

UNITED NATIONS

00 62989



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FIRST YEAR

UN LIBRARY

JUN 19 1985

**1944**<sup>th</sup> MEETING: 27 JULY 1976

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1944) .....	1
Statements made on the occasion of the successful landing on Mars of Viking I .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
Complaint by Zambia against South Africa: Letter dated 19 July 1976 from the Chargé d'affaires, a.i., of the Permanent Mission of Zambia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12147) .....	1

## NOTE

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

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

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

## 1944th MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 27 July 1976, at 3.30 p.m.

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

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

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1944)

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

*The meeting was called to order at 3.55 p.m.*

### Statements made on the occasion of the successful landing on Mars of Viking I

1. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): A week ago—on 20 July 1976, to be precise—an astonishing event occurred which brought joy to all mankind and about which I should like to say a few words before we begin our work today. I am referring to the landing of Viking I on the planet Mars, after a voyage through space that had lasted one year and covered more than 400 million miles. That feat initiated a new era in interplanetary exploration.

2. This mystical juncture of time and space heralds further tremendous advances in technology that fill us with hope for a better life for mankind. But that can happen only within a system of peace and justice, under the aegis of the United Nations.

3. This scientific and technological accomplishment represents more than the triumph of a single nation: it represents the victory of the human spirit, of individuals, of scientists, of engineers, of technicians, of experts, both in government and in private industry, who, working from this part of the earth, have made this glorious feat possible. This event will go down in the annals of history, with universal congratulations and applause. It was without doubt an act for peace

that does honour to the United States, which has one of the most innovative and creative societies in the history of mankind.

4. The PRESIDENT: With the Council's permission, I should like to subscribe totally to the statement just made by the representative of Panama about this great event constituted by the landing of Viking I on Mars. I think I shall be speaking for all the members of the Security Council as well as for my own delegation if I say that this historic event has filled us all with great admiration. We have been tremendously impressed by this landmark in the exploration of the solar system—and perhaps beyond it—which will widen our knowledge of life in the solar system. That is of the greatest importance for the future of mankind.

5. On behalf of all the members of the Council, I should like to offer our very warm congratulations to the United States representative on this great success.

6. Mr. BENNETT (United States of America): As the representative of the Government of the United States, I should like to say how much we appreciate and how touched we are by the statement of the representative of Panama and by your statement, Mr. President. We hope that this feat will indeed be in the interest of mankind. I think that when we enlarge the horizons of any country we enlarge the horizons of all countries. I should like to feel that this event is going to be in the interest of all of us.

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

### Complaint by Zambia against South Africa:

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

7. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the members of the Security Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Zambia, South Africa and Mauritania requesting to be invited to participate in the Council's discussion of the question just inscribed on its agenda. Accordingly, I propose, if I hear no objection, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to

vote, in accordance with the provisions of Article 31 of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

8. I invite the representative of Zambia to take a place at the Council table, and the representatives of South Africa and Mauritania to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the understanding that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table whenever they wish to address the Council.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mwale, (Zambia), took a place at the Council table and Mr. Botha, (South Africa), and Mr. El Hassen, (Mauritania) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

9. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The first speaker is the representative of Zambia, on whom I now call.

10. Mr. MWALE (Zambia): Mr. President, allow me first of all to express the gratitude of my delegation to you and to all the other members of the Security Council for having promptly acceded to our request for this meeting to consider the numerous acts of aggression committed against my country by the racist minority régime of South Africa. I also take this opportunity to congratulate you on your assumption of the high office of President of the Council for the month of July. My delegation looks forward to fruitful co-operation with you, as indeed with the other members of the Security Council, within the spirit of the cordial relations existing between your country and Zambia. Permit me also to convey to you and your colleagues on the Council the greetings and best wishes of my President, Mr. Kenneth David Kaunda.

11. This is a fitting occasion for me to register the deep thanks and appreciation of the Party, the Government and the people of the Republic of Zambia for the commitment and tireless efforts of the Secretary-General, in connexion with the liberation of southern Africa. The Secretary-General has, moreover, shown a deep understanding of the special problems of front-line countries in southern Africa.

12. This is not the first time that we have brought to the attention of the Council the acts of aggression perpetrated against Zambia by South Africa and other racist white minority régimes of southern Africa.

13. In July 1969 the Council considered the aggression committed against my country by the former colonialist and Fascist régime of Portugal, and, *inter alia*, strongly censured the Portuguese aggression and called upon Portugal to desist forthwith from violating the territorial integrity of Zambia and carrying out unprovoked raids against it. In January 1973 the Council considered the aggression committed against my country by the

régime of Ian Smith in the British colony of Southern Rhodesia. In this regard, the Council, *inter alia*, condemned the aggression perpetrated against Zambia by the illegal minority Smith régime. The Council also addressed itself to the need for putting an immediate end to the illegal Ian Smith régime as an effective way of terminating its hostile acts against my country.

14. With specific regard to South Africa, on 12 October 1971, the Security Council considered South African aggression against Zambia and unanimously adopted resolution 300 (1971), in which the Council called upon South Africa to respect fully the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Zambia. Furthermore, the Council declared that

“in the event of South Africa violating the sovereignty or territorial integrity of Zambia, the Security Council will meet again to examine the situation further in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter.”

15. This is not the first time this year that the Council has considered the question of South African aggression against a sovereign and independent African country. Only a few months ago the Council considered South African aggression against the People's Republic of Angola.

