsible. Of course, it is very typical of him to applaud the press when it says things favourable to his Government and to condemn it when it speaks the truth. But before this august Council Mr. Muller has confirmed that this is in fact the policy of his Government: that on any occasion when freedom fighters within Namibia take refuge in a neighbouring African territory, it is the intention of his Government to carry the internal war in Namibia into that neighbouring African territory.

104. It is significant to note that the statement in question was made only two days ago by a man who for the last nine months has been busy trying to persuade his friends, to persuade Africans, to persuade the world that he has no aggressive designs against his independent African neighbours; a man who claims that he respects the sovereignty of independent African countries and desires nothing but dialogue with them.

105. The South African authorities have no evidence, and Mr. Muller produced none, to show that Zambia had anything to do with the laying of landmines by the victims of their wicked, oppressive administration, an administration which they have been labouring these last seven days to make the Council believe is progressive and selfless in the interest of the indigenous people of Namibia.

106. This minor incident of a few landmines placed by the dispossessed but courageous nationalist people of Namibia

has been used as a pretext for terrorizing the civilian population of Zambia, in the hope that the Governments of Zambia and other independent African countries will be forced to turn a blind eye to the barbarities that are being perpetrated against the indigenous people of Namibia in the name of Western civilization.

107. Contrary to Mr. Muller's assertion that this incident is irrelevant to the Namibia debate, I submit that in fact it underlines the whole issue. The General Assembly and the Security Council have time and again declared that South Africa's presence in Namibia is illegal, that the denial of the right to self-determination of the people of Namibia is morally wrong. Hence, even assuming that the Government of Zambia—a neighbouring African country—gives refuge to the nationalists who carried out this incident, is Zambia to be terrorized because it is doing what the United Nations says is right? I submit that this incident is most relevant to the Security Council's decision on the question of Namibia, now before it.

108. Those of us who are deeply concerned with the problem of southern Africa have emphasized over and over again the dangers posed to international peace and security by the continuation of the open defiance of the Government of South Africa and other minority régimes in that part of the continent. We have stressed time and again the need for the United Nations, particularly the Security Council, to nip in the bud a situation which potentially may erupt into a full-scale blood bath in that part of our continent. We have repeatedly stressed the threat which South Africa and its protégés pose to independent African countries in that region. What has been the reaction of those in this Council on whom lies the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security?

109. We are told a little while ago that the situation in southern Africa does not in fact constitute a threat to international peace and security. We were told that there is no need for direct, positive action to be taken by the Council under the appropriate provisions of the United Nations Charter, so, South Africa becomes more and more emboldened by such declarations on the part of the powerful members of the Council and the *apartheid* régime feels no restraint in committing open aggression against the territorial integrity of a United Nations Member State. I cannot believe that the most effective way to ensure peace is to condone evil. Black African States may be militarily weak today, but no one should regard that situation as permanent. The time will come when black African States will fight back, and at that time the world will not escape the effects of that fight.

110. The aggression by South African forces against the Republic of Zambia raises once again several questions which lie within the power of this Council to answer. First, it brings into focus, at a time when the Security Council is still in the process of considering the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice, one of the consequences of the continued occupation of Namibia by South Africa. The Caprivi Strip is not part of the territory of the Republic of South Africa, nor does South Africa claim that it is; it is part of Namibia. If South Africa were not

occupying Namibia illegally, there could have been no question of a South African officer being killed and four South African policemen being injured in a landmine explosion in the Caprivi Strip.

111. However, since South Africa continues to occupy Namibia illegally, with the connivance of powerful members of the Council which shelter behind legal technicalities in order to shirk their responsibilities, it is clear that the people of Namibia have been left no choice but to turn to armed struggle in order to secure their liberty. South Africa ought to realize that, for all its inhuman policies and all its repressive measures, it cannot completely kill the human yearning for freedom, and that the Namibians will continue, as long as the situation remains, to show in such positive ways that they are being illegally governed by the *apartheid* régime. And may I say that as long as there remains a single patriotic African on that continent, South Africa will enjoy no peace until the downtrodden, humiliated people in its wicked grip are freed. The Security Council, which is responsible for promoting peace throughout the world, not only in the white half but throughout the whole world—I repeat, the whole world—has a duty to curb the excesses of the present South African régime.

112. As I said earlier, South Africa's aggression against Zambia raises the vital issue of the security and territorial integrity of independent African countries in central and eastern Africa. Because of the financial and military support which South Africa enjoys from some Western Powers, that country has come to pose a serious and immediate military threat to those countries in the region that cannot reconcile their own policies of individual liberty at home with support for repression abroad. Thus, unless the Council takes seriously its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, South Africa, by its present policies, is likely to precipitate a catastrophic global racial war.

113. The sister Republic of Zambia, since assuming independence and membership of this Organization, has shown its devotion to all the ideals of the United Nations. Its esteemed leader, President Kenneth Kaunda, is widely acclaimed as a humanist and a man devoted to the cause of peace, freedom and justice. His stand on the South African issue has all along been based strictly on the provisions of the United Nations Charter and on the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which was reaffirmed again in the General Assembly [*resolution 2649 (XXV)*]. If the *apartheid* régime, therefore, is threatening—as it is—the peace-loving State of Zambia on account of its support of Namibians, it is in fact declaring war on the most cherished principles upon which this Organization is based. The truth that must be faced by the Council is that in southern Africa, as well as in Guinea (Bissau), there is open and continued denial of the principles of human equality and national self-determination which are enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

114. It is significant that in the past few months the incidence of open aggression by the colonial and racist régimes clinging on to Territories in Africa has become frequent. We were all living witnesses to the naked

aggression committed by Portugal on the territory of the Republic of Guinea. The Security Council, on the basis of eye-witness reports by some of its members, came to the conclusion that Portugal did invade Guinea, causing extensive loss in lives and property before the heroic resistance of the Guinean people turned back the aggressors. Only last week the Council received another report concerning aggression by Portugal against the Republic of Senegal. Today the Council has received from the Ambassador of Zambia a report of South African aggression against this country. If these incidents do not constitute grave threats to international peace and security, then perhaps the words "peace" and "security" have lost their meaning.

