



UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-SEVENTH YEAR

1639th MEETING: 4 FEBRUARY 1972

ADDIS ABABA

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1639)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Consideration of questions relating to Africa of which the Security Council is currently seized and implementation of the Council's relevant resolutions	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

SIXTEEN HUNDRED AND THIRTY-NINTH MEETING

Held in Africa Hall, Addis Ababa, on Friday, 4 February 1972, at 8.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Mansour KHALID (Sudan).

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

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1639)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Consideration of questions relating to Africa of which the Security Council is currently seized and implementation of the Council's relevant resolutions.

The meeting was called to order at 9.40 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Consideration of questions relating to Africa of which the Security Council is currently seized and implementation of the Council's relevant resolutions

1. The PRESIDENT: At the outset I wish to outline the procedure which it is my intention to follow. It is based, on the one hand, on the order in which documents have been submitted and, on the other, on the actual availability of the documents. Our discussion and voting will relate first to the question of Southern Rhodesia and the three-Power draft resolution contained in document S/10606, which was distributed two days ago. As the revised draft resolution on Portuguese Territories is not yet available, it is my intention to take up the second topic, concerning the question of *apartheid* in South Africa, and the five-Power draft resolution contained in document S/10609/Rev.1. We shall then take up, as the last issue, the topic concerning Territories under Portuguese administration, and we hope to have received in due time the revised text of the three-Power draft resolution originally circulated in document S/10607.
2. As I hear no objection, I take it that the Council wishes to follow the procedure which I have outlined.
3. We shall therefore begin with the draft resolution on Southern Rhodesia.
4. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote before the vote.

5. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia): My delegation thinks that the draft resolution on Southern Rhodesia [S/10606] introduced by three African members, in expressing the views and demands of the whole African Group, merits our support and enables the Council to take a favourable decision. Addressing itself both to the topical phases of the current situation in Southern Rhodesia and to the basic requirements of a just solution, the draft resolution, in its preambular paragraphs, states some of the major reasons and the basic starting positions for the Council's action.

6. We are all indeed gravely concerned at the dangerous political situation in Southern Rhodesia, including the latest brutal acts of suppression. Both the overwhelming opposition of the African people of Southern Rhodesia to the proposals for a settlement¹ and the further dangerous aggravation of the situation in Rhodesia and, subsequently, in the whole of Africa, because of the attempt to present these proposals as the only future that the people of Zimbabwe must accept, are the basic realities of the situation.

7. The draft resolution rightly notes all the resolutions that this Council has adopted concerning Rhodesia so far, resolutions in which we have many times asked for specific measures, acts and restraints mandatory upon the administering Power and other Member States. They have postulated inalienable political principles which must be observed in bringing about majority rule in Rhodesia--principles firmly enshrined in all our basic documents and decisions. The draft resolution notes also that the decisions of the Council forbidding trade with the illegal régime are being violated.

8. In its operative paragraphs, the draft resolution commends itself by its requests, which are at once firm, responsible and realistic. It *inter alia* repeats former resolutions in reaffirming that the present situation in Southern Rhodesia constitutes a threat to international security. It calls upon the United Kingdom to take all appropriate measures to safeguard the people of Zimbabwe against further brutal acts. It urges the United Kingdom, as a matter of urgency, to desist from implementing the settlement proposals and expresses the firm belief that a constitutional conference should be convened, describes this constitutional conference and urges the United Kingdom to convene it, again as a matter of urgency. It calls upon all of us to take more stringent measures in order to

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971*, document S/10405.

assure the full implementation of sanctions. I shall not, of course, enumerate here all the other elements of the draft resolution which we support.

9. We also think that this draft resolution merits our favourable decision because of its restraint, especially considering the dangerous situation, aggravation and provocation to which the people of Southern Rhodesia and the whole of Africa are currently being submitted by the whole approach and prospects concerning the so-called proposals for settlement.

10. What the draft resolution is asking for is really the barest minimum. It shows the realism and statesmanship of the African delegations.

11. We have heard here many angry statements and many demands which go much beyond what we have here in the draft resolution. The Council was asked to condemn directly the proposals for settlement; to condemn the United Kingdom for its failure to protect African populations in Southern Rhodesia; to ask the United Kingdom directly to withdraw the Pearce Commission immediately, and so forth. By being just and addressing itself to the basic requirement of the situation created by the latest action of the United Kingdom and the Smith régime, the draft resolution does reflect a spirit of flexibility as well.

12. In concluding this short statement in explanation of my vote, I should like to mention briefly just a few guiding considerations that motivate our delegation in dealing with the current Rhodesian situation and in considering it.

13. Firstly, we reject absolutely the false dilemma that the people of Zimbabwe either have to accept the proposals for settlement or otherwise must be visited by the horrors of *apartheid*. To agree to that proposition, directly or by implication, is to suggest to the people of Southern Rhodesia to stop struggling, to stop believing in the rights of man. It is to deny the whole *raison d'être* of the United Nations and the Security Council, which exists just in order not to permit the peoples of the world to be confronted with such dilemmas.

14. Secondly, we fully understand and support the people of Southern Rhodesia when they ask for the Pearce Commission to leave their country. They have already paid too much in blood and lives and in suffering in prisons. From the beginning of its work it demonstrated what we already knew anyway—that the people of Zimbabwe would not want to sign for their own further enslavement. They must look upon the Pearce Commission as part and parcel of the whole structure of the proposals for settlement. We understand their unwillingness to entrust their whole future to a commission and test of that kind, to the interpretation of its findings by the United Kingdom Government and the Smith régime.

15. Thirdly, in permitting the approach exemplified by the proposals for a settlement to become acceptable in any of its major elements we should gravely risk setting a precedent contrary to the spirit and letter of all our basic documents and decisions, contrary to the minimum basic requirements of justice, contrary to the minimum basic

rights and demands of the people of Zimbabwe, of Africa, and, indeed, of the whole world. We must not even by implication become a party to that.

16. Fourthly, in the meantime the entire international community, especially States Members of the United Nations, should rigorously continue to apply political, economic and diplomatic sanctions against the régime in Southern Rhodesia until its racist rule is brought to an end. On this occasion we wish to express the hope that the Governments of all countries will do their utmost to exercise strict sanctions against the Ian Smith régime.

17. Finally, we share an inescapable obligation—the duty to make it impossible for any people of the world, and not just the people of Southern Rhodesia, to be confronted with the dilemma I have mentioned. For us, there is no dilemma here. That is why the Yugoslav delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution now before the Council.

18. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): I should like to state our views in regard to the draft resolution on Southern Rhodesia [S/10606]. The Chinese delegation has studied the draft resolution which will be put to the vote. Our opinion is as follows.

19. First, with regard to operative paragraphs 6 and 7 of the draft resolution, about urging the United Kingdom Government to convene a constitutional conference, the Chinese Government has consistently held that Britain should immediately end the colonialist rule of the white racist régime of Southern Rhodesia so that the Zimbabwe people may achieve national independence without any outside interference. This is the universal desire and sacred right of the Zimbabwe people. Therefore, we have reservations about these paragraphs.

20. Secondly, the heroic struggle now being waged by the Zimbabwe people is entirely just. The Security Council should call on the Governments and peoples of all countries to give active support and solidarity to the just struggle of the Zimbabwe people. Moreover, it must be pointed out that the barbarous repression of the Zimbabwe people by the Smith white racist régime is being carried out with the connivance of the British Government with the very aim of forcibly pushing through their fraud of the so-called settlement proposals. Therefore the Council should not only condemn the Smith racist régime of Southern Rhodesia but also condemn its accomplice, the British Government. In addition, the Council should condemn the United States Government and other countries for violating the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. The draft resolution is not satisfactory since it fails to include the above contents.

21. With these reservations, the Chinese delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

22. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation supports the proposals made by the three African delegations in the Security Council, which have been submitted on behalf of

all the African States and are designed to put an end to the monstrous crimes, violence and terror perpetrated by the racist Salisbury régime against the Zimbabwe people.

23. We do not feel this draft resolution [S/10606] to be sufficient. It has gaps. The major gap is that it does not stress the responsibility of the United Kingdom and its Government for everything that is happening in Southern Rhodesia, and for the fact that this problem has not yet been solved and that the Zimbabwe people is deprived of its freedom and independence and still remains in colonialist and racist slavery.

24. In the past few days dozens of African patriots have died in Southern Rhodesia, and a large number of participants in demonstrations have been wounded while justly and legitimately demanding freedom and independence for their country. The bloody reprisals taken by the racists against peaceful demonstrations in the Rhodesian towns of Shabani, Salisbury, Umtali and Gwelo and the mass arrests of patriots have again shown the bestial face of the racist fascist régime at Salisbury.

25. For everything which is now happening in Southern Rhodesia the Government of the United Kingdom bears a direct and first-hand responsibility; after a number of manoeuvres, it embarked last November on a course of direct collusion with the handful of colonists and racists who have unlawfully usurped power in Southern Rhodesia and are cruelly oppressing the indigenous population of the Country.