16. It is obvious, therefore, that the existence of white minority and racist régimes in southern Africa constitutes a grave threat to the peace and security of the independent African countries of the region. Such a situation has implications for Africa in particular and for international peace and security in general.

17. I need not remind the Council that those of us who are constant victims of the acts of aggression perpetrated by the white minority régimes have a duty to defend ourselves. We also reserve the right to call upon our friends to assist us. But, because of our abiding faith in the United Nations and the principles and purposes enshrined in its Charter, we have once again come to the Security Council—the organ primarily responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security—so that we can together determine an appropriate response to the numerous acts of aggression committed against my country by the arrogant, belligerent and intransigent South African white minority racist régime which, like the illegal Ian Smith régime in Southern Rhodesia, is bent on perpetuating the *status quo* and hence refusing to heed the demands of the African people and the international community as a whole for the establishment in the area of a just order and the respect for human dignity.

18. We view with grave seriousness the recent act of aggression committed against my country by the racist white minority régime of South Africa. This act of aggression was committed on 11 July 1976, 30 kilo-

metres inside Zambian territory: specifically, at Sialola, in the Kaunga Mashu area of the Western Province. This act of aggression committed inside Zambia is a blatant and flagrant violation of our territorial integrity which the Council and the entire international community should vigorously condemn. The immediate target of this violation was a freedom-fighter transit camp of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

19. The scenario leading to the attack on the camp is that South African military aircraft, flying from the south-east to the north-west, hovered over the area and dropped armed men, who planted land-mines all around the camp. Subsequently, they attacked and shelled the camp. The inhabitants of the camp hollowed out, but some of them were caught in an ambush and killed. Others died of injuries from land-mines which exploded as they ran over them. The preliminary count of casualties of this senseless attack was 22 people dead and 45 others injured. The list of those dead has since risen to 24 and could grow as additional bodies are discovered. The area to this day remains infested with live land-mines.

20. This diabolical act of aggression by South Africa demonstrates the lack of consideration and respect for human life on the part of the white minority racist régimes of southern Africa. But this act is condemnable for two other specific reasons. First, it is an act perpetrated in blatant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of my country. Needless to say, this is a direct contravention of international law and the Charter of the United Nations. Secondly, the attack was directed at a SWAPO freedom-fighter camp. I need not remind the Council, in this regard, that South African occupation of Namibia is itself illegal. Therefore, it is cruel and totally without justification for the South African régime to attack Namibians fighting to liberate their country from the illegal occupation régime, which is flouting with impunity the authority of the United Nations.

21. Indeed, the cruelty of the racist South African régime was recently blatantly demonstrated by the savage and shocking massacre of innocent black people, including women and children, in Soweto and other African townships in South Africa itself. That massacre, which surpasses the horrors of Sharpeville, should, together with the general aggressive and belligerent nature of the South African régime, as evidenced by its wanton attacks against my country, serve notice on the international community as to the extent to which racist South Africa and the illegal minority régime in Southern Rhodesia are prepared to go to defend their reign of terror. It is a fact that these racist régimes have embarked on genocide against the black man in southern Africa in order to preserve the region for themselves.

22. Is it any wonder that South Africa, in its determination to perpetuate its evil system of *apartheid*

in southern Africa, drew up a map in which it claims the whole of Africa south of the Sahara as part of its territory for strategic and defence purposes? Is it any wonder that the racist régime has recently rammed through the racist South African parliament a "law" which authorizes and makes "hot pursuit" of freedom fighters a State policy and which empowers the régime to cross into any neighbouring country and violate its sovereignty and territorial integrity? Indeed, is it any wonder that in utter defiance of the decisions of the United Nations, of which it is a Member, South Africa continues with impunity to collaborate militarily, economically and politically with the illegal régime of Ian Smith in the British colony of Southern Rhodesia?

23. As I have already said, South Africa is illegally occupying Namibia in utter defiance of the United Nations. More than in any other case, here you have a direct challenge to the authority of the United Nations by one of its own Members. South Africa cannot escape responsibility for the deteriorating situation in Namibia and in the whole of southern Africa. Moreover, its designs on the independent countries in the region, including all those south of the Sahara, show that the régime is also expansionist in nature.

24. The central issue, therefore, is black majority rule in Namibia and Zimbabwe, and the destruction of *apartheid* in South Africa. As long as the white minority racist régimes continue to exist in the region, the international community will witness repeated acts of aggression by these régimes against independent African countries, such as the one my country was subjected to on 11 July 1976. Indeed, as long as the white minority racist régimes continue to exist in the region, peace and security in southern Africa will remain precarious, and international peace and security will be threatened.

25. So the challenge before the United Nations—and in particular the Security Council, which has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security—is to take decisive measures to hasten progress towards majority rule in southern Africa. Failure by the international community to act decisively can only lead to intensification of the racial conflagration in the region, which in fact has already started.