115. It is incumbent upon the Council to act decisively to safeguard the territorial integrity of all United Nations Member States, great or small. This incident is a further reason for the immediate removal of the South African administration from the Territory of Namibia, which the *apartheid* régime is now using to commit aggression against sovereign African States.

116. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am most grateful for the generous references to me made by the representative of Nigeria. They are characteristic of his generosity.

117. I have been informed that two other non-African States have become signatories of the letter I referred to earlier. They are Jamaica and India.

118. Mr. PRATT (Sierra Leone): We have listened with rapt attention to the complaint made by Zambia, and have also heard the explanation given by South Africa. The explanation given by Mr. Muller of South Africa is that, while not admitting that on the occasion in question South Africa violated Zambian sovereignty and territorial integrity, it is true nevertheless that South Africa on previous occasions violated Zambian sovereignty and territorial integrity, but that those were necessary violations due to the way the border lines run and to take-off and landing requirements for aircraft in the Caprivi Strip.

119. Mr. Muller went on to say that it was necessary to take action that might infringe upon the sovereignty of neighbouring States for the defence of the people of Namibia—which he called South West Africa—and for the defence of South Africa. Then he talked about putting down terrorists.

120. It is necessary for us to pause a while and determine who those terrorists are. Mr. Muller did not suggest that they were Zambians. If anything, he left us with the impression that they were Namibians. I shall revert to this in a moment.

121. He went on to say that certain articles or reports appearing in the South African press had been denied, thereby giving us the impression that he wanted us to believe that the mass media inside South Africa were unreliable and that those outside South Africa, such as *The New York Times* or *The Times* of London, from which he is in the habit of quoting, were much more reliable. Now, what can we conclude from that explanation? For my part, I have come to the following conclusions.

122. First, South Africa has admitted acts of violation of the territorial integrity of Zambia. We have a complaint; we have a reply. It is up to us to decide whom to believe. Zambia says that South Africa has committed violations on a number of occasions, culminating in the incident of 5 October. South Africa says: "Yes, I have been violating; but not on 5 October." It is up to us to decide whom to believe.

123. Secondly, South Africa has admitted that those "necessary" violations resulted from the fact that terrorists had been operating in South West Africa. I use its own words.

124. Now, when we hear about terrorists and we get admissions of violations of territorial sovereignty and we further get disclaimers, not about what Mr. Vorster said, but about the interpretation given to what he said, and when those statements concern an independent sovereign State, can we have any doubt whatever in our minds that those violations are indeed a threat to international peace and security within the meaning of Article 24 of the Charter? I am satisfied that they are—even on South Africa's explanation.

125. Those violations constitute interference in the affairs of independent States and, as we have heard in the Zambian complaint, if such violations and threats to international peace and security were to continue, Zambia would be perfectly ready to retaliate.

126. If we examine Mr. Muller's explanation even very briefly, we find that it is completely incredible, completely devoid of substance. Although I do not yet have the verbatim record of what he said, I shall examine a few of the allegations he made, which he wanted us to believe.

127. Let us take the question of the mines. It seems from Mr. Muller's statement that there were two mines: one which exploded on the 4th and one which exploded on the 5th. He left us with the impression that there were two, and only two, mines. It would have been helpful to us if he had given us the true position. Was there only one mine explosion on the 4th and only one mine explosion on the 5th? It appears from the reports which one sees in the press—although they are not before us here—that there was not only one mine explosion on the 4th, nor was there only one on the 5th. Indeed, Mr. Muller himself said that as a result of the explosion on the 4th the South African Government had to send members of the police force to make some further investigations—and at that time one of them appears, unfortunately, to have lost his life.

128. Now, was there only one mine? Did the South African expeditionary force find other mines? What was the origin of those mines? Who made them? Were they made by the terrorists? Were they made in Zambia?

129. And when I say all this, we must not forget that not so long ago we had the complaint of Senegal that Portugal, a NATO country, had laid mines on Senegalese soil, blowing up Senegalese citizens. We now hear, from the mouth of the South African representative, about land mines which had been laid on the border between South

West Africa and Zambia on the Caprivi Strip. Who laid them? To my delegation the answer is clear: the South Africans themselves laid them—not terrorists; not Zambians. There is a common pattern, developing all over Africa, in the acts of fascist régimes which want to retain their hold over Territories of which they ought not to be in control. It seems clear that this is a question of being stewed in one's own juice.

130. The next point in Mr. Muller's statement which needs clarification, and which in any case leaves us with no delusions whatever, is that there were footprints of four people. It would have been a good thing if we had been given some information about those footprints. In the first place, is the area of the Caprivi Strip sandy desert? Is it muddy waste? The information I have is that that area is hard soil. Now, this is not the rainy season in that part of the world. If it were the rainy season, one might expect to find mud, which would retain footprints. This, however, is not the rainy season there; and it is hard-soil area, an area in which, according to Mr. Muller himself, the South African police were operating vehicles before the explosion took place.