26. The events now occurring in Southern Rhodesia leave no doubt as to the attitude of the Zimbabwe people to the so-called Home-Smith agreement. Every day reports come in—and they can also be read on the pages of the English press, particularly in *The Times*—that in spite of the terror, threats and persecution, the African population of the country is by all the means available to it demonstrating its negative attitude to the collusion between the Conservative Government of the United Kingdom and the Southern Rhodesian racists. It is in vain that the colonialists and racists, together with their imperialist friends and protectors, have attempted to confuse the Zimbabwe people and trick it into agreeing to the so-called “proposals for a settlement”.

27. The reaction of the Zimbabwe people to this agreement is fully justified. The Zimbabwe people have seen without any difficulty that this shameful racist-imperialist deal between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Southern Rhodesian racists aims at consolidating for an unspecified period the domination of the racist régime in Southern Rhodesia, which is pursuing a policy of racial discrimination, segregation and *apartheid* against the 5 million indigenous people of Southern Rhodesia, the Zimbabwe people. The agreement is a direct encroachment on the inalienable rights of the Zimbabwe people to freedom and independence, an open challenge to African peoples and to all of world public opinion, and a gross violation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and a whole series of other United Nations resolutions.

28. The Home-Smith agreement is based on the theory of racial supremacy, the imperialist “theory” that the African population is purportedly not ready or able to run its own country or decide its own destiny. This is clear from statements by the head of the Southern Rhodesian racists himself.

29. On 1 December 1971, Smith, replying in a television interview to the question when in his opinion the Africans would be able to take over the government of the country, cynically stated: “At the moment, I don’t believe they are fit to govern the country. What the position will be in 100 years’ time or 1,000 years’ time isn’t easy to predict . . .”. Apparently the racist Smith is dreaming of a thousand years of domination by the Southern Rhodesian racists over the Zimbabwe people. These dreams are as ephemeral and as unrealizable as Hitler’s dreams and plans for establishing a thousand-year racist empire of the “Third Reich”, dominating the peoples of the whole world, turned out to be.

30. Representatives of African countries have stated at Security Council meetings, both in New York and at Addis Ababa, that after a detailed study of the Home-Smith agreement they have reached the conclusion that the political essence and the foundation of this agreement are clearly racist and imperialist. This deal was rejected by the vast majority of Members of the United Nations at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly. Of 102 delegations participating in the voting, 94 voted for a resolution resolutely condemning this racist-imperialist deal. Consequently, the vast majority of the United Nations will not accept this colonialist deal, which was concluded at the expense of the interests of the Zimbabwe people. The Organization of African Unity has described the deal as open treason against future generations of 5 million Africans by 243,000 white Rhodesians connected with white domination and *apartheid*.

31. In order to give this shameful deal a semblance of legality, London has with cynical hypocrisy established a special commission, headed by Lord Pearce and consisting wholly of experienced United Kingdom colonial officials who have stifled the freedom and independence of colonial peoples, for the alleged purpose of ascertaining the “acceptability” of the Anglo-Rhodesian agreement to the various racial groups in Rhodesia. However, when the Commission arrived at Salisbury, it was met by disturbances and protests on the part of the African population of Rhodesia, which in spite of the terror and intimidation said a clear and categorical “No” to the Home-Smith deal.

32. While representatives of the United Kingdom, under the leadership of Sir Alec Douglas-Home, were conducting talks on the consolidation of the racist ranks in Southern Rhodesia, the United States was adopting the decision to remove the ban on imports of chrome ore from Southern Rhodesia which has already been referred to more than once during these meetings. This is a direct violation of the obligations incumbent upon all Members of the United Nations under Security Council resolutions concerning the application of strict sanctions against the Southern Rhodesian racist régime.

33. The actions of the United Kingdom and the United States with regard to Southern Rhodesia and the other colonialist and racist régimes in southern Africa have a common basis; they are directly linked with the plans of the imperialist Powers for uniting and consolidating the militarist colonialist bloc in southern Africa, in order to bar the way of the national liberation movements among the African peoples which are still oppressed by colonialists and racists and to threaten the independence of sovereign African States.
34. We should like to emphasize here again, as clearly as possible, that the Soviet Union resolutely condemns the United Kingdom deal with the racist Smith régime which has usurped power in Southern Rhodesia. We reject any manoeuvres designed to lend that illegal racist régime a semblance of "legality".
35. The Soviet delegation, like the vast majority of Members of the United Nations, firmly and resolutely advocates the adoption of the most effective and efficient measures to remove the racist régime in Southern Rhodesia and to transfer power to the country's lawful owners, the Zimbabwe people.
36. In view of the fact that the three African representatives on the Security Council, supported by the vast majority of African delegations, have introduced this draft resolution and consider it acceptable at the present stage, the delegation of the Soviet Union will support the draft resolution and will vote for it. We consider it the very minimum which the Council should do at the present time.
37. Under operative paragraph 6, the Security Council would advocate that a constitutional conference should be convened, without delay, in which the African people, through their genuine representatives, would be able to participate in the formulation of new proposals for the political and constitutional advancement of their country. In view of the position of the United Kingdom Government, and of its deal with the Southern Rhodesian racists, it is difficult to count on such an approach producing positive results acceptable to the Zimbabwe people. However, if this paragraph is adopted by the Security Council, the Soviet delegation will feel it necessary to insist on it, and to stress that the outstanding leaders of the ZANU (Zimbabwe African National Union) and ZAPU (Zimbabwe African People's Union) parties, who are known throughout the world, and who have now been thrown in gaol by the Southern Rhodesian racists and are under arrest, should participate in the conference. We are referring to Nkomo and Sithole. If this paragraph of the draft resolution submitted by the African delegations is adopted, and if such a conference takes place, an essential condition for it must be the participation of these outstanding leaders of the Zimbabwe people.
38. In conclusion, I should like to recall what was said in the Soviet delegation's statement yesterday [*1637th meeting*]: that voting on the draft resolution submitted to the Security Council by three African delegations, and also on that submitted by the delegations of India and Yugoslavia during the Council's meetings in Africa, would show not only the peoples of Africa, but also the whole world, who are the friends and allies of the African people and who is the ally, friend and protector of the colonialists and racists in Africa. For the United Kingdom, we said, the vote on these draft resolutions would be a test of the acceptability to that country of the freedom and independence of the peoples enslaved by racist colonists in southern Africa. The whole world will realize where the United Kingdom stands, whose side it is on; on the side of the enslavers of the African peoples or on the side of the enslaved African peoples. This is a test for the United Kingdom and its Conservative Government of the acceptability of freedom and independence for Africa.
39. Mr. NAKAGAWA (Japan): My delegation is deeply disturbed by the recent turbulence in South Rhodesia and fully shares the concern expressed by African leaders in this Council. Therefore, we firmly support operative paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the draft resolution contained in document S/10606. I should also like to express the support of my delegation for operative paragraph 8 calling for the full implementation of sanctions decided upon by the Security Council and I should also like to reiterate the determination of my Government to apply faithfully the provisions of the relevant Security Council resolutions until the rebellion has been brought to an end and the illegal situation has been terminated in Southern Rhodesia. In particular, Japan has been fully and faithfully applying the economic sanctions mandated by the relevant Council resolutions. Japan therefore has no trade or any other economic relations with Southern Rhodesia in contradiction of the decisions of the Council. However, we have certain reservations about operative paragraph 5.
40. Last December, when the Security Council considered the question of Southern Rhodesia, I expressed the view [*1623rd meeting*] that it was not appropriate for the Council to reject the so-called proposals for a settlement before the will of the Zimbabwe people had been ascertained, as proposed by the Government of the United Kingdom, the administering Power. Although the so-called test of acceptability which is now being conducted by the Pearce Commission is faced with much difficulty, and opposition to the proposals for settlement seems to be prevalent, my delegation believes that the Council should not prejudge the issue before the work of that Commission is terminated. For that reason, and solely for that reason, my delegation is constrained to abstain from the voting on the draft resolution contained in document S/10606.
41. At the same time, I strongly urge the Government of the United Kingdom to respect fully the wish of the Zimbabwe people as demonstrated during the process of the test of acceptability. Meanwhile, my Government fully reserves the right to render its own judgement with regard to the result of the so-called test of acceptability.
42. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): The Security Council has already heard me on a number of occasions and at considerable length on the question of Southern Rhodesia so I will not go into detail again. But, as I said in my speech in the general debate on Wednesday [*1635th meeting*], my delegation regards it as natural that the Council should view recent developments in Rhodesia with

concern. We can understand this as we ourselves view them with great concern.

43. But from my speech last Wednesday, the Council will realize that my Government cannot accept a directive to change its policy while it is in process of being worked out. It may indeed in due course, depending on the results of the Pearce Commission, wish to review its policy, but until the Pearce Commission has reported and has given its verdict, my Government cannot accept such a directive. It not only would prejudice the result of the investigation, but would seriously prejudice the work of the Commission. The same also applies to operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution S/10606.