26. Let me emphasize here that the South African aggression committed against Zambia on 11 July was not an isolated incident, but was part of a series of acts of aggression to which we have been subjected since our independence 12 years ago. Because of our geopolitical position, and because of our principles and our commitment to the liberation of southern Africa, we have been and remain the target of hostile acts by South Africa. Suffice it to say that this year alone we have been subjected to no less than 14 provocative acts perpetrated by South Africa. These are as follows:

(1) On 19 January 1976, a South African aircraft twice violated our airspace at Kazungula;

(2) On 14 February, a South African helicopter violated our airspace at Katombola;

(3) On 11 March, a South African anti-personnel mine went off, injuring several herds of cattle at Likonda Village in Sesheke district;

(4) On 12 March, six South African soldiers crossed the border at Katima Mulilo and defaced a border sign by writing and drawing skeletons on it;

(5) On 1 May, an innocent Zambian civilian woman at Imusho had her foot blown off by an anti-personnel mine planted by South African agents;

(6) On 3 May, a military vehicle was damaged beyond repair when it hit an anti-tank land-mine planted by South African agents at Imusho;

(7) On 14 May, houses were damaged when South African troops fired arms and guided anti-tank missiles from armoured cars at Sesheke Boma;

(8) On 28 May, South African troops fired arms at Sesheke Boma, causing serious damage to property;

(9) On 14 June, a Zambian Government Roads Branch Office was damaged when South African troops fired mortars and guided missiles. On the same day, a South African aircraft violated our airspace at Sesheke Boma. Again at Sesheke Boma, on the same day, a nine-year-old girl by the name of Nalishabo Ilukela was hit by South African armed forces with a bullet, which went through her leg;

(10) On 16 June, a Land Rover hit a South African land-mine, killing one soldier and seriously injuring three others at Sesheke;

(11) On 20 June, South African troops again shelled Katima Mulilo, causing serious damage to property;

(12) On 7 July, six persons were seriously injured when a Land Rover in which they were travelling hit a land-mine planted by South African agents at Sinjembela;

(13) On 8 July, one Zambian was killed and two severely injured when a Land Rover in which they were travelling was wrecked by a land-mine planted by South African agents at Sinjembela;

(14) Then there was the aggression of 11 July, which was the most serious of them all.

27. The Council may wish to know that the white racist régime of South Africa, in collaboration with

the illegal Ian Smith régime in Southern Rhodesia, has deployed air and infantry commando forces along the Caprivi Strip and Kazungula borders with Zambia. These commandos have not only posed a real danger to the lives of those living closely behind the Zambian borders but have also caused havoc and created terror by actually crossing over our border and planting anti-personnel and anti-vehicle land-mines which have taken a heavy toll in human life and property.

28. The same situation obtains on the border between Southern Rhodesia and Mozambique. The illegal régime of Ian Smith has wantonly bombed certain places in the sister Republic of Mozambique.

29. In addition to the acts of aggression I have just cited, the Council will wish to know that we in Zambia have irrefutable evidence that for a long time South Africa has been interfering in our internal affairs. The racist régime of South Africa has, in fact, trained, financed and armed certain dissident elements in Zambia. Among the agents used by South Africa was William Chipango, who together with some of his henchmen, was recently sentenced to death, having been convicted of treason by our courts of law. Chipango was paid millions of dollars by South Africa, with the express objective of subverting the Zambian Government. To achieve this sinister objective, Chipango was to recruit—and he did recruit—a number of collaborators who subsequently received military training in South Africa, in Namibia, in the then Fascist Portuguese-ruled Angola, and in Southern Rhodesia. These dissidents were trained by South African racists in sabotage, espionage and subversion.

30. One of William Chipango's accomplices was Bratson Mushala, a Zambian dissident who was responsible for the recruiting and training of Zambian recruits in the then Fascist Portuguese Angola. Mushala went to South Africa from Angola with 23 men armed with sophisticated weapons to lead an attack on Zambia. He entered Zambia, through the Senanga district in the Western Province, from Namibia near the end of 1975. Our law-enforcement officers are currently searching for Mushala and his gang, who are terrorizing our people. They have committed numerous murders and destroyed and stolen property.

31. All these activities by South Africa are designed to change our policy with regard to the liberation of southern Africa. They are intended to put an end to our support for the liberation movements, which are waging a heroic struggle for the freedom and independence of their countries.

32. South Africa hopes that, as a result of these acts of aggression and interference in our internal affairs, Zambia will abandon SWAPO and other liberation movements of southern Africa and sacrifice their just cause at the altar of expediency.

33. I wish to state categorically that these acts of aggression have only made us more united and more resolute in our support for the liberation movements and their just cause. We shall support them to the end, for we believe in the legitimacy of their cause. We shall not fail them nor abandon them, for we also know that their struggle is in accordance with the United Nations and its resolutions. These liberation movements are fighting for the inalienable right of their peoples to self-determination and independence. Moreover, we in Zambia realize that we shall enjoy genuine peace and security only when we have free and independent neighbours around us. We cannot co-exist with racist white minority régimes.

34. I take pride in stating here publicly that Zambia will continue to render every possible form of assistance to the people of Namibia and their national liberation movement, SWAPO.

35. South Africa has demonstrated that it does not want a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem; the so-called constitutional talks being held in Windhoek, Namibia, are being conducted by its hand-picked stooges and puppets. These talks are a smoke-screen to cover the diabolic intentions of the South African régime to legitimize the fragmentation of Namibia on the basis of its policy of bantustanization. South Africa has blatantly ignored numerous Security Council resolutions on Namibia. Indeed, last January [resolution 385 (1976)], the Council gave South Africa until 31 August 1976 solemnly to declare its intention to withdraw from Namibia and to agree to the convening of a national election in the Territory under United Nations supervision and control. However, instead of complying with this important resolution, South Africa has increased its oppressive rule over Namibia, has conducted wholesale massacres of Namibians, and has also stepped up its unwarranted and wanton aggression against Zambia, including the violation of its airspace and territorial integrity. In committing these acts of aggression, South Africa has used the international Territory of Namibia as a base.