131. How, then, in dealing with such an area, should we expect anyone to start telling us about four footprints, or footprints of four persons—even to the extent of saying the footprints were seen coming from one direction, and the same footprints were seen going in another direction? I presume there were footprint microscopical analysers in the South African team, but we have not been able to get any further information about that.

132. Now, even if there were footprints, there is the second problem to be faced: were the footprints side-by-side, to decide that there were four? Is it the practice, if bombs are laid by terrorists, for the terrorists to walk four abreast in one direction, so that their footprints would be seen; and then to walk four abreast in another direction? This is what one might call, to use a Churchillian phrase, "a terminological inexactitude" in the statement we have heard from South Africa.

133. Next, still on the question of the footprints, we have been told nothing about the distance of the area from the Zambian border. Was it a question of only a few yards, was it a question of a few kilometres, or was it a question of a few miles—for the South African authorities to have come to the conclusion, following the trail of those four-abreast footprints, that it was leading towards Zambia? We have no information on the distance between the place where the mines exploded and the Zambian border. Yet we are asked to believe that the footprints were going towards the Zambian border.

134. As I have said, we have one person making a complaint and another trying to reply; and it is clear from the latter that the reply is without substance. Further, in that reply it is said that on 4 October one mine exploded and that on the next day, 5 October, another mine exploded: two separate days. Did Mr. Muller want us to believe that one set of mines was laid on 4 October and then, on the night of 4 October or the morning of 5 October, another set was laid? If so, could he tell us a

little more about the extent of the patrol the South African police conducts in this area, which the South Africans themselves have admitted is a trouble-spot?

135. The other day Mr. Muller tried to give us the impression that the Namibians were happy with South African rule. Today he admits to us for the first time that there are Namibian terrorists. I suppose that those Namibian terrorists are not Namibians, and they are satisfied and happy with South African rule. If that is not so, how can we try to reconcile the obviously irreconcilable?

136. Next, Mr. Muller and his friends have argued that the South West African question—or the question of Namibia—is not a threat to the peace. Now, we hear him telling us that the policy of the South African Government is, in so many words, a policy of violence and of the annihilation of terrorists and others who threaten the peace of South Africa and South West Africa. In effect, he admits that the situation in that area is a threat to international peace and security.

137. But that is not the only reason why I perhaps welcome Mr. Muller's statement. For what purpose has South Africa come to reply to the *Zambian complaint* and to participate in this debate? South Africa has all along been saying that the United Nations has no jurisdiction over Namibia. South Africa has all along been saying that it has undisputed control and rights of administration over Namibia. South Africa has all along been saying that the United Nations—and that includes South Africa's friends at the United Nations—and its organs have no call at all to interfere in the South African mandate. It is heartening to see that South Africa has at last sent its Foreign Minister to a United Nations organ to say that South Africa expects the United Nations to take a certain course of action in the matter of Namibia, a certain course of action as a result of Zambia's complaint, a certain course of action which by implication means that South Africa is coming round to accepting that the United Nations at last has some control over Namibia.

138. The Security Council should accept the South African challenge and tell South Africa to desist immediately from violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Zambia, even with aircraft that want to land. After all, not so long ago there was some dispute between the United Kingdom and Spain over Gibraltar. The corridor for aircraft was very narrow indeed, but so far as we know at no time did the United Kingdom utilize the narrowness of that corridor to violate the territorial integrity of Spain. South Africa should follow that worthy example.

139. The Security Council should also tell South Africa that for the maintenance of international peace and security it should remove its presence from Namibia.

140. This is a grave matter requiring urgent and immediate attention. We see the South African Premier, Mr. Vorster, instructing his Foreign Secretary, Mr. Muller, not to deny statements he allegedly made, but to deny the interpretation given those statements by his own internal press. He has not denied that he made the statements.

141. The Security Council should, then, draw its own conclusion as to whom to believe. When a Prime Minister attacks the integrity of his own loyal press, can we doubt that he will attack the territorial integrity of States that have attacked his favourite policy of *apartheid*?

142. The PRESIDENT: (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am informed that Botswana is also a signatory of the letter to which I referred earlier.

143. I have also received a letter from the representative of Guinea in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. In accordance with our rules of procedure and with past practice, and with the consent of the Council, I invite him to take the place reserved for him in the Council chamber, on the understanding that he will be seated at this table when he is called upon to participate in the debate.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. Touré (Guinea), took the place reserved for him.

144. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): My delegation has in various forums of the United Nations repeatedly emphasized that the racial policies pursued by South Africa and the measures it has taken to implement them present a great obstacle to the fulfilment of the purposes of the United Nations in the neighbouring colonial Territories in southern Africa, and constitute a direct threat to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of independent African States and to the peace and security of the whole region.

145. My delegation has always viewed the problems of southern Africa as being closely interrelated, and has always felt that the United Nations should deal with them by a co-ordinated programme of action.

146. It would not be out of context to consider the complaint of the Government of Zambia against South Africa concerning violations of Zambia's sovereignty and territorial integrity by South African armed forces against the background of a message which the Secretary-General addressed to the Third Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity held in Addis Ababa from 5 to 9 November 1966. Referring to the situation in southern Africa, the Secretary-General said:

"I see in all these problems, as I have said on previous occasions, common factors not only of geography but also of substance. Basically, they all challenge us to find ways of removing artificial, archaic and inequitable restraints that have been imposed by the few upon the many at the expense of political and human rights recognized and cherished almost everywhere in the world. The motives may differ. The present inequities may be inspired by fear of change in some hearts, by attitudes of outright racism in others. But the results are the same. The minority arrogates to itself the authority to prevent the expression by the majority of their right of self-determination and their enjoyment of fundamental freedoms. It achieves this position by purely artificial and arbitrary means, and increasingly by the threat or use of the modern instruments of force to which it alone has ready access; and in doing so it inescapably . . . sets race

against race, and builds up the tension, the mistrust and the hostility that are the ingredients of violence.