44. Subject to these reservations we were ready to reach an understanding with the authors of this draft resolution. We made suggestions to this effect but they were rejected. We have offered compromises which in our view would have met the purposes of the sponsors. But the draft resolution, on the contrary, insists on ignoring our present efforts except in so far as to demand that they should be abandoned. It prejudices their outcome and it recommends alternative courses which in the present circumstances are unrealistic and impracticable. My delegation therefore does not find this draft resolution acceptable.

45. Mr. BOYD (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Consistent with what was said in its statement of 31 January last [1631st meeting], the delegation of Panama announces that it will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document S/10606 submitted by Guinea, Somalia and Sudan, in which the actions of the illegal Government of Southern Rhodesia are condemned and other measures are taken.

46. It is not in our mind to mortify Great Britain with this type of measure since my Government has most cordial relations with Great Britain and we have the greatest admiration for the British people. In voting in favour of this important draft resolution, the delegation Panama would like to demonstrate that it is behind any new formula which may be sought to put an end to this bastion of racism in Africa, which oppresses the long suffering people of Zimbabwe.

47. Simply stated, by our attitude we are trying to say to Africa that in the field of colonialism and neo-colonialism Latin America and Africa should always be united because, as the Spanish proverb says: "Today it is you, tomorrow it is us".

48. The PRESIDENT: I take it that the Security Council is ready now to proceed to the vote. Accordingly, I shall put to the vote the draft resolution on Southern Rhodesia contained in document S/10606.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Argentina, China, Guinea, India, Panama, Somalia, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Abstaining: Belgium, France, Italy, Japan, United States of America.

The result of the vote was 9 in favour, 1 against, and 5 abstentions.

The draft resolution was not adopted, the negative vote being that of a permanent member of the Council.

49. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who have expressed the wish to explain their votes after the vote.

50. Mr. GHALIB (Somalia): I have asked for the floor not so much to make an explanation of vote after the vote, but merely to express, on behalf of my Government and people, a relevant concluding note and a serious observation of the events which have taken place in this Council this evening. Before I go any further I should like to express deep gratitude, on behalf of my Government and people and on behalf of our African brothers who are suffering humiliation in their own homes, to those who supported us on this draft resolution. We shall never forget that gesture of goodwill they have shown us.

51. The draft resolution in document S/10606 on Southern Rhodesia, which has been destroyed by the application of the United Kingdom veto this evening, expressed the wish of the African States—in fact the minimum which we hoped the United Kingdom should conveniently be able to do without hitch or hindrance—on behalf of the millions of Zimbabweans, whose fate unfortunately hangs today in a precarious balance. This draft resolution also carried the least guarantees for the future of Zimbabwe and contained a genuine, sincere and practicable measure to ensure peaceful political settlement in that Territory. This was the only alternative to the already unacceptable "test of acceptability". The consequences of the action of the British on the agreement and of their obstinacy and their action here tonight will lie squarely on the United Kingdom Government, and history surely will record this addition of ill will to Britain's already long list of betrayals.

52. Having in mind similar attitudes shown by that Government in the past, my delegation was not surprised at the British veto today. Members of the Council will recall that in Mogadiscio last weekend my President referred to the use of the veto by those permanent members who apply it to defend their selfish interests. I wish to amplify that statement. It was the understanding of my Government that the veto was intended to protect one major Power against the other, particularly in the field of peace and security. It is being used for other purposes as well. It has become a power in itself—a power which, when so indiscreetly used against the powerless, demonstrates a serious lack of responsibility.

53. While my Government realizes the difficulties involved in amending the Charter, it nevertheless holds the belief that some restriction on the usage of this privilege, or at least some modification of its application, is decidedly timely and desirable. The veto should—without even changing or amending the Charter—be understood to serve positively, not negatively, the interests of the international

community. It must be used with restraint and with a sense of justice and sincerity. My delegation believes that the last few vetoes applied against African interests have been most unfortunate. Even if those draft resolutions had been adopted, their implementation would as usual, by the same token of ill will, have stood very little chance of success.

54. Africa is awake, and, veto or no veto, nothing will deter or diminish the pace of march towards our freedom, our development and our socio-economic salvation and the inevitable African revolution.

55. Some quarters cynically stated that the meeting of the Security Council in Africa would achieve nothing even by the adoption of some resolutions. That is not the way that Africa had viewed this historic event. Africa has been watching us very closely. Our people have been listening to our deliberations and debates in their own local languages. The Council was definitely being weighed, its members were being tried by the tribunal set up in the African mind, and through standards of morality and human conscience they believed in the Council and expected much. This expectation sometimes even slowed down their pace and arrested their initiatives.

56. Today, at the grassroot level, every African will realize that the Security Council has once again failed. He knows that he need not expect too much from this organ.

57. A new page has been turned in the African's struggle for freedom. Today he has learned that he must rely on himself, his initiative, his wit, his strife, and his blood. The African, guided by the spirit of the Lusaka Manifesto,² has advocated peaceful methods for political settlement. We all here know that this spirit of goodwill has not been heeded by the minority régimes in southern Africa and their allies who have connived with or condoned the stubborn attitude of these racist régimes.

58. Out of this dismal situation was born the Mogadiscio Declaration, which updates the Lusaka Manifesto and endorses the position that freedom can be won only at the high price of losing or destroying lives. Only through this unavoidable action can the African attain his freedom. Some members of this Council may dismiss this statement as a mere emotional outcry, but I can assure them that they will realize the force and truth of this assertion when it is too late for anyone to chart a different course.

59. Mr. VINCI (Italy): I wish to explain very briefly the vote of my delegation on the draft resolution concerning Rhodesia, contained in document S/10606. But let me first of all make a general remark. The result of the vote that has just taken place might give, and in fact seems to give, public opinion not conversant with our work the unfortunate impression that the Council is fundamentally divided on essential principles with regard to the Rhodesian question. That, I believe, is not the case, although we fully understand the disappointment of our African colleagues.

60. I should like simply to draw the attention of members to the fact that out of 19 paragraphs contained in the draft

² *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes, agenda item 106, document A/7754.*

13, which in the main are statements of principles and purposes or non-controversial assertions of fact, merely reproduce provisions of resolutions already adopted by the Security Council, particularly the provisions of resolution 277 (1970), which was adopted unanimously. That means that most of what is contained in the draft resolution just voted upon can still stand in spite of the vote.

61. The real new point of the draft was paragraph 5, whereby the United Kingdom was requested "to desist from implementing the 'settlement' proposals". This gave the draft the very special nature of a specific request to a Member State to reverse its policy with regard to certain obligations. That left to it no other choice than to reply "yes" or "no", since an abstention in this case would also represent an acceptance of the request.

62. The only possible way to deal with this sort of specific situation, in our view, is through negotiation and not through the procedure of voting. If the negotiation leads to an agreement, then a resolution might formalize this agreement. If agreement is not reached and the Council member concerned does not accept the request in question, then the voting on the request becomes pointless. It is certainly pointless when, as in the present case, the member to which it is addressed is a permanent member whose negative vote, whatever its intentions might be, have the inescapable effect of a veto.

63. Fully convinced that in the present special case the only way out was through negotiation, my delegation actively participated in consultations, in and out of the contact group, to reach agreement on the basis of a compromise and to introduce some new ideas which, in our opinion, were most constructive. I should like to add that other delegations shared our conviction and worked skilfully and constructively with the same purpose in mind. In this connexion I wish to express my sincere appreciation to those delegations.

64. In the very short time at our disposal, it was not possible, however, to work out a compromise or to find another way out of the present deadlock. My delegation was therefore obliged to abstain on the draft resolution. If for lack of agreement the veto could not have any practical result, the casting of an affirmative or a negative vote by a delegation like my own, which was not a direct party in the negotiations, would have meant an expression of blame for one or the other of the parties concerned, for not having done its utmost in such negotiations.

65. Let me conclude by saying that the result of the vote is, as I said in the introductory remarks, less negative than would appear to be the case. In the course of our intense consultations, most delegations realized the difficulty of bluntly asking a Government, which had publicly taken a position a few days before, radically to reverse that position. On the other hand, it is clear from the statement made by Sir Alec Douglas-Home in the House of Commons on 26 January that the United Kingdom Government will not fail to draw the necessary conclusions from the work of the Pearce Commission and from the events taking place in Rhodesia. We have been strengthened in this opinion by the explanation of vote made by the representative of the

United Kingdom and we are confident that this expectation will somehow materialize when this matter is taken up again, as it undoubtedly will be, in due course in the Council.

66. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): The holding of the current Security Council meetings in Africa is an event of great significance in the history of the Council. The African countries and peoples, and the people of the whole world, attach great importance to, and place high hopes in, these meetings. Like all the African representatives and peoples, the Chinese delegation hopes that at these meetings in Africa the Council will fulfil its responsibilities and then make positive contributions in solving the urgent problems now facing Africa, particularly the question of Southern Rhodesia, in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The draft resolution on the question of Rhodesia just put to the vote only contains a number of minimum propositions and demands and, as a matter of fact, is not satisfactory. However, the British representative once again abused the veto even on such a minimum draft resolution, thus once again rendering the Council impotent and helpless in face of a major question of right and wrong.