36. Since South Africa is not prepared to promote genuine independence in Namibia, the rightful owners of the Territory have no alternative but to struggle using all means at their disposal. They have the right to struggle for what is theirs. Those who have fled their country in order to promote the struggle need transit facilities. It would be inhuman of us if we did not assist the victims of such racial cruelty.

37. We in Zambia have an obligation to the oppressed Namibians to offer these facilities. Incidents such as the bombing of a transit camp on our soil on 11 July and the cold-blooded murder of Namibian patriots will not halt the struggle. The struggle will be stopped only by the total and unconditional withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia and the accession of the Territory to independence as a single entity on the basis of majority rule.

38. The Security Council can ill afford to be aloof in the unfolding political drama in southern Africa. Conscious of its responsibilities under the Charter, the Council must demonstrate its full support for the just cause of the oppressed people of southern Africa. Such support must include concrete action by the Council totally to isolate the white racist minority régimes of southern Africa, which are in fact merchants of death and destruction. The support must also be reflected in the Council's sensitivity to the plight of the front-line independent African countries in southern Africa. In rendering all possible support to the liberation movements, Zambia and other front-line States are in fact assuming the burden that should equally be the responsibility of the international community as a whole.

39. In the specific case before it, the Council must condemn in the strongest terms South Africa's wanton aggression against Zambia and the senseless, savage and cold-blooded murder of innocent people. The Council must also demand that the racist régime of South Africa henceforth respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Zambia, as well as those of other front-line States. Moreover, the Council should declare in no uncertain terms that South Africa should relinquish forthwith its illegal hold on Namibia, and that peace and security in southern Africa are inextricably linked with the liberation of the region. In this regard, the Council must, therefore, express its unqualified support for SWAPO and for the other liberation movements in southern Africa.

40. In making these demands, I wish again to remind the Council of its resolution 300 (1971), to which I referred at the beginning of this statement. South Africa has again violated the sovereignty and territorial integrity of my country. In resolution 300 (1971), specifically in paragraph 3, the Council declared that it would examine any recurrence of such hostile South African acts against Zambia in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter. This is the moment for the Council to honour its pledge. I now appeal to the Security Council to take stern and effective measures within its jurisdiction against South Africa.

41. I trust the Council will live up to its responsibilities. I hope to return home with a clear and sound Security Council message of solidarity with the people of Zambia and, indeed, with the people of other front-line States who continue to make tremendous sacrifices in the interest of the liberation of southern Africa, a responsibility of the entire international community. The solidarity of the Council, which we hope will be reflected in the unanimous adoption of a resolution containing all our demands, would be a source of great encouragement to us. Everything must be done to isolate South Africa and other forces of evil in southern Africa. Indeed, everything must be done to speed up the liberation of Namibia and Zimbabwe as well as the destruction of the evil policy of *apartheid*, so ruthlessly practised by the South African white minority régime.

42. The PRESIDENT: I wish to assure the Foreign Minister of Zambia that I will convey to the Secretary-General his expression of appreciation for the close attention with which the Secretary-General is following the problems of southern Africa and his dedication to carrying out the main purposes and principles of the Charter. I would like to add that the Secretary-General sincerely regrets not being here with us today. His schedule, which was prepared a year in advance, has taken him to Geneva to deal with important work of the Organization. I shall certainly keep him informed of the Council's deliberations.

43. I should now like to fulfil a pleasant duty and respectfully extend a warm welcome to the Foreign Minister of the United Republic of Tanzania, Mr. Ibrahim Kaduma, who is honouring the deliberations of the Council at this meeting with his presence.

44. I wish to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 26 July 1976 from the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which reads:

"The Security Council is about to consider the complaint by the Republic of Zambia concerning the repeated acts of aggression committed against the Republic of Zambia by South Africa which apparently used for this purpose the territory of Namibia.

"I wish to convey to you the desire of the United Nations Council for Namibia to participate in this debate, without right to vote, and to be represented by a delegation headed by myself as Acting President and including the representatives of Botswana and Yugoslavia."

45. It may be recalled that on previous occasions the Council has extended invitations to representatives of the United Nations Council for Namibia, most recently at its 1902nd meeting, on 29 March. Accordingly, if there is no objection, I propose that the Council extend an invitation, in accordance with rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, to the Acting President and the other mentioned members of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

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

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

47. Mr. BOTHA (South Africa): Mr. President, may I congratulate you on your assumption of the important and responsible position of President of the Security Council for the month of July.

48. At the outset I wish to state that the South African Government had no knowledge of an attack on a Zambian village at Sialola on 11 July 1976. The South African Government at no time authorized and would not authorize attacks on Zambian villages. It is in our interest to endeavour to maintain friendly relations with all the States of southern Africa, including Zambia. The interests of the States of our region continue to lie in the direction of endeavouring to settle their differences peacefully and bilaterally.