"I can think of no greater contribution which the States of Africa and their leaders can make in the immediate future to the peace, not only of their continent but also of the world, than to consider these problems and their common underlying causes in their totality, to look for solutions which no doubt have to be radical but which will also have to be peaceful, and to give to the international community as a whole a strong, clear guidance which it will need in order to bring universal support to these solutions."

147. The solutions to the southern African problems which the leaders of Africa were urged to make were eventually formulated and incorporated in the Lusaka Manifesto on Southern Africa,⁶ a Manifesto which was adopted by the Organization of African Unity and endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly.

148. That document attempted to explain to the international community, in as concise and lucid a manner as possible, the attitude of African nations towards the inhuman problems of *apartheid* and the injustice of minority rule, and towards those who deny self-determination to subject peoples which seek it. These policies and practices, which clearly run counter to the Charter of the United Nations and to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, have long been condemned by this Organization. As we all know, South Africa rejected the Manifesto as a starting-point for the solution of the interrelated problems of southern Africa. And so the southern Africa situation continues to deteriorate. We find in each of the explosive situations in southern Africa a consequence of the application of one or more of South Africa's pernicious policies.

149. Against this background, my delegation would like to express briefly its views on the complaint of the Government of Zambia and on some of the related issues. The charges are that on 5 October units of South African armed forces violated the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Zambia by entering the territory in speed-boats and helicopters, allegedly in pursuit of Namibian nationalists. The complaint states that these forces spent some time inside Zambian territory and then retreated to their military base at the Caprivi Strip.

150. News of this illegal incursion by South African forces was reported widely in the international press the following day. All pointed to the fact that the forces crossed the border on direct orders from Mr. Vorster who, according to *The Times* of London "dramatically interrupted the opening session of his National Party Congress in Pretoria" on the afternoon of 5 October to announce the move. *The Times* of London goes on to quote Mr. Vorster as saying: "It will be remembered that I said at this Congress last year that if terrorists came in our territory and attacked our people we reserve the right to pursue them wherever they might be."

⁶ *Ibid.*, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

151. Before looking further into the question, naturally we must ask ourselves, where is the Caprivi Strip? It is a long piece of land linking Namibia with the Zambezi River, and passes between Angola and Zambia to the north and Botswana to the south. The mines that exploded, causing casualties to the South African paramilitary police, are said to have been planted at a point about five miles from Katima Mulilo and well within Namibian territory.

152. A question which legitimately springs to my mind is this: what were South African paramilitary units doing on a Territory over which South Africa has no legal control, and which is in fact an international Territory of the United Nations? According to reports, the police involved in the incident belonged to a column 3,000 strong, and the build-up of the South African armed units in Namibia, particularly at this strategic point, is for the purpose of destroying the nationalistic activities of Namibian liberation forces and of sealing the frontiers so that none might escape into neighbouring areas.

153. For some years now South Africa has made no secret of the fact that it has been building up a large police and military presence in Namibia and employing weapons, aircraft and other military equipment supplied to it by Member States of this Organization, despite the imposition of an arms embargo by the Security Council. Time and again my delegation, in concert with other African and Asian States, has called attention to the dangerous situation that is developing in southern Africa and the need for resolute measures to contain and eliminate the threat.

154. Over the past three years this Council has adopted six resolutions, all affirming the illegality of South Africa's continued presence in Namibia. The latest one, resolution 283 (1970), went a step further than others in that it called upon all States to take specific actions that would emphasize the illegality of South Africa's presence and assert the authority of the United Nations. This Organization is already committed, by its own decision, to an irrevocable course of action. Namibia is now a direct responsibility of the United Nations and all States are obliged to assist the people of the Territory in shaping their own destiny. Indeed, most of the resolutions adopted by the Security Council and by the General Assembly affirm the inalienable rights of the people of Namibia to self-determination.

155. But the illegal presence of South Africa in the Territory constitutes a real obstacle to the achievement of that goal. Since such an illegal presence has been denounced by the United Nations, and since the United Nations has already approved the initiation of certain actions on the political, diplomatic and economic level against this illegality, then the fact must also be recognized and accepted that action taken by the people of Namibia themselves to resist that illegal occupation is legitimate.

156. Allow me, Mr. President, to return to the particular incident of 5 October, when South African armed forces were operating from a base in Namibia on which they had no right to be in the first place. It is somewhat strange that the incident, which has been extensively described in the world press, including that of South Africa, should now be

denied by the South African Government. But even if doubt is cast on the credibility of the world press singing in chorus the guilt of South Africa, we have the testimony of the aggrieved State, Zambia, which confirms the violation of its airspace, its sovereignty and its territorial integrity by the armed forces of South Africa.

157. The statement of the representative of Zambia points to possible motives behind the long series of violations which his Government complains have been committed by South Africa. It is widely known that the liberal and enlightened policies pursued by the Government of Zambia under the leadership of President Kaunda are diametrically opposed to the imperialistic and racist policies of the Pretoria régime. This Organization is aware of the threats that have been made against Zambia in the past by the South African régime and of its unsuccessful bid to win over the people and Government of Zambia to its point of view.

158. The Special Committee on *Apartheid*, together with the Special Committee on Decolonization, have issued many reports in recent years all pointing to the dangerous situation that is developing in the region. The oppressed non-white people of South Africa have begun to organize themselves effectively into militant units against the racist régime; the people of Namibia, encouraged by the support and sympathy of the international community, have now entered the militant phase of their struggle. Today they are better organized, better trained and better armed. No wonder the South African authorities are fearful; no wonder they are frustrated by the success of the Namibian liberation movement against their illegal presence in Namibia. Mr. Muller, in his statement, described these valiant people as terrorists. To us at the United Nations they are our wards.