67. We cannot but feel deep regret and indignation at this. The British Government bears the unshirkable responsibility for obstructing the Security Council from performing its duties, for trampling underfoot the principles of the Charter and sabotaging the current Council meetings in Africa and for the consequences arising therefrom.

68. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation cannot but express its dissatisfaction and indignation at the way in which the United Kingdom delegation has thwarted the adoption by the Security Council of even such a weak resolution on Southern Rhodesia as the one submitted for its consideration. By its vote against this draft resolution, the United Kingdom has shown its repugnant imperialist face as an enemy of freedom and independence not only for the Zimbabwe people, but for all the people of Africa. This is yet another utterly shameful page in the history of British imperialism. But this action, the improper use of the veto by the United Kingdom, will not stop the heroic struggle of the Zimbabwe people for their lawful rights to freedom and independence, whose legitimacy has been recognized by the United Nations in its many resolutions and in the Programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*General Assembly resolution 2621 (XXV)*] adopted at the twenty-fifth anniversary session of the General Assembly.

69. The Security Council's meetings in Africa made it possible to realize at first hand who is a friend of Africa and the peoples of Africa, who is their supporter and ally in providing assistance and in co-operating with the just struggle of the African peoples for their freedom and national independence, and who is their enemy, continuing to create and set up obstacles in their path to freedom and independence. The peoples of Africa have been convinced by the example of the Security Council's meetings that the vast majority of members of the Security Council, like the

vast majority of States Members of the United Nations, support, sympathize with and are ready to provide assistance and support to the Zimbabwe people in its just and lawful struggle for its freedom and national independence against the Southern Rhodesian racists and the British imperialists.

70. The African peoples also ascertained something else, namely that certain delegations of member States of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization abstained in the vote on this resolution. Yesterday [*1637th meeting*], the delegation of the Soviet Union had occasion to explain the essence of the practice of abstaining in votes in the Security Council during the cold war years, and this practice still continues. When votes are taken on such important draft resolutions in the Security Council on such acute international political problems affecting the fate of millions, such abstention is equal in force to a veto and to solidarity with those who use the veto and prevent the adoption of just resolutions in the Council. The peoples of Africa saw this during these meetings and learned at first hand who uses such voting methods, and how and why they do so.

71. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): The Security Council has just voted on the draft resolution that the African members of the Council on behalf of all of Africa submitted to this Council on a painful problem which afflicts deeply all Africans, that is, the question of Zimbabwe. The British veto, which we expected, has not surprised us at all, but we did learn some lessons from that vote.

72. We learned first that the British Government by no means intends to draw the consequences of a lesson based on experience which Africa is trying to teach it.

73. The second thing we learned is solidarity—the solidarity of justice which Africa has demonstrated. That solidarity has been met with the solidarity of injustice and inequity.

74. The third thing we learned is that it is Africa itself that will have to find the lessons to be drawn from all of the situations of injustice imposed on it, and we are happy to note that the people of Zimbabwe are no longer on their knees but are standing upright ready to take up the challenge of injustice from the British Government and its allies.

75. The PRESIDENT: The Council will now take up the next topic, which is *apartheid* in South Africa. The first name on my list is that of the representative of India, who wishes to introduce the five-Power draft resolution contained in document S/10609/Rev.1.

76. Mr. SEN (India): After the dramatic events of the last few minutes it does seem a little anticlimactic to talk about *apartheid*. But I do believe, as indeed I suggested before, that the root of all that is happening now—all that happened a few minutes ago—is the policy of *apartheid* of the South African Government. That Government has created the poison, is continuing to spill it over its own territories and is spreading it all over southern Africa, and unless we can eradicate this particular poison, whether it is

in Southern Rhodesia, Namibia, the Portuguese colonies or South Africa itself, we shall not be able to make any progress.

77. With those introductory remarks I should like to draw the attention of the Council to document S/10609/Rev.1, which contains the joint proposal of five delegations—Guinea, India, Somalia, Sudan and Yugoslavia—for the Council's action on the evils of *apartheid*. This is a revision of an earlier document, which I introduced yesterday [1637th meeting], and there are not very many comments I have to make on it. Most of the paragraphs—in fact, all the paragraphs of the preamble—are unchanged.

78. However, when we come to operative paragraph 5 we find a slight change. The original paragraph read as follows:

“Calls upon all States to observe strictly the arms embargo against South Africa and to deny all military co-operation to the South African Government;”

The last few words, “and to deny all military co-operation to the South African Government”, have been dropped in the revised text. The reason is that we came across a view that to the extent that the South African Government is entitled to defend its own territories against external aggression or attack, military co-operation should not be denied that Government. And since the main purpose of our draft resolution was to deprive South Africa of all means of creating further oppression of its own black people we thought that in a spirit of compromise it would not do us any harm to delete those few words.

79. Operative paragraphs 6 and 7 are identical with the old document. Operative paragraph 8 has now been deleted. That paragraph called for a committee of the Security Council to study further all matters relating to *apartheid* most urgently. Again in the process of consultation, it was pointed out to us that so long as the Asian members, and the African members particularly, are keen to keep this subject under continuous study there is no reason whatever to fear that the Council will return to a state of doldrums and not continue its efforts to pursue its objectives, and therefore a separate committee was not considered to be particularly necessary. That is the honest explanation, and I hope that with that explanation the Council will have no difficulty in approving our draft resolution unanimously.

80. Since I have the floor and I have already warned the Council that I shall take advantage of this intervention to make some general comments on behalf of the Indian delegation, I shall, with permission, make those comments now rather than speak on each draft resolution separately.

81. To begin with, on these draft resolutions there have been continuous consultations between some of the Western members of the Council and ourselves, and especially with our African colleagues, concerning the wording of all of them and the factors, elements and principles underlying these documents, these pieces of paper, or these declarations of intent. In the course of consultations and negotiations it has sometimes appeared that the Western Powers have felt that we were pressuring or pushing them. All I can say is that none of us, including

our African colleagues, has in the expression of the idealism of humanity said or written anything more radical, more progressive or more poetic than what has been said by Abraham Lincoln, Albert Schweitzer or even Bertrand Russell, each one of whom is quoted with reverence and approval by some representatives.

82. However, in the course of the debate three points have been brought out which I fear have not been fully answered. I shall not attempt to answer them fully now, but I shall mention them briefly. It has been suggested that a peaceful solution must be found. We agree. But there must be an inducement for both the Africans and their white rulers in southern Africa to seek such a solution. The trends of international politics over the last 25 years have been such as to encourage the whites in every possible way and to discourage the blacks in many ways. We would hope that all countries, all States, all peoples of goodwill will help in reversing this trend so that peaceful solutions can indeed be found without further delay.

83. Secondly, on Rhodesia it has been suggested that at long last we shall know what the Africans think, that they have now an opportunity to communicate with the outside world and that we should finally be guided by the wishes of the people. Now, to us this seems rather sophisticated, if not cynical. Assuming that the black Rhodesians are human beings—and I have not yet heard any contradiction of that assumption—their reaction to oppression, repression and suppression does not require any elaborate, dilatory or complicated machinery to determine. A British wit—I think it was Dr. Johnson—once said that you do not have to eat a whole ox to know what the beast is like. That observation truly applies to the so-called test of acceptability.

84. Thirdly, much has been said about the process of decolonization since the end of the Second World War, but, as has been admitted, the situation in Rhodesia is a very special one. Its special nature lies in the fact that Rhodesia is the only existing and significant colony where a local white minority rules over a black majority many times the size of the white colony. The process of decolonization has not been applied in a territory of this type. Indeed, we doubt whether the world has yet adjusted itself to the idea of a State in which the non-whites can exercise political power over minority white settlers. In such examples as we have—Australia, New Zealand, Canada and elsewhere—the white settlers could not tolerate even a few coloured people who had lived there for thousands of years. It is this dimension of the problem that is a source of concern to many of our black fellow-citizens—among whose number I may be permitted to presume to be counted.

85. In spite of those firmly held beliefs we have already voted in favour of three draft resolutions and shall vote in favour of the other two in a spirit of compromise and hope.

86. Further, I do not believe that we are united in our objectives and differ only on timing and method. I believe that this assertion is false. We are divided in our objectives.

87. Finally, much responsibility has been placed on our new Secretary-General for the entire range of problems we have been discussing for the last week and indeed for the

last 26 years or more. We have every confidence in him and shall look forward to a fruitful conclusion to his efforts.

88. I have already mentioned a number of concrete measures which can be taken. I am gratified that some of those ideas have found some support even at this preliminary stage. We must continue our efforts in spite of all difficulties and frustrations. In the end truth will prevail and we shall win.

89. India believes—and it has always functioned at home and abroad, in its own Parliament and in the United Nations, on this basis—that liberty on our small planet is indivisible; it is stored in the minds and hearts of men and is achieved by the determination and perseverance of human beings.

90. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

91. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (*interpretation from French*): There is no need for me to repeat here what everyone knows. By nature, by education, the French are unaware of prejudices of race or colour. This attitude flows from a centuries-old tradition. We condemn any racial discrimination and in particular *apartheid*, an outrageous doctrine whose application is revolting. Therefore France will vote in favour of this draft resolution [*S/10609/Rev.1*]. It establishes, however, a link which is not obvious between *apartheid*, the violation of human rights and what has been called the problem of the sale of weapons to South Africa.

92. This draft resolution offers me the opportunity, in explaining our vote, to answer certain misunderstandings and sometimes real distortions concerning our position on this question.

93. I should like first of all to point out that for some time we have proposed international general control, applying to all countries, on international trade in weapons, but we have not received very much support for this proposal. Moreover, when the Middle East war broke out, we were the only Power immediately to declare an embargo on the shipment of arms to the theatre of operations, and that did cause some stir. These decisions ought to suffice to show, if need be, that we do not hesitate to accept material sacrifices when political and moral considerations are at stake. Nor shall we try to sidestep the question by dealing with what others do. Everyone knows that, in the absence of this international control of the sale of weapons, there are throughout the world a host of intermediaries, States or private individuals, who engage in all forms of traffic. We are not part of this.

94. I should also like to emphasize that we take the United Nations seriously. We are often asked: "Why do you not vote in favour of such and such a resolution? It is of no importance, and you know very well that it will not be applied, and you will have made a gesture for which people will be grateful." But that is not our concept of international morality. One of the reasons for the crisis of confidence in the United Nations is precisely this gap between what is said and what one is ready to do.

Sometimes we are reproached for excessive legalism, but it is simply a question of scruples, honesty and faithfulness to our word. When we undertake a commitment, we abide by it, but we do not have to abide by what we have not committed ourselves to.

95. That is our position, and I clearly reaffirm it. As early as 1962 the French Government decided to prohibit the sale to South Africa of weapons which could be used for so-called internal police operations dictated by racial prejudices. This restriction was announced by our permanent representative in the Security Council on 6 August 1963 [*1054th meeting*]. To that end a list of weapons, the sale of which to South Africa was prohibited, was drawn up by the French Government. It was later supplemented, as the Security Council was informed on 4 December 1963 [*1078th meeting*], by the prohibition of the sale of matériel and equipment designed for the manufacture of the weapons in question.

96. In the application of these decisions there is a ban on the sale of light weapons which could be used in so-called police operations, such as slow observation aircraft, ground attack aircraft, automatic weapons, light mortars, flame-throwers, and ammunition for these weapons, including napalm bombs and grenades. It was explained in connexion with the visit to Paris of some African personalities, including President Kaunda, who was then President of the Organization of African Unity, that these prohibitions would be extended to helicopters and to light armoured vehicles. We have strictly abided by this embargo.

97. However, South Africa can obtain, on the same conditions as any other State, including of course the other African States, the weapons which are necessary for external defence and which are usable only in conflicts involving regular armies. This difference has sometimes been questioned by some but is none the less the reflection of the realities of common sense, and anyone who has the slightest military experience will recognize that it is perfectly well founded. We have heard a lot of talk about submarines, but I am unaware that they can impede guerrilla operations. The Mirage is a famous aircraft, and rightly so. Unquestionably these are high performance devices fundamentally conceived for interception and air combat, but owing to their high minimum speed, they are totally inappropriate for any use in repression operations. If I dare to give a few personal reminiscences—I really do not like to cite my own experiences—having had in the course of my career the need to fight in two types of war, war on the battlefield and underground war, resistance war, I can attest to the fact that it is not submarines or combat aircraft that can impede resistance fighters or underground fighters.

98. In truth, none of the deliveries made to South Africa by French companies can be of any use to that country in any possible repression operations within the country. This difference between the various categories of weapons in terms of their use has indeed been admitted implicitly by the Security Council itself, which, when it referred in resolution 181 (1963) of 7 August 1963 to weapons held by South Africa, mentioned expressly "some" which helped it to apply its racial policy. Noting with appreciation

on 4 December 1963 [resolution 182 (1963)] the replies given by Governments within the framework of that resolution, the Council included in that expression of appreciation all of the statements, including France's reply, which expressly distinguished the two categories of weapons.

99. In September 1970 in New York, in the General Assembly,³ the Minister of Foreign Affairs confirmed our position. I can say that we abide by resolution 182 (1963), for which we voted, and I can reaffirm that we will abide by the current resolution, with the reservations that I have just expressed. We would have been able to vote for it if certain members of the Council had not given an interpretation to paragraph 5 that we cannot go along with. But we are grateful for the efforts at conciliation that have been made. I must say that, as far as we are concerned, the paragraph on military co-operation was no problem for us: we have no such co-operation with South Africa.

100. But we do not like ambiguities. Ambiguity in words has weighed heavily on certain resolutions of the Council, in particular on the Middle East. We prefer clarity and frankness. We would of course not place obstacles in the path of or vote against a draft resolution which as a whole meets with our full consent, but everyone would recognize that in the course of this session we have gone to the extreme limits in our spirit of conciliation. It is the strictest honesty and frankness which compels us to abstain on this draft resolution.

101. Mr. NAKAGAWA (Japan): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document S/10609/Rev.1. I wish to reiterate that Japan is second to none in its strong opposition to the abhorrent policies of *apartheid* pursued by the Government of South Africa. I will not waste the time of the Council by explaining the position of my Government on this problem because I believe that I have already made it clear in my general statement.

102. I simply wish to add that the Government of Japan has been supporting humanitarian and educational assistance to the victims of *apartheid*. Deeply concerned with the plight of the victims of their policies and desirous of taking part in the international efforts to relieve this suffering, the Government of Japan has contributed annually to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and to the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa.

103. Mr. BOYD (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Panama will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document S/10609/Rev.1 which condemns South Africa for continuing its policy of *apartheid* in flagrant violation of the precepts laid down by the United Nations Charter. My country would like to speak out against the white minorities who are trying to impose the policy of *apartheid* to the detriment of the vast national majority of the African peoples. Panama would like to avail itself of this opportunity to reaffirm by its vote that it will always combat any political or governmental system which denies

³ *Ibid.*, Twenty-fifth Session, Plenary Meetings, 1842nd meeting.

equal opportunities and treatment for racial reasons or for any other subterfuge.

104. The PRESIDENT: As no other representative wishes to speak at this time I shall put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document S/10609/Rev.1.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Argentina, Belgium, China, Guinea, India, Italy, Japan, Panama, Somalia, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: France.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 14 votes in favour, none against, with 1 abstention.*⁴

105. The PRESIDENT: We have now concluded the second topic on our agenda for this evening.

106. I understand that a revised version of the three-Power draft resolution concerning Territories under Portuguese administration has been handed in and is in the process of translation and reproduction. We are not yet in a position to examine this new text, which I am informed cannot be ready for circulation before 11.55 p.m. It is my intention, once other business which we have is disposed of, to suspend this meeting briefly and reconvene it if the draft resolution is before us then. Before doing so, and since the hour is late, I believe that I should inform the members of the Council that it is my intention to continue the meeting, complete the voting on the draft resolutions and conclude our work tonight before we adjourn. If I hear no objection, I shall consider that this course coincides with the wishes of the Council. It is so agreed.

107. There is a small financial problem I should like to take up at this stage. It relates to the question of assessing amounts of money to be devoted to the Office of Public Information (OPI). The members of the Council will recall that the Committee on Council Meetings away from Headquarters recommended that the Council consider, during its meeting in Addis Ababa, the question on the production by OPI of an illustrated pamphlet on the session. This recommendation is contained in paragraph 29 (g) of the Committee's report [S/10514, of 18 January 1972]. The members of the Council are also aware that the cost of issuing a 32-page special illustrated pamphlet covering the discussions and decisions of the special session of the Security Council for wide distribution was estimated at \$25,000. It appears from the inquiries I have made that an appropriation of \$10,000 would be sufficient if, instead of issuing a special pamphlet on this occasion, a special issue of the publication *Objective: Justice* were printed and given the widest circulation. Unless there is any objection I shall take it that the Council accepts this proposal.

108. We should bear in mind that the first series of meetings of the Council in Africa was an historic event

⁴ See resolution 311 (1972).

which increased understanding of the United Nations among the Governments and peoples of Africa and that it would therefore be appropriate if wide publicity were given to this event. I believe that a special issue of *Objective: Justice* would fulfil this purpose and I would therefore urge the members of the Council to support this idea.

109. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): I understand that the cost involved will be provided out of the regular budget as opposed to being assigned to the special trip. If that is correct we certainly commend you, Mr. President, on your judgement here and I would certainly support your position on that.

110. The PRESIDENT: I do not know whether I am in a position to make such a commitment. All I can say is that every effort should be made to see to it that it is covered from the regular budget.

111. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): As far as I know, the Office of Public Information has special allocations under the United Nations budget for its work. Presumably, the Office of Public Information will cover the payment for this publication from its estimates under the regular budget. Perhaps it may also be necessary to make cuts somewhere under another part of the budget, but this necessary and important publication should be paid for from the Office's own estimates.

112. The PRESIDENT: Unless there is any objection I take it that the suggestion is acceptable, taking into account the statements made in the Council. It is so agreed.

113. Since there is no further business immediately at hand, and as we are still awaiting the last draft resolution, I suggest we postpone our meeting and reconvene at 11.55 p.m.

114. Mr. SEN (India): I admire your skill and precision, sir, but why 11.55 p.m., why not a little before or after? And could you give us some indication of how long it will take?

115. The PRESIDENT: I have said that the documents will be ready by 11.55 p.m., and I should like to adhere to my decision. We cannot of course finish in five minutes if we receive them at five minutes before midnight. If it suits the convenience of the members we could postpone the meeting until 12 midnight.

116. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): I remember Mr. Malik exhorting the Council at various times, telling it how difficult it was to get instructions. Now being far removed from Washington, I have something to be grateful for in being here, but it is perhaps easier to get instructions when one is close to one's home base, as the Soviet Ambassador has told us over and over again. Here we are going to be asked to vote on a draft resolution that we have not seen, and we have a time-limit coming up. I wonder whether, in order to save some precious time the sponsor could read out the text of the draft resolution so that we might understand what we are going to be asked to vote on. I think that would be appropriate. In that way we would

not just be standing around the camp fire, but could get to work and study the draft.

117. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I admit that I have raised this question on a number of occasions, that I have envied Ambassador Bush in New York for being so close to the White House. But in this case Ambassador Bush's position is somewhat easier. The draft we are discussing has already been published and distributed to members of the Security Council. They have studied it. Now, as a result of consultations during the day it has, as I understand it, been somewhat watered down. It has not been strengthened but, regrettably, it has been weakened. Therefore I do not think that Ambassador Bush will require special instructions from the White House in order to vote on a weakened draft with which he is familiar.

118. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): I simply raised the question. The draft might be too weak for us. I simply ask whether somebody could read out the text of the draft about which we are speaking. We have 30 minutes left, and I should like to know what the draft states. I do not think that this is an unreasonable request. The draft is being typed and somebody has sponsored it. Would the sponsor please read out the draft and thereby give us time to think about it. Then we would be perfectly agreeable to a suspension of the meeting. Otherwise we shall have a suspension and then return and go through the same thing over again. Are we talking about the draft that we saw at noon? Ambassador Malik, are you a sponsor of the draft? Perhaps you could explain this to us.

119. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): On a point of information, I am not a sponsor. However, I take note of the fact that for the first time the United States delegation has expressed the desire to have a stronger resolution on the struggle against colonialism and racism. I welcome this. I have no objection to his proposal that we should hear the resolution read out.

120. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): It would be, perhaps, useful to make some clarifications. The draft resolution submitted by the three African members of the Council and contained in document S/10607 was, as everyone knows, the subject of consultations which were carried out up to this evening. The draft as it will be presented will have certain substantial changes both in the preamble and in the operative part. As the President has requested at this stage of our work the draft resolution as revised is being processed and will be ready in a few minutes, when all the members of the Security Council will have it before them. What we can say is that the changes included in the revised text were the subject of numerous consultations, and those consultations caused the delay in distributing the document.

121. The PRESIDENT: Having heard the representative of Guinea, I still stand by my ruling that the meeting be suspended for half an hour. The representative of the United States will have the opportunity of seeing the draft resolution outside the meeting room. We shall resume the meeting at midnight.

The meeting was suspended at 11.25 p.m. and resumed on Saturday, 5 February, at 12.25 a.m.

122. The PRESIDENT: I intend now to proceed to the next topic, the three-Power draft resolution on the Portuguese-administered Territories. I understand that the representative of Guinea wishes to speak on the draft resolution, but first I call on the representative of India.

123. Mr. SEN (India): Mr. President, before you give the floor to the representative of Guinea, I should like to take one minute of the Council's time to bring to its attention some disturbing news we have just received. According to a message received from Reuters just now, the Secretary-General has received a complaint that South African forces murdered 90 Africans, including 11 women and 4 children, in Ovamboland during the last five days of January. I thought I should let the Council know about this information.

124. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): I have the honour, in the name of the three African countries, Guinea, Somalia and Sudan, to submit the draft resolution contained in document S/10607/Rev.1, which has been the object of fruitful discussion between all the members of the Security Council. Members will remember that when we submitted the initial draft it included nine operative paragraphs. The new draft has only seven. We preferred also in a spirit of close and fruitful collaboration and in a desire for harmony in this Council, to give up certain phrases in the preamble and to use more general expressions. That is why the new text that the Council has before it includes mainly points which seem to us from our consultations to reflect the feeling of a great majority of the members of the Council.

125. In order to allow members to follow the revised text and to compare it with the initial draft, as well as to point out to them the very important effort for co-operation that the three sponsors have made during their discussions in order to present the fruit of this effort, I should like to submit to the Council the following considerations.

126. In the preamble the first paragraph remains the same. There are no changes. In the second preambular paragraph we have the following wording, which was accepted in the previous resolutions and therefore should not be a source of any disagreement:

"Having heard the statements of those individuals invited to address the Council on this question,"

The third paragraph of the preamble remains the same, as does the fourth. In the fifth paragraph there is a slight change, and it now reads:

"Deploring the refusal of the Government of Portugal to implement the pertinent resolutions of the Security Council, adopted on the question of the Territories under Portuguese administration, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations,"

127. That stipulation, in our opinion, does not make any allusions, insinuations, or reservations, as we had been told, and, as members will observe, the sponsors have taken into consideration this suggestion.

128. The sixth preambular paragraph, which was not subject to disagreement, and the seventh remain the same in the revised draft resolution. However, we have the following provision in the eighth preambular paragraph:

"Deeply disturbed at the reported use of chemical substances by Portugal in its colonial wars against the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau),"

Considerations were put forward that some members of the Council could not in any way rely on this information, but it seems to us pertinent that all the reports which were sent to the Security Council and the General Assembly indeed mentioned the concern at the use of such weapons—even bacteriological weapons—by the colonial Portuguese forces. But we limited ourselves to mentioning those reports—which, for us, cannot be doubted in their morality and veracity. In the English text there is a slight error, which members are asked to correct: "reputed" should read "reported".

129. In the ninth paragraph, on which consultations were also held, we mention the legitimacy of the struggle of the liberation movements in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), and their demands for self-determination and independence. I should like to make a short observation here. No member of the Council contests the legitimacy of the struggle of the peoples still under foreign domination that aspire only to their legitimate rights proclaimed by the Charter, namely, recovery of their right to self-determination and independence. Having thus drafted this text, the sponsors feel that they are only recognizing an obvious fact which, in itself, has already been recognized as legitimate by the United Nations.

130. I come now to the operative part of our draft resolution. In operative paragraph 1 the Security Council

"Reaffirms the inalienable right of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) to self-determination and independence, as recognized by the General Assembly in its resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, and recognizes the legitimacy of their struggle to achieve that right;"

131. In operative paragraph 2 the Council

"Condemns the persistent refusal of the Government of Portugal to implement General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and all other relevant resolutions of the Security Council;"

Here the members of the Council will recall the lack of co-operation and the systematic refusal of Portugal in respect of all the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Of course, we are told often—even privately and in the corridors—that Portugal's lack of co-operation and stubbornness in maintaining under its domination Territories which it considers as an extension of its own territory are regretted. But if we stipulate, in the operative part, that we condemn Portugal's persistent refusal we are thereby only proving a fact—if it is still necessary to prove it.

132. In operative paragraph 3, we reaffirm that the situation resulting from the policy of Portugal in its colonies constitutes constant provocations against neighbouring States and that that seriously disturbs international peace and security on the African continent. That is no longer in doubt, in view of the repeated aggressions and violations of air space of the territories of sovereign States committed by Portuguese colonialist forces.

133. In operative paragraph 4, which is the main part of the complaints—complaints which are also demands to find a constructive and even a final solution to the persistent maintenance of Portuguese colonialism in African countries—Portugal is called upon:

(a) To recognize immediately the right of the peoples of the Territories under its administration to self-determination and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV);

(b) To cease immediately the colonial wars and all acts of repression against the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau);

(c) To withdraw all its armed forces;

(d) To promulgate an unconditional political amnesty and the restoration of democratic political rights;

(e) To transfer power to political institutions freely elected and representative of the peoples, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

134. In operative paragraph 5 the draft resolution again calls upon Portugal “to refrain from any violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of African States;”.

135. In paragraph 6, the Council

“Calls upon all States to refrain forthwith from offering the Portuguese Government any assistance which would enable it to continue its repression of the peoples of the Territories under its administration, and to take all the necessary measures to prevent the sale and supply of arms and military equipment to the Portuguese Government for this purpose, including the sale and shipment of equipment and materials for the manufacture and maintenance of arms and ammunition to be used in the Territories under Portuguese administration”.