49. The representative of Zambia has referred to a number of other incidents. There have indeed been a number of incidents on both sides of the border in the past. The South African Government is fully aware of them, and, for their part, the South African authorities have had occasion to bring a number of infringements by Zambian nationals to the attention of the Zambian Government—for example, incidents which occurred on 19 and 23 June and 3 August 1974; and on 21 April, 14 May and 14 June 1976. Our records show that, in addition, a number of border violations have occurred in respect of which we have not made representations. We did make representations in regard to the incidents I have just listed, as I am sure the Foreign Minister of Zambia would be able to confirm. Incidents in respect of which we have not made representations, which involved violence, occurred on 26 January, 16 and 18 March, 8 and 14 April, 26 June, 18 July, 6 and 9 September 1975 and 3 June 1976. Moreover, violence has been committed by hostile elements which enjoy refuge in Zambia. These elements have crossed the border on numerous occasions, killing innocent inhabitants of South West Africa, both black and white.

50. Complaints about border violations on both sides have lately been handled by notes exchanged between the two Governments. That is a commendable procedure which enables investigation of alleged incidents to take place and steps to be taken to prevent recurrences.

51. However, in the case of the alleged incident at Sialola, the South African Government learned of the events that are said to have taken place there by way of reports in the press. My Government took the initiative of trying to establish the facts. On Sunday, 18 July, the South African Department of Foreign Affairs dispatched a message to the Zambian Government seeking particulars of the incident. There was no reply.

52. For its part, South Africa is willing to discuss the situation with Zambia, with a view to establishing the facts and, on that basis, taking any further joint steps which might seem appropriate. South Africa has at all times been willing to do this.

53. During his statement the representative of Zambia referred to a group operating, under one Mushala and, if I understood him correctly, he alleged that the

group was encouraged or assisted by the South African Government to act against Zambia.

54. It is true that we know of Mushala. The facts, as we know them, are briefly as follows.

55. On Sunday, 17 November 1974, an aircraft arrived at Rundu in Kavango in the north of South West Africa, with Mushala and 67 of his followers, including women and children, aboard. No prior notification of the aircraft's arrival had been received. Mushala is a Zambian. He came from the north. He presented his group as refugees and asked for asylum. The authorities were thus confronted with a difficult situation. After consideration of the alternatives, it was decided to grant asylum to the group for humanitarian reasons, but it was made clear to them that the asylum was conditional—the condition being that in no circumstances would they undertake, nor would they be allowed to undertake, any subversive activities against Zambia.

56. Subsequently, it became doubtful whether Mushala would abide by his undertakings. We doubted his sincerity. Consequently, he was separated from his followers, and both he and they were then restricted to two camps at different locations. Attempts were made to keep them occupied by offering them work. These attempts were unsuccessful. They did not want to work. For example, a number of Mushala's followers agreed to assist with guard duties at a local road construction project. However, they proved to be so inefficient that we had to return them to the main group within a short space of time.

57. On 29 November 1975, following renewed assurances from Mushala that he would comply with the initial conditions, he was allowed to return to the camp where the rest of his people were confined. During the night of 7 to 8 December, Mushala and a number of his followers absconded, after raiding a storeroom in the vicinity. Efforts to track them down failed, as rain had obliterated their tracks.

58. I wish to state very clearly here today that Mushala is no friend of the South African Government, and neither is the South African Government a friend of Mushala's. Mushala was granted asylum for humanitarian reasons. He is a disreputable character who became a nuisance and an embarrassment to us. I admit that. He is not welcome, and should he again attempt to cross the border he and his followers would be arrested and handed over to the Zambian authorities.

59. Mushala's background and his activities are well known to Zambia—indeed, better known to the representative of Zambia than to me. His apparently immutable hostility to the Zambian Government is not of South African origin. Of that I can assure the Council. Far from encouraging Mushala in his activities and hostility towards Zambia, South Africa restrained

him. All he was offered was a place to reside. He was neither assisted with his plans against Zambia nor permitted to act against Zambia from South African or South West African territory.

60. The thrust of the allegation is that South Africa countenances, and in this case has countenanced, the mounting of a campaign of subversion and terrorism against another African country. The representative of Zambia should know that such activities do not accord with the policies of the South African Government. As is known, there are numerous dissident elements and groups that operate inside and outside Africa for the overthrow of established Governments. I think I must be frank about this today: these dissident groups appeal to other Governments inside and outside Africa for assistance in the subversion of their established Governments. I believe that it is my duty to state here in the Council today—although I am somewhat hesitant about doing so—that we have in the recent past been approached by no less than 11 dissident African groups from 11 different African countries with requests for assistance to subvert and overthrow the Governments of the countries concerned. Requests of that kind have not been limited, may I add, to the African continent. In not one single case—and I must emphasize this—have we given any consideration to these requests. It is, moreover, firm South African policy not to render assistance of any nature to elements designed to commit subversion against their Governments.

61. Can there be any doubt that South Africa desires peace in Africa, and in particular in southern Africa? No one can argue this point, really. An escalation of conflict and strife would be catastrophic for all of us. It would hurt all of us badly.

62. There seems to be a predisposition automatically to lay at South Africa's door responsibility for any and every incident in southern Africa, almost—if I may say so—as if by reflex. This is not a legitimate reflex in regard to a region which has been plagued by turmoil and guerrilla attacks for years; where factions, rival movements, private armies and maurauding bands are rife. South Africa is not the initiator or instigator or supporter of this regional unrest. Zambia also has not been immune to it. Zambia also has been compelled by circumstances known to be completely unrelated to South Africa to take emergency action. And quite recently there have been reports of internecine struggles waged by movements which are guests in Zambia, with serious implications for Zambia and other countries of the region.