159. Zambia, evidently, is being made the scapegoat for the failure of the South African forces and for the failure of South African policies. Zambia is being singled out by South Africa as the object for potential punitive action, because it happens to be the most influential and richest African State in the region which can withstand South African pressure tactics.

160. Equally, Zambia is being subjected by pressure to change its position on a principle by which Zambia and all of us here have gained our independence and sovereignty—the principle of the right to self-determination.

161. The questions to which we should address ourselves in this debate are these: First, in what manner can this Council best secure the effective and speedy withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia? Second, in what manner can this Organization best discharge its responsibilities to the people of Namibia, and how can it assist those people effectively in their struggle against South African armed repression? Third, in what manner can South Africa be induced to abandon its racist and imperialistic designs on southern Africa? Fourth, and last, in what manner can this Organization assist a Member State such as Zambia, which falls victim to the aggressive policies of the South African régime?

162. My delegation trusts that the debate on Namibia, of which the Security Council has been seized for the past 10 days, will resolve the first two questions. The third question will no doubt be brought to the attention of the Council at a later date when the debates on *apartheid*, the Portuguese Territories, and Southern Rhodesia are resumed. As for the last question, it is the view of my delegation that this Council should, in a clear and concise manner, draw attention to the principle that violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a State are contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, that the violations committed by South Africa against the sovereignty and territory of Zambia are to be condemned, and that South Africa must desist from committing any further violations.

163. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): Since this is the first time, Sir, that I have spoken since you assumed the high office of President of the Security Council, I should like to extend my congratulations to you. With your long experience in the field of diplomacy and international affairs, we feel sure that the grave historic problems with which we are dealing now will find their just solution under your wise guidance.

164. I wish also to thank and to express our appreciation to the outgoing President, the representative of Japan, for the wisdom, courtesy and perseverance with which he conducted the business of the Security Council. He did a wonderful job.

165. The Council has heard today the complaint of Zambia, a former member of the Security Council as put forward by its representative, Ambassador Mwaanga, with whom we have enjoyed wonderfully constructive co-operation. We have also heard the Foreign Ministers of Tanzania and Burundi, the Permanent Representative of Kenya, the Foreign Ministers of Nigeria and Sierra Leone and the Permanent Representative of Somalia. We have been informed of a letter in support of Zambia's complaint, signed by 38 African Member States and six non-African Member States. All of this indicates the great interest and importance which all these co-signatories and speakers attach to the complaint of Zambia.

166. In this complaint we are not dealing with a separate phenomenon; we are dealing with an indivisible phenomenon—that is, the phenomenon of imperialism and colonialism, already repeatedly condemned by the General Assembly and the Security Council. Therefore, when the South African speaker, Mr. Muller, rises in the Security Council to answer the representative of Zambia and begins by saying that we should set aside the political aspect and direct our attention to the complaint itself, he has already perpetrated the first fallacy. Why? Because we are dealing with a political situation which cannot be divorced from the ideological basis, the legal basis, or the moral basis of that political situation or complaint. Therefore, by recognizing that Mr. Muller's very starting-point is a fallacy, we must realize that all his other arguments collapse because they are fallacious and based on a fallacy.

167. I need not go into great detail to show this fallacy, because the speakers who preceded me have already, each and every one of them, referred to it. This is, to put it very

briefly, the régime of *apartheid*, condemned by the Security Council and the General Assembly, and the illegal presence of South Africa in Namibia, already declared illegal by the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice. Therefore, whatever the representative of South Africa wants to build upon as a rebuttal or reply to the representative of Zambia has no foundation whatsoever, because those very grounds have already been refuted, demolished and rejected by the Security Council itself, by the General Assembly and by the International Court of Justice.

168. This illegal foundation on which the speaker for South Africa has based his defence represents an unholy alliance and a phenomenon which manifests itself in various forms: it is *apartheid* in South Africa; it is an illegal rule in Namibia; it is a coalition or collusion with Southern Rhodesia, with Portugal in its Territory—and all of them without exception at one time or another have been condemned by this very Council for their rule of tyranny, oppression and denial of human rights. Therefore the Council is called upon to put teeth into its own resolutions so as to give meaning to the Charter and confidence to the peoples of the world when they turn, as small or weak States, to the Security Council or the General Assembly in order to find justice.

169. The Foreign Minister of Sierra Leone has dealt at length with Mr. Muller's answer on behalf of the South African régime. However, in addition to what has already been said, I should like to point out that we should not for one moment forget or lose sight of the fact that the Prime Minister in whose name he speaks is at best an unrepentant Nazi. This is his record, and such a record should not be forgotten.

170. In fact, while he was speaking I could not help but feel amused at what he was saying. For example, he mentioned instances of unauthorized border crossings of South African boats due to the twisting river boundaries, and said that South African aircraft violated the airspace of Zambia because of adverse winds. In the usual manner of people who are afraid of liberation movements and freedom fighters, he used—as we have heard several times in this Council—the word “terrorists” in referring to the freedom fighters who are trying to uphold human rights and the principles of the Charter. But I should like to make one point clear: that those “terrorists”, according to Mr. Muller, those freedom fighters, according to us, are actually fighting the battle of the United Nations; because according to the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice in which the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia has been confirmed and in which, in paragraphs 52 and 53, the right to self-determination has also been confirmed, those “terrorists” are not terrorists. They are actually fighting the war of the United Nations when the United Nations itself is unable to fight that war.