136. Finally in paragraph 7, the draft resolution

“Requests the Secretary-General to follow the implementation of the present resolution and report to the Security Council from time to time.”

137. This draft resolution, as revised, is the fruit of consultations and hard work and also of the wide comprehension of its sponsors. We should like to say that we hope that this draft resolution will not meet with the fate reserved for the one on Rhodesia presented by three States. We feel that the vote on the draft resolution concerning Rhodesia constitutes a bitter lesson for Africa. But we hope it will not escape the notice of the international community

that the persistence of Portuguese colonialism and the war of repression being waged by Portugal is a danger to peace and international security. In the light of these observations the African countries, trusting in the United Nations organs, and in particular, the Security Council, can hope that this draft resolution will receive broad and unanimous support and that the whole world—the liberation movements, those who have faith in universal justice and the noble ideals of the Charter—will not be disappointed by the vote the Council is soon to take.

138. The PRESIDENT: Some members have indicated a desire to speak in explanation of their votes before the vote. I shall now call upon them.

139. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (*interpretation from French*): We too have some friends in Africa—old friends, new friends, there are many of them—and we are always receptive to their appeals. We should note, however, that in the course of this session of the Security Council we have found among them—and particularly among the three African members of the Council—a tremendous amount of understanding, and I believe that they, similarly, have found understanding in our delegation, and, indeed, in all the Western European delegations that have come here with a desire to make this session successful.

140. We have considerable grounds for having reservations on the draft resolution [*S/10607/Rev.1*] before us—reservations of detail and also of substance—and we have some doubts about the methods or certain solutions advocated here. However, going beyond details and certain of these provisions, we feel we must consider the substance and also the hopefulness shown by the representative of Guinea.

141. We regard two provisions as essential. First, the protection of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of African States. We are all attached to that principle. And, secondly, the inalienable right of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) to choose their own destiny freely—a principle which goes well beyond any resolution, even one with a Roman figure, and dates back centuries. That is, simply, the right to independence—that independence to which peoples are so attached.

142. That is what is important for us about this draft resolution. It quite clearly enunciates these principles. We know that the African States legitimately cherish these principles, and it is in response to their appeals that we shall not oppose this draft resolution. No doubt a great deal of further discussion would have been necessary before we could be in a position to vote in its favour. But time is short, and such discussion cannot take place. None the less in a spirit of understanding which I hope its sponsors will appreciate, and in spite of our reservations, we shall not vote against it, but will confine ourselves to abstaining.

143. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia): My Government's position on the question of the Portuguese colonial occupation and oppression of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) is well known and has been clearly stated many times. We are, indeed, observing the phenomenon of a Government deaf and blind to the forces of history, a

Government able to postpone the inevitable tide of change because of the help it gets from outside. We are quite confident that the peoples of those Territories will finally succeed in their liberation struggles. We shall vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document S/10607/Rev.1, although we should have preferred a stronger, more concrete draft, because we believe that even as it now stands it will be helpful to those peoples valiantly struggling in their liberation movements, the legitimacy of whose struggle and objectives this draft resolution recognizes. As far as the Yugoslav Government is concerned, it will continue to support and assist those movements morally, politically and materially in all possible ways.

144. Mr. SEN (India): I should like to deal particularly with paragraph 6 of this draft resolution [S/10607/Rev.1]. We in India have more than adequate knowledge and experience of Portuguese colonialism. I shall not at this late hour weary the Council with our experience, but we are rather concerned about paragraph 6, because the way it has been put does not seem to us sufficiently strong or specific. Open accusations have been made that NATO arms are going to the colonial Territories. Open denials also have been made. This obviously will require investigation. There are, apart from NATO arms, other arms under the control of the Government of Portugal and we are most anxious that these arms, however procured—bought in the open market and sold for reasons of profit—are finding their way into these colonial Territories. We are anxious that all sources of supplies to Portugal which can be diverted to these colonial Territories should somehow or other be stopped. It should be possible, therefore, for the Security Council—if not tonight, at least at a later stage—to investigate all these complaints and denials about the source of supply of arms to the colonial Territories.

145. The representative of France drew a distinction between the arms for external use and the arms for internal use. Whatever might be the position in South Africa, it is quite clear that any consideration of arms for external use cannot apply in Portuguese colonies.

146. Lastly, we should like to ensure that no arms supplied to Portugal, Rhodesia or South Africa are used for aggression against neighbouring territories or for the suppression of liberation movements.

147. Those specific considerations do not find, in the view of my delegation, sufficient reflection in paragraph 6 of this draft. This does not mean to say that we shall vote against this draft resolution or abstain on it. We shall certainly vote for it, but at the same time I should like the Council to keep these considerations in mind when we come back to this subject in New York as soon as possible.

148. Mr. NAKAGAWA (Japan): In connexion with this new draft resolution submitted by Guinea, Somalia and Sudan, [S/10607/Rev.1], I wish to ask the sponsors for clarification with regard to the amendment of this text. In operative paragraph 4 (c) as now drafted it is stated, "to withdraw all its armed forces", whereas the original draft said, "the withdrawal of all military and other forces at present employed for that purpose". In the original text it is quite clear that the armed forces required to be

withdrawn are those forces which are at present employed for the purpose of the repression of the people of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), while in the new text there is no qualification, but we ask for the withdrawal of "all its armed forces" from those Territories. Perhaps it may be argued that the armed forces which now exist in those Territories are solely used for the repression of the people of those Territories, but even so, theoretically, it can be argued that there must be a distinction between asking for the withdrawal of all armed forces of the countries at present administering Territories and asking them to withdraw the armed forces used for certain aims which are contrary to the purposes of the Charter.

149. Therefore, if the text stands as revised, my delegation has certain reservations on this part of this draft, and I think that I must ask for new instructions from my Government, for which, unfortunately, we have no time. So we hope the sponsors will revise this new text so that there will be no misunderstanding.

150. Mr. BOYD (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Even though some may think that the draft resolution in document S/10607/Rev.1 is not very specific, my delegation wishes to state that it will vote in favour of it since the text is designed to lend support to the independence movements of the Portuguese colonies in Africa. Panama states decisively and unequivocally that it sympathizes with the peoples that are fighting for their independence from colonial domination in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). Portugal's policy concerning the colonial Territories that it controls is not shared by my Government, which on various occasions has expressed itself in favour of self-determination and freedom for these peoples.

151. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I should like to draw the attention of the Secretariat to the fact that there is an inaccuracy in the Russian translation of paragraph 4 (c). The English text reads "to withdraw all its armed forces", whereas in the Russian the word "all" is omitted. I request the inclusion of the word "all".

152. Mr. NAKAGAWA (Japan): I asked the sponsoring countries just now whether they might be able to make a slight amendment to the text. I have explained the position of my delegation quite frankly before the Council. If there is no amendment of the new text, my delegation, with great reluctance, will have to abstain from voting.

153. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of the sponsors, I would say that we were very much impressed by the appeal made by the representative of Japan. We know the deep ties of friendship and solidarity which Japan has with the African peoples. But the operative part of our text is so concise, clear and precise that we would have hoped that the representative of Japan would make a specific proposal which the sponsors would be prepared to examine.

154. Mr. NAKAGAWA (Japan): In reply to the statement made by the representative of Guinea I would suggest that subparagraph 4 (c) be redrafted to read as follows:

“To withdraw all its armed forces as presently employed for the purpose of the repression of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau);”.

155. Mr. GHALIB (Somalia): I should like to thank the representative of Japan for his constructive suggestion. But before we agree to this amendment, can he assure us that he has no other suggestions or amendments in mind?

156. Mr. NAKAGAWA (Japan): I can say that I have no other amendments or suggestions.

157. Mr. GHALIB (Somalia): Therefore, although we have not had time to consult each other, I can safely accept, on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution and on behalf of the people concerned, that proposal because it conforms to the explanations which I have given.

158. The PRESIDENT: In my capacity as representative of SUDAN, I can say that as a sponsor of the draft resolution, my delegation is also ready to go along with this amendment in a spirit of conciliation, although we could never think that any Portuguese forces in those Territories are there for an excursion; they are there for repression.

159. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): It goes without saying that, since we are the third sponsor, my delegation fully supports the position expressed by the two African members of the Council.

160. Mr. NAKAGAWA (Japan): I should like to thank the countries sponsoring the draft resolution for accepting my suggestion.

161. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document S/10607/Rev.1, as amended.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: China, Guinea, India, Japan, Panama, Somalia, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Argentina, Belgium, France, Italy, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.⁵

162. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those members of the Council who have asked to be allowed to explain their votes after the vote.

163. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation has just voted in favour of the two draft resolutions: one on the question of the Portuguese colonies and the other on the question of *apartheid* in South Africa. But we deem it necessary to point out that those resolutions have failed to call upon all

countries and peoples of the world to voice solidarity and support for the just struggles of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), and have failed to condemn the United States, the United Kingdom and other countries for their acts violating the arms embargo and supporting the Portuguese colonial authorities and the racist regime of South Africa in various fields. Therefore, this is not satisfactory.