63. It is the unsettled nature of the situation in southern Africa which itself is to blame for developments such as those that have given rise to this discussion. It is the toleration in the region of armed groups which owe allegiance to no one and which frequently act on their own initiative, without regard

to the interests of the sovereign States of the region or of the region as a whole, which is at the root of the trouble. Surely what the area needs is a solution wider in scope than the issues of shooting incidents and aggravations, a solution which promises hope of stability, of permanence, not only for one boundary or locality but also for the whole of southern Africa. Only in such a way can region-wide tensions and suspicions be allayed. South Africa subscribes to such a recipe for peace; we are ready to discuss it with other countries concerned. We would wish to think that all the other countries of the region are willing to examine together, seriously and responsibly, the very real possibilities for promoting a condition of lasting peace.

64. We are as concerned as anybody to find a way to eliminate the friction which must inevitably be generated by the sort of situation which I have described.

65. As regards the situation in South West Africa, substantial progress has been made by the Constitutional Conference. The Conference has already achieved agreement on many matters which would have been considered impossible a short while ago. What was anathema yesterday can become acceptable tomorrow—but not in an atmosphere of tension and terror and not under threat. Further progress requires an atmosphere of understanding.

66. On the delicate issue of the composition of the Constitutional Conference, I should like to reiterate what my Prime Minister said recently in the South African Parliament. He stated:

“They themselves decided on a certain *modus operandi*. That *modus operandi* is theirs. If they want to bring in other people—whether I like it or whether I do not like it—it is their business. I am not going to interfere with that.”

On the subject of the status of South West Africa, the South African Prime Minister said:

“South West Africa has a particular international character. Whatever our standpoint on the Mandate may be, and however we may differ in regard to it, the fact remains that South West Africa has a particular international character and that one may not ignore this.”

He added:

“There is one thing I want to make very clear here today. If those leaders have worked out a future for themselves, even if I do not like the way in which they have done so, I shall accept it, for it is their land and their future.”

67. Too much is at stake for too many people in southern Africa to let an opportunity pass for achieving

future peace. We remain hopeful indeed that, despite the inhibitions and prejudices of the peoples and nations involved, peaceful solutions to the problems of southern Africa as a whole are indeed attainable, however remote they may sometimes seem. We remain hopeful that peace is attainable. We are appreciative that the United States of America has recently renewed its identification with this hope and taken a positive initiative in this direction. We are realistically alive to the considerable obstacles along that path, but in principle we are willing to explore it. We now need a bold willingness on the part of those directly concerned in southern Africa and elsewhere to trust one another, for trust is the essential but elusive ingredient in the southern African situation. We cannot at this particular time afford acrimony. Acrimony does not help to build confidence. The real issue is peace; and it is not merely desirable; it is not merely important; it is an overriding necessity that the countries of southern Africa, with the encouragement of the outside world, should come together to examine the underlying issues, not simply discuss the symptoms of dispute and conflict, and to lay the foundations of permanent harmony in the area.

68. I appeal to the Council not to mete out condemnations, criticisms and pejoratives to South Africa. The Council would do well to weigh the consequences of such an approach. Perhaps the Council is not sufficiently aware of its counter-productive effect. What is needed how in southern Africa is encouragement for efforts and successes in moving away from old and outmoded attitudes to more constructive conceptions which would result in fruitful co-operation and the dissipation of the fear of domination of one nation or group by another. I urge the Council members to recognize that the problems that have to be solved in southern Africa are of a far greater order than those experienced in many of their own countries and to consider these problems with tolerance and realism. We need conciliation; we do not need vituperation. We need communication; we do not need exacerbation.

69. Let us not allow our emotions to march us into a war no one can win. Let us rather allow reason and realism and confidence in each other's good faith to win a future for all of us. Peace can be won without conquering anyone. We can achieve the peace we seek, but we can achieve it only if all of us once and for all firmly accept that the devastation of war is the one alternative which not one of us can afford.

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

71. Mr. EL HASSEN (Mauritania) (*interpretation from French*): The problem before the Council has been presented clearly, precisely and pertinently by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Zambia this afternoon. Thus, in speaking in this debate I shall not be putting new facts or new clarifications

before the Council. As Chairman of the Group of African States in the United Nations, I should merely like to demonstrate to the Council the concern of the Organization of African Unity over the aggression committed by the racist régime of South Africa against an African State.

72. For the Security Council and the international community the month of July has been particularly eventful. Africa, for its part, was unfortunately not sheltered from these dramatic events, which continue to threaten the very existence of its States.

73. The Council's heated debates on these events bear eloquent testimony to this. Scarcely two weeks ago the Council was seized of a complaint regarding the violation by Israel of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of an African State—Uganda. Whatever the motivation for this aggression and the justifications given for it, it is quite obvious that it was an extremely dangerous act which could have dramatic repercussions on international relations.

74. The Council adjourned or, rather, suspended its deliberations without any measure being taken to prevent a repetition of such acts of terrorism—a terrorism which is particularly dangerous because it is premeditated and carried out by an organized authority which is a Member of the United Nations.