171. It has become not unusual in international affairs, especially in recent years, to hear of fabricated or pre-fabricated incidents, later proved completely false, in various parts of the world, in Asia, and in Africa, upon the assumption of which have been perpetrated an escalation of war or wars or pre-emptive attacks; and there is now quite a large vocabulary to describe such actions.

172. However, I wish to draw particular attention to point (20) of the complaint of the Ambassador of Zambia, in which he says:

“On 4 March 1971, two South African soldiers entered Zambia on foot at about 1600 hours at Katima Mulilo. They . . . inquired about the movement of the Zambian paramilitary police. One of them was arrested and prosecuted. His friend managed to escape.”

That is an undeniable fact. Could Mr. Muller deny that fact?

173. Then point (23) states:

“On the same day, 9 May 1971, a South African military boat . . . VASBYT 305034, was found on the Zambian side of the Zambezi River near Sesheke. South African army personnel later claimed it, saying that they had run out of petrol during what they called ‘patrols’.”

That is very clear-cut proof of the confession of guilt by the South African authorities themselves, not to speak of the confession of guilt as we heard it from Mr. Muller.

174. The representative of Zambia, Ambassador Mwaanga, in closing his complaint, made a very adequate, valid and moving appeal which ought to be remembered by the members of the Security Council. He said:

“As members of the Security Council, you have assumed crucial positions of leadership in the international community. You must have the courage to exercise not only paramount but responsible authority over our affairs. Leadership, to be worth exercising and asserting, must be genuine, responsible, and in the interest of those over whom it is being exercised. Your leadership, without wider morality, is brutal leadership and is not worthy of the human society.”

I believe that those words are in full harmony with the Charter of the United Nations and that they place the Security Council face to face with its responsibility in this grave situation.

175. In response to that call, the delegations of Burundi, Sierra Leone, Somalia and Syria, my own delegation have formulated and are submitting to the Council a draft resolution [S/10365] which I have the honour to present on their behalf. Like all resolutions it has preambular paragraphs, which are factual. The preambular paragraphs read as follows:

“*Having received* the letter of the representative of Zambia contained in document S/10352 and also the letter from forty-six Member States contained in document S/10364,

“*Taking note* of the statement made by the representative of Zambia at its 1590th meeting, concerning violations of the sovereignty, airspace and territorial integrity of Zambia by South Africa,

“*Mindful* that violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a State constitute a threat to international peace and security,

"Gravely concerned that violations of this nature seriously undermine the independence, peace and stability of neighbouring independent African States,

"Conscious of its responsibility under Article 24, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the Charter of the United Nations".

So in these preambular paragraphs we have statements of fact concerning a complaint that has been submitted to the Security Council and supported by a large number of States. This complaint has as its subject the violations which have been perpetrated against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a Member State of the United Nations, violations which certainly should cause grave concern among the members of the Council and remind the Council of its responsibility under the Charter.

176. These violations having been ascertained and confirmed, we proceed to the operative paragraphs of the draft resolution, as follows:

"1. Condemns the violations of the sovereignty, air-space and territorial integrity of Zambia by South Africa;

"2. Declares that such violations are contrary to the Charter of the United Nations;

"3. Calls upon South Africa to respect fully the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Zambia and desist forthwith from any violation thereof;

"4. Further declares that in the event of a refusal by South Africa to comply with this resolution, the Security Council will meet again to consider further appropriate steps or measures in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter."

These operative paragraphs follow logically from the preambular paragraphs. The required condemnation, the declaration that these violations are contrary to the Charter, the call upon South Africa to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of another Member State: all are in full harmony with the Charter. And operative paragraph 4 constitutes a warning, adequate and valid, to South Africa not to repeat its actions.

177. This draft resolution has already been handed to the Secretariat and will be circulated. It is also the desire of the co-sponsors that a vote on this draft resolution should be taken at the next meeting of the Security Council.

178. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am grateful to the representative of Syria for the kind words he addressed to me regarding my conduct of the Presidency. I am particularly appreciative because these words were spoken by a distinguished diplomat and a chivalrous friend whom I esteem very highly.

179. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Security Council has not yet had time to complete its consideration of a whole series of questions concerning the situation on the African continent brought about by the policy of the

Republic of South Africa and Portugal, when yet another urgent question, which the Government of Zambia has been obliged to submit to the Council, appears on the agenda. This concerns a number of serious incidents and violations of the sovereignty, airspace and territorial integrity of an independent, sovereign African State, Zambia, by the armed forces of the Government of South Africa.

180. In his clear and convincing statement at this meeting of the Security Council the representative of Zambia, Ambassador Mwaanga, cited a long list of incontrovertible facts demonstrating the continuation of acts of aggression by the South African racists against Zambia and its people. It is common knowledge that the most recent of these acts of aggression was committed a few days ago, on 5 October, when South African armed forces invaded Zambian territory in the neighbourhood of the Caprivi Strip, situated in Namibia. Thus a young, independent African State, the Republic of Zambia, has yet again been the victim of aggression by the racist colonialist Pretoria régime. This invasion of the territory of the Republic of Zambia by the armed forces of the Republic of South Africa is not denied, but is in fact admitted by Prime Minister Vorster of the Republic of South Africa himself, as many earlier speakers at this meeting have already pointed out. At the same time, the rulers of South Africa are dredging up the pretext, much resorted to by *provocateurs* of all kinds, of alleged infiltration by certain terrorists. The aggressor cynically asserts that if the invading armed forces are attacked, they will "defend themselves". In other words, an aggressor who has invaded the territory of another State insolently declares that he will "defend himself" if the owners of the territory, the Zambians, attempt to offer him the resistance he deserves.