164. The current meetings of the Security Council in Africa are drawing to a close. Owing to obstructions by certain big Powers, the meetings have failed to achieve the expected results. Nevertheless, it is clear to all that the just struggles of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau), Zimbabwe, Namibia, Azania and other African countries against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism have formed a surging torrent. They will rely on their own unity and struggles, overcome all obstacles on the road of advance, completely shatter imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, and win their national independence and liberation. No force on earth can thwart the forward strides of the people of the whole African continent. No matter what may happen in the world, the Chinese Government and people will, as always, unswervingly stand together with the African people and firmly support their just struggle until they win final victory.

165. Mr. VINCI (Italy): My delegation shares the motives and objectives that prompted Guinea, Somalia and Sudan to introduce the draft resolution concerning the Portuguese Territories which the Council has just adopted.

166. As I stated in explaining the general position of the Italian delegation on all the issues discussed in this special series of meetings of the Council in Africa, my delegation maintains that the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) should be allowed to exercise freely their right to self-determination and independence. We did agree, therefore, on this point, which is affirmed in the three-Power draft resolution. We also agreed on some other points, as did the delegation of France. However, the draft resolution in its revised form has been introduced only this evening, and my delegation was not in a position to study all its provisions, some of which raise delicate legal problems, and to seek instruction from my Government. We certainly appreciate the efforts made by the sponsors to improve some parts of the text. However, lacking instructions, we had to abstain from voting, as we would have done on the original text.

167. Mr. NAKAGAWA (Japan): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution because we fully support the legitimate aspirations of the peoples of these Territories to self-determination and independence.

168. I wish to point out that, consistent with the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, the Government of Japan has maintained and will continue to adhere to the policy of not granting approval to any sale or supply to the Government of Portugal of arms and military equipment and materials. Moreover, Japan has never offered, nor has it any intention of offering in the future, the Portuguese Government any

⁵ See resolution 312 (1972).

assistance which would enable it to continue its repressive colonial policies.

169. The PRESIDENT: Since there are no more names on the list of speakers, I wish to make the following concluding statement.

170. As this last in the series of Security Council meetings held in Addis Ababa, in Africa, draws to a close I should like to sum up very briefly what I feel to be the outcome of our historic decision to hold meetings away from the United Nations Headquarters devoted to consideration of questions related to Africa of which the Security Council is currently seized and implementation of the Council's relevant resolutions.

171. These meetings have been unprecedented not only because of the locale in which they took place, but also because for the first time the Security Council has been able to devote its undivided attention to a global review of the grave political problems which are currently of great concern to the Governments and peoples of the African continent. I feel also that through our meetings here, we, as members of the Security Council, have derived individually and collectively a greater depth of understanding of these problems and of the extent to which they are a source of deep concern and preoccupation to those African Governments and peoples.

172. We have also seen how fervently determined Africa is through its Governments and liberation movements in the captive Territories to recapture the independence of those Territories and erase the tottering edifice of colonialism from its soil. No force on earth can freeze history.

173. As an African, as well as President of the Security Council, I am grateful to feel that by coming here and holding its meetings in Africa the Security Council has also served reciprocally to arouse in the African Governments and their peoples a greater interest in and understanding of the United Nations and of the Council in particular.

174. In having responded to the request of the Organization of African Unity by holding these meetings on African soil, the Council has helped to bring to the Governments and peoples of Africa a heightened awareness of the functioning and the purposes of the United Nations and a renewed resolve to make full use of the Organization as an instrumentality against the ruthless intent of colonialism, against the petrified dogmas of racial prejudice and against the exploitation of man by man.

175. Inasmuch as we are gratified that the Council was able to adopt positive resolutions concerning some of the major African problems and thankful to those who found it possible to support them, we regret the failure to do the same in relation to some of the most burning issues in our continent. The logic that some among us have advanced to justify their inaction or frustration of action on those issues eludes our trust. There are issues on which no fair-minded person can be neutral, and I feel that the English-speaking among us should have been the first to learn from the historian of the English-speaking people, Sir Winston

Churchill, that it is immoral to be neutral between the fire and the fire brigade.

176. Africa has its realities and problems and, as I said yesterday, those realities and problems can never be properly seen through the distorting prism of self-interest. Our problems are human and—let us not delude ourselves—man can only engage in humanity through self-surrender and not self-interest.

177. I wish also on behalf of the Council to thank the Secretariat for its dedicated and efficient help, and the Secretary-General for the statesmanship, sagacity and devotion demonstrated throughout our deliberations and consultations here. We all wish him success in his new thankless job, which experience has proven to be something akin to the interminable labour of Sisyphus. Some of the sad experiences of tonight are a case in point.

178. Before closing this meeting, I wish to turn to yet another matter, namely, the feelings of gratitude of members of the Council for the hospitality which has been enjoyed here in Addis Ababa. In this connexion, I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of all members of the Council, a statement of consensus expressing gratitude to the host country:

“On 19 January 1972 the Security Council adopted resolution 308 (1972) in which it decided to hold meetings in Addis Ababa from 28 January to 4 February 1972, devoted to the consideration of questions relating to Africa of which the Security Council is currently seized and implementation of the Council's relevant resolutions.

“In accordance with that resolution, the Security Council held its 1627th to 1639th meetings in Addis Ababa. During the course of these meetings, the members of the Council have listened with great interest to addresses by His Imperial Majesty the Emperor of Ethiopia and by the President of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania, the current Chairman of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity as well as to the statements made by the representatives of States Members of the United Nations invited to participate in the Council's discussions pursuant to rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure and by 13 persons invited in accordance with rule 39 to supply the Council with information relating to the questions under consideration.

“During their stay in Africa, the members of the Security Council also accepted with gratitude the invitation of the Government of the Somali Democratic Republic to visit its capital of Mogadishu and meet with the President and leading members of that Government.

“Before concluding their meetings in Addis Ababa, the members of the Security Council have requested the President of the Security Council to convey to His Imperial Majesty, the Emperor of Ethiopia, and to the Government of Ethiopia their respectful gratitude for the invitation issued to the Security Council and the generous hospitality and unflinching courtesy and helpfulness ex-

tended to them at all times during their visit to Addis Ababa. They have further requested the President to assure the Government and people of Ethiopia, and in particular the authorities and populace of Addis Ababa, that the members of the Council and all those who accompanied them carry away with them an abiding memory of the warm welcome extended to them.

"In addition, the members of the Security Council wish to convey to the Secretary-General of the United Nations their sincere appreciation for the outstanding contribution made by him and his staff to ensure a smooth and efficient functioning of the services required for the meetings of the Council. The members of the Council also wish to express their appreciation and gratitude to the Executive Secretary of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa and his staff for their invaluable assistance in that regard."

179. This would normally conclude our business for this meeting. However, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ethiopia has indicated that he wishes to make a statement. Accordingly, and with the consent of the Council, I now invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

180. Mr. Minasse HAILE (Ethiopia): It was not my intention to intervene at this moment, but after having heard so many generous words of thanks addressed to the person of His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie I, my august Sovereign, and to the Government and people of Ethiopia, I thought I would be less than grateful if I did not respond to all those kind sentiments.

181. I should like to assure the members of the Council that we have considered it a privilege to play host to these historic meetings of the Security Council, the first ever held in Africa. When we expressed our readiness to receive the Council here in our capital we were very conscious of the special significance and the consequence that it might have for developments in Africa. I believe that the United Nations has never before come as close to the African

peoples, who need its assistance most, as it has in the last week when the Council has been meeting here.

182. We believe that the achievements of the Council at the end of these meetings were not as much as had been hoped for by Africans in general and particularly by those who are still under colonial domination. The fact that the Council in its wisdom has found it possible to meet on African soil is in itself, as the Secretary-General put it, an achievement. It will no doubt further encourage the African peoples under alien domination to feel that their problems are finally getting the attention they have deserved for far too long. It is also a clear warning to the colonialist régimes that there is increasingly an open mind in the United Nations to examine critically, and from very close quarters, the system of oppression they have created.

183. In this connexion, the fact that the Security Council has been able to hear at first hand from the representatives of independent African States, as well as from the African liberation movements, cannot be over-emphasized.

184. I have also no doubt that settler groups in Rhodesia, South Africa and Portugal, who because of lack of information have been prepared to believe the worst about African aspirations, will have learned something about the truth from the news that may have filtered through the concrete walls of censorship that their régimes have erected as a barrier to a free interplay of ideas.

185. For all these reasons, I should like to salute the wisdom shown by the members of the Security Council when they agreed to meet on African soil to discuss questions relating to independence and peace in Africa.

186. I should like once again to acknowledge with gratitude and heartfelt thanks the generous words addressed to my august Sovereign and to the Government and people of Ethiopia.

The meeting rose on Saturday, 5 February at 1.30 a.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

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

如何购取联合国出版物

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

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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