75. Today the Council has before it a practically identical complaint. This time it has to do with a clear act of aggression committed on 11 July by South Africa against the Republic of Zambia. True, the representative of South Africa has just affirmed before the Council that he had no knowledge of this event. This is a tactic that is fairly well known to the Council, a tactic practised by the supporters of *apartheid* and by the Tel Aviv authorities, which consists either of purely and simply denying the existence of events, or of diverting the attention of the Council from its immediate and serious responsibilities.

76. We all know that a camp sheltering representatives of SWAPO was attacked by helicopters, that there were dead, that there was material damage and destruction; we can at least wonder where this phantom which attacked SWAPO came from, and why it should bear any animosity to SWAPO when the latter is located in Zambia, an African territory and country which is offering SWAPO its hospitality.

77. In any event, on 11 July the village of Sialola, situated 30 kilometres within Zambian territory, was attacked and bombed by the South African air force. That attack alone led to more than 24 dead and 45 wounded, according to still provisional figures.

78. We should emphasize that this violation of Zambian territory was preceded, as was recalled by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zambia, by 13 acts of aggression perpetrated since 1 January 1976 by the

Pretoria régime. All of those acts of aggression were committed from Namibia, an international Territory the occupation of which by South Africa has been repeatedly condemned and deemed illegal by the Council.

79. Under the pretext of the right of "hot pursuit" which some States are trying to impose on the rest of the international community, and particularly on Africa, the Pretoria régime is arrogating to itself the right to administer justice by violating the territorial integrity of neighbouring States and by sowing terror, destruction and death in the countries bordering on Namibia.

80. The assistance Zambia gives to SWAPO and other liberation movements—assistance which South Africa cites to justify its aggression—is nevertheless in accordance with the numerous decisions and recommendations adopted by the United Nations, and particularly by the Security Council. The United Nations decisions are clear on this subject: not only have they recognized the legitimacy of the struggle of the Namibian people, but they have also called upon all States to grant their material and moral support to that people. The Republic of Zambia, an African country which is especially concerned by events and which is a Member of the United Nations, could not but subscribe to those decisions by giving active support to the liberation movements that are struggling against occupation and against a régime whose inhuman policy is a continued affront to the world's conscience.

81. By transforming the airports of Katima and Pacha and the Caprivi Strip into permanent bases for aggression against Zambia and neighbouring African countries, South Africa has demonstrated once again the contradictory policies that it pursues.

82. The occupation of Namibia and the segregation that South Africa has established as a State system can only be continued at the price of the annihilation of the liberation movements, and that is what really motivates South Africa's policy of intimidation and aggression. Such behaviour on its part is contrary not only to international law and morality but also to decisions adopted by the Security Council. We believe that the Council cannot give its endorsement to such action.

83. On 12 October 1971, in deciding on the complaint submitted by Zambia, the Council adopted resolution 300 (1971), in which it demanded that South Africa cease all attacks against the Republic of Zambia; the Council also decided to reconvene should another act of aggression be committed by South Africa against Zambia. The 14 acts of violation of sovereignty and territorial integrity committed against Zambia by South Africa bear witness, as if there were any further need, to the lack of interest and respect which South Africa has always had for Council decisions.

84. It would be superfluous, furthermore, to enter into a discussion of the developments concerning the less-than-praiseworthy attitude which South Africa has always taken towards decisions of the Security Council, the United Nations and the international community.

85. South Africa's presence in Namibia, the Soweto and Sharpeville massacres, and the many acts of aggression committed against neighbouring States are all acts which lay bare the true nature of the Pretoria régime. Hence it is not surprising that South Africa should commit another act of aggression against Zambia, sowing death and destruction in a country which has done everything to ensure that the spirit and letter of the Lusaka Declaration<sup>1</sup> should be respected, both by South Africa and by the African States.

86. In this connexion, Zambia has explored all possible peaceful channels to ensure the peaceful settlement of the problems of southern Africa, particularly the Namibian problem, without useless bloodshed. But the Pretoria racists and the Tel Aviv Zionists, in order to survive, must constantly resort to racism and the policy of depopulation of the African and Arab territories which they occupy. In the face of this intransigent and obstructive attitude on the part of South Africa, the Security Council must take firm measures concerning the acts of aggression committed by the Pretoria authorities against neighbouring African States.

87. If, as in the case of the Ugandan complaint, Zambia's complaint were not to culminate in an unequivocal decision of the Council, Africa would rightly wonder whether recourse to violence may not be the only possible way of solving international conflicts. Such an attitude on the part of the Council would, beyond a doubt, be contrary to the most relevant provisions of the Charter, and would eventually, or in the not-too-distant future, threaten the very existence of the United Nations.

88. But we are convinced that the Council cannot and will not adopt such an attitude. Once again, the attention of Africa and the international community is focused on the Council. Peace and security, not only in Africa but elsewhere in the world, would be endangered if the disappointment recorded during the meetings of the Security Council on the Ugandan complaint were once again to manifest itself at the current meetings.

89. We are convinced, however, that the wisdom which has always animated the work of the Council will ultimately prevail, in the interest of the United Nations and in the interests of peace and justice in the world.

90. The PRESIDENT: The next name in my list of speakers is that of the Acting President of the United

Nations Council for Namibia, Mr. Jaipal, on whom I now call.

91. Mr. JAIPAL (Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia): Mr. President, on behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia, may I express to you and to the members of the Security Council our gratitude for this opportunity to address the Council.