181. Even more outrageous in its insolence is the aggressor's declaration that those mythical terrorists will be pursued, if necessary, to the capital of Zambia, to Lusaka itself.

182. It has already been pointed out here that, while the Security Council is considering ways and means of implementing earlier United Nations decisions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council on the liberation of Namibia in the light of the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice, the South African racists are using that international Territory as a base for aggression against the independent African State of Zambia. This demonstrates once more the importance and urgency of the request of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its eighth ordinary session⁷ for the convening of an emergency session of the Security Council.

183. Recent facts and events have shown that imperialism and colonialism, whose vanguard on the African continent are South Africa, Portugal and Southern Rhodesia, do not stop short of direct acts of aggression against African countries. In addition to the acts of aggression against Senegal and the Republic of Guinea, against the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the People's Republic of the Congo and against Tanzania and Zambia which lie on their

⁷ Held in Addis Ababa from 21 to 23 June 1971.

guilty consciences, the colonialists are continuing their war of attrition against the African peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). The non-white population of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia is in the grip of slavery and racial discrimination. The Republic of South Africa is illegally occupying the territory of Namibia and using it for acts of aggression against other States. It is in the Caprivi region in north-eastern Namibia, on the Zambian border, that South Africa has established a military base with airstrips and a ground-to-ground rocket system.

184. From these bases the South Africans carry out reconnaissance flights over Zambia and over another African country, Tanzania. At those same bases decisions are taken on diversionary operations which, according to press reports, are organized by the South Africans in Zambia for the purpose of intimidation.

185. Hardly anybody can be unaware of South Africa's role as an intermediary in supplying Rhodesia's army and air forces. In addition to the arms which it receives from NATO, Portugal is also supplied with arms through South Africa. There is every evidence of a most diabolical union between the three colonial Powers, backed by the major partner of this alliance, the Western Powers, especially the member States of NATO.

186. There is no doubt that, despite its impressive economic and military strength, South Africa would nevertheless be unable to defy the Security Council, the United Nations as a whole and the demands of all progressive mankind if it was genuinely isolated and received no outside aid.

187. There is hardly any need to cite further facts and figures about the interests of Western monopolies in the Republic of South Africa and in Namibia, since they are well known throughout the world and were produced fairly recently at a meeting of the Security Council. As Mr. Eline-winga, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Tanzania, quite rightly pointed out in his statement, those permanent members of the Security Council which continue to co-operate on a large scale with South Africa must discontinue all support for the aggressor, the racist colonialist régime of Pretoria.

188. We fully agree with the statements made by representatives of African States at recent meetings of the Security Council urging the Council to require the major partners of the Republic of South Africa to comply strictly with the decisions of the United Nations and the Security Council on the question of southern Africa, in order to deprive the racist régime of the Republic of South Africa of all support.

189. The Soviet Union is pursuing an unswerving course of supporting the liberation of all peoples from colonial rule and the total elimination of colonialism and racism. The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, L. I. Brezhnev, setting forth the programme of the Party's and the country's fight for peace and international co-operation at a recent Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, announced on behalf of the entire Soviet people that the

Soviet Union advocates the full implementation of the decisions of the United Nations concerning the elimination of the remaining colonial régimes, and that all manifestations of racism and *apartheid* call for universal condemnation and boycott.

190. The Soviet Union whole-heartedly supports the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on the problems of southern Africa, and implements them consistently. The task is to ensure that these resolutions are implemented by all States, that they are put into practice and that they become a reality.

191. In the opinion of the Soviet delegation, the Security Council must make serious efforts to solve the problem of aggression by the Republic of South Africa against Zambia. It is in the interests of peace and security and of respect for the United Nations Charter that the aggressor should be condemned, that he should be duly punished for his crimes, and that effective steps should be taken to prevent the recurrence of similar acts of aggression.

192. Only such an approach on the part of the Security Council will be consistent with the performance by this high authority of the fundamental task entrusted to it by the peoples: the maintenance of international peace and security.

193. Mr. President, we have listened with great attention to the statement of the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, Ambassador Tomeh, and have studied the draft resolution submitted by four members of the Security Council: Burundi, Sierra Leone, Somalia and Syria; and I am pleased to announce that the Soviet delegation supports this draft resolution and the proposal that it should be voted upon at the time suggested by the Ambassador of Syria.

194. Mr. KUŁAGA (Poland) (*interpretation from French*): Before taking up the item on our agenda, I should like, Mr. President, briefly but cordially to offer you the congratulations of my delegation on your accession to the post of President of the Security Council. Two years of co-operation with you and, during those two years, three months under your chairmanship, enable me to express the certainty that under your guidance the Security Council will be able to settle the problems before it successfully, and that you will preside over our meetings with the distinction that is characteristic of you.

195. I also wish to congratulate our colleague from Japan, who so ably presided over the Council during the month of September.

196. Turning now to the item on our agenda for today, with the complaint of Zambia a new page has been added to the history of colonialist and racist misdeeds in Africa: violation of the territory of Zambia by the armed forces of South Africa.

197. For some time past the Council has had on its agenda a series of items listed by the African States. All of them have factors in common.