92. The item before the Council today has particular relevance to Namibia and its people, since once again the Territory has been used by South Africa as a springboard for a military assault against a peaceful village community in Zambia.

93. From what direction did these South African forces come? South Africa has no common border with Zambia. But it is well known that South African troops have been sent to Namibia in increasing numbers, in flagrant defiance of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. What are these troops doing in Namibia? The resolutions of the Assembly and the Council have determined that the South African presence in Namibia is illegal and have demanded the withdrawal of the South African administration from Namibia. The forces of the Pretoria régime are in Namibia evidently to carry out attacks against the neighbouring African countries and to intimidate them in pursuance of its policy of racist and colonialist exploitation.

94. The participation in this debate of the Foreign Minister of Zambia underlines the gravity of the situation. His eloquent statement has profound implications not only for Namibia. Zambia is in the front line of a struggle which reverberates throughout Africa. The threats to the territorial integrity of Zambia cannot but intensify the concern of the international community, because in fact they constitute also wider threats to international peace and security.

95. For some time now the Council for Namibia has been made aware of the increasing militarization of Namibia by South Africa, whose militaristic policies have been the source of ominous developments in that region. In Namibia, the illegal South African administration has increasingly used its troops to perpetuate acts of brutality and oppression against the Namibian people. In southern Africa—first in Angola and now in Zambia—the forces of the Pretoria régime have mounted acts of aggression from the international Territory of Namibia.

96. The Council for Namibia was established by the General Assembly as the legal administering authority of Namibia, and it is fully committed to the goal of independence and self-determination for the Namibian people. The presence of the South African administration in Namibia and the militarization of that Territory are incompatible with the commitments of South Africa as a State Member of the United Nations.

Furthermore, they also contribute to the aggravation of tensions and threats to international peace and security in that area.

97. The attack against a peaceful rural community, 30 kilometres deep inside Zambian territory, is an alarming intensification of South Africa's policy of aggression.

98. The Security Council should not remain indifferent to the disclosures made by the Foreign Minister of Zambia of South African acts of aggression which are in total violation of the Charter and the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

99. In the light of the Pretoria régime's ruthless repression of the African people of Namibia and of its acts of aggression against Zambia, it is clear to the Council for Namibia that the so-called constitutional talks are nothing but manoeuvres to perpetuate South Africa's illegal presence in Namibia and its racist exploitation of the people of Namibia.

100. The United Nations Council for Namibia vigorously condemns the aggression of South Africa against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Zambia and considers that the Security Council should, among other things, demand the withdrawal of the racist Pretoria régime from Namibia without any further delay.

101. The PRESIDENT: Since the list of speakers has now been exhausted, I now call on the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zambia to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

102. Mr. MWALE (Zambia): If my delegation has asked to speak, it is merely to make a few observations. We do have the right, or rather we do ask for the right, to speak at a later stage perhaps, if need be, in detail. However, for the moment, I should like only to make a few observations as follows.

103. First of all, the representative of South Africa in his statement mentioned that there have been border violations by Zambia. I want to make it abundantly clear that this is a gross fabrication. As far as Zambia is concerned, Zambia has not violated any space of South Africa. Technically, Zambia borders on Namibia; technically, the presence of South Africa in Namibia is illegal, which means that the acts of aggression by South Africa emanating from Namibia are themselves illegal and deserving of condemnation.

104. The representative of South Africa has denied that South Africa had any knowledge of these attacks,

in particular the attack of 11 July. This comes to us as a surprise. We did not expect them to say that they had no knowledge, because if South Africa did not know about these acts, then it is obvious that they have lost control of their troops that are illegally in Namibia.

105. I want to appeal to the Council not to take this statement seriously and not to let it be used to dissuade the Council from considering what is before it, namely a case of a complaint from the Republic of Zambia, fully documented and with specific dates.

106. The representative of South Africa has talked about peaceful moves in southern Africa. Zambia should be the one to point out that we have gone all the way, we have left no stone unturned on the road towards a peaceful solution in southern Africa. The Council is fully aware of the Lusaka Manifesto<sup>2</sup>, which is now a document of the United Nations. And South Africa knows that. We are the ones who have gone all out to try to find a peaceful solution, not South Africa.

107. South Africa talks again about liberation movements as if they were simply a group of terrorists. They are not terrorists; these are people who are fighting for their inalienable right to self-determination.

108. It is the diabolical system of *apartheid* in South Africa which is behind all this trouble. Once *apartheid* is removed from South Africa, the whole of southern Africa will be a peaceful haven.

109. Finally, I would like again to refer to the statement that the representative of South Africa has made in his reference to Mushala. It is now abundantly clear that South Africa knows about Mushala's activities. The representative here has admitted that South Africa knows about these people. South Africa received them. South Africa gave them facilities. And he talks about Mushala having absconded. It is quite clear that South Africa has been behind this. We have evidence to that effect.

110. Those are the comments I wished to make. At a later stage, with the indulgence of the Council, if need be, Zambia will exercise the right to speak again in detail.

*The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.*

*Notes*

<sup>1</sup> Declaration of the Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Lusaka from 8 to 10 September 1970.

<sup>2</sup> Manifesto on Southern Africa, see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

---

### كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

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

#### 如何购取联合国出版物

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

#### HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

#### COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

#### КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

#### COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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

---