198. The first of these is the continuing aggressiveness of the colonialist and racist forces in Africa. We have not yet completed our study of the situation in Namibia, where the culprit, South Africa, clings to its stubborn, illegal attitude of defiance of the United Nations and of the political decisions and legal pronouncements of the world community as contained in the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice; we have barely undertaken an examination of two other cases of colonialist aggression and a study of the reports of special missions of the Security Council sent to Senegal and the Republic of Guinea, when a new act of aggression intervenes and the sovereignty and territorial integrity of an independent African State is once again violated, in this case Zambia. For those who had already been pondering the practical measures to be taken so as finally to implement the moral and legal principles and political decisions for the liberation of Namibia, that the Republic of South Africa should have brought us, first, a categorical denial in the statement made by the Foreign Minister early in the week [1589th meeting] and, today, a characteristic reply by saying that under an alleged right of hot pursuit the South African forces will defend themselves if attacked, is really the last straw. By virtue of a right which is not a right—for it is simply an aggressive notion of hot pursuit, which is universally rejected—the South African armed forces will use force in a sovereign State whose sovereignty they have violated, should that State take measures to defend itself against external aggression! Such a theory can in no way be accepted by us, and must be resolutely rejected and condemned.

199. The second factor is the systematic nature of these attacks. We know the facts of the problem: systematic acts of aggression on the part of Portugal against its neighbours. We have heard today the statement made by the representative of Zambia, Ambassador Mwaanga. These new acts of aggression which he has emphasized, whose intensity, frequency and gravity increase in terms of the hesitation of the Council towards the aggressor—a hesitation due to the attitude of certain Members of the Council—give fresh proof of this truth.

200. The third common factor is the extension of that policy of systematic aggression against independent African States. The logic of colonialism requires that it should extend to independent States its policy of aggression against people under colonial occupation. That dangerous, inadmissible logic is unacceptable, and we have denounced it repeatedly in the Council. What is particularly inadmissible is that these acts of aggression are launched from Territories which are themselves a prey to racism and colonialism. I am thinking now of Namibia, in the issue under discussion, and of Guinea (Bissau), in the case of the other two items on our agenda.

201. The fourth common factor is the threat to peace and security which these systematic acts of aggression constitute for Africa and therefore for the world. After the statements made by all our colleagues at this table, and particularly those of the Foreign Ministers of Sierra Leone and Nigeria, I do not think it necessary to add to what has been said on the subject.

202. The fifth factor is the encouragement and assistance which colonialism and racism receive from a number of Western States: economic, military and political assistance. I have had occasion in the past to point out that these States provide colonialism and racism with the weapons they systematically use against the national liberation movements and now, in an equally systematic manner, against the independent African States; they further provide a shield to protect colonialism and racism so that no effective action can be taken against such criminal systems. The statements made here today, particularly that of Ambassador Mwaanga of Zambia, prove that this argument is still valid.

203. We have carefully listened to all the statements made during the debate today. In particular we heard the sober statement made by Ambassador Mwaanga, a long-time friend for whom I have the greatest respect.

204. The position which my delegation takes will be consistent with the policy we have adopted with regard to the peoples struggling for liberation and the independent African States fighting colonialism and aggression, and in support of the victims of these evils.

205. We will support any measure in the Council to put an end to these aggressive acts, and any decision of the Council to liberate Namibia and all the African States which are still under the domination of colonialism and racism. We are in favour of concrete, effective and immediate measures in this matter.

206. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am very grateful to Ambassador Kujaga for his kind words in regard to myself. He knows how much I appreciate his confidence in me, and I am honoured by his words. They come from a most respected Ambassador and a highly esteemed friend.

207. The next speaker on my list is the representative of Zambia, on whom I now call.

208. Mr. MWAANGA (Zambia): I apologize for having to speak at such a late hour, but I thought that in the light of the statement made by the South African Foreign Minister I should make a few observations which are relevant to the case now under consideration.

209. My delegation listened with great interest and attention to what the champion of *apartheid*, Mr. Muller, had to say in his role of "His Master's Voice". When we made our factual charges in a properly-documented manner, we would have been surprised had the Foreign Minister of South Africa admitted his country's guilt for the criminal acts committed by its occupation forces in the international Territory of Namibia. Mr. Muller's statement has, if anything, served to confirm our charges and also goes to show that South Africa has aggressive intentions against our country. I thank Mr. Muller for this unsolicited support.

210. My country has no air base anywhere near its border with the international Territory of Namibia. There is no war between the people of Zambia and the people of Namibia. On the contrary, we have maintained traditionally

good relations with them over the years. The problem is, and has always been, the South African occupation forces which Mr. Muller is representing here.

211. We have refugee camps in Zambia for people who are running away from the oppression and tyranny of the South African régime. We have an obligation under international law to receive refugees who leave their countries because of persecution, be it political or otherwise. We therefore have a duty to the international community in this regard, and we shall continue to discharge this responsibility religiously.

212. The South African Foreign Minister conveniently omitted to answer the specific charges I made in my statement, and we have taken note of that. Mr. Muller admitted that South African aircraft have violated Zambia's territorial integrity. He further stated: "In the case of aircraft, [the violations] occur because the planes, owing to the wind direction, have to cross the border in the course of normal take-off and landing procedures."

213. I stated that South Africa's violations have included helicopters, and it is indeed laughable that South African helicopters have been violating Zambia's territorial integrity merely as the result of what Mr. Muller described as "the twisting river boundary".

214. We therefore reject Mr. Muller's entire statement as cheap and unworthy of any serious consideration. It is obviously intended for domestic consumption inside South Africa. We further reject most firmly Mr. Muller's rejection of our statement. We hope that the Council will dismiss Mr. Muller's statement with the contempt it more than deserves.

215. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): There are no further names on the list of speakers. Accordingly, it is my intention to adjourn this meeting and, with the consent of the Council, to convene the next meeting for Monday at 4 p.m., to continue the consideration of the complaint by Zambia.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в нашем 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.
