

UNITED NATIONS

05 60108



SECURITY COUNCIL

OFFICIAL RECORDS

UNI LIBRARY

THIRTY-FIRST YEAR

JUL 16 1985

UN/SA/AGENDA/1946

1946th

MEETING: 29 JULY 1976

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1946)	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.

1946th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 29 July 1976, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Piero VINCI (Italy).

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

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1946)

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

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

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

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

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at previous meetings [1944th and 1945th meetings] I shall now, with the consent of the Council, invite the representatives of Zambia, South Africa, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Liberia, Madagascar, Mauritania, Uganda and Zaire to participate in the Council's discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the provisions of Article 31 of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.
2. In accordance with the Council's further decision, I shall renew the Council's invitation, under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, to the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the other members of the delegation of that Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mwale (Zambia), and Mr. Jaipal (Acting President of the United

Nations Council for Namibia) and the other members of the delegation of that Council took places at the Security Council table; and Mr. Botha (South Africa), Mr. Acosta (Cuba), Mr. Ahmed (Egypt), Mr. Ibrahim (Ethiopia), Mrs. Brooks-Randolph (Liberia), Mr. Rasolondraibe (Madagascar), Mr. El Hassen (Mauritania), Mr. Mwangaguhunga (Uganda) and Mr. Umba di Lutete (Zaire) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: In addition, I have received letters from the representatives of Botswana, Mozambique, Qatar, Sierra Leone and Yugoslavia, in which they also request to be invited to participate in the debate. I therefore propose that the Council agree, in accordance with the usual practice, to invite the representatives I have just mentioned to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote.

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

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mogami (Botswana), Mr. Chissano (Mozambique), Mr. Al-Obaidly (Qatar), Mr. Nicol (Sierra Leone) and Mr. Mujezinović (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

5. The PRESIDENT: Before we hear the first speaker, I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to the letter dated 29 July from the representative of South Africa to the President of the Security Council [S/12157].

6. The first speaker is the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, on whom I now call.

7. Mr. JAIPAL (Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia): On behalf of the Council for Namibia I should like to make a brief observation on the document that has just been circulated.

8. The question of a fact-finding mission was raised yesterday [1945th meeting] by the representative of Liberia, and today we have before us in document S/12157 a letter from the representative of the South African Government in which that Government claims to have consulted the authorities of the areas concerned

and that they have indicated their willingness to co-operate fully. Who these authorities are is not clear. Thereupon, the South African Government has agreed also to give its full co-operation.

9. The Council for Namibia desires me to inform the Security Council that the only co-operation the United Nations and its organs expect from the South African Government is that it quit the international Territory of Namibia. That Government's presence in Namibia is a continuing affront to the United Nations.

10. Furthermore, there can be no question of seeking the co-operation of the South African Government in regard to any inquiry into an attack that took place 30 kilometres inside Zambia. The Government of Zambia has all the evidence that is needed to establish that the attack was made by South African forces. The Security Council may, if it chooses to do so, seek additional information from the Government of Zambia—that is, if the Council is not satisfied with the facts set out by the Foreign Minister of Zambia [1944th meeting].

11. So far as the Council for Namibia is concerned, it is opposed to any action that would seek to confer any sort of legitimacy on the South African Government in relation to its presence or activities in Namibia. The sending of a fact-finding mission to Namibia with the co-operation of the South African Government would be such an act.

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

13. Mr. AL-OBAIDLY (Qatar): In my capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group for the month of July, I wish to take this opportunity to extend to you, Mr. President, my profound and sincere congratulations on your assumption of the high office of President of the Security Council for this month. Similarly, I wish to express my delegation's appreciation to the Council for allowing me to participate in these deliberations.

14. I wish also, on behalf of the Arab Group, to express my deep and sincere condolences and sympathy to the representative of the People's Republic of China on the loss of lives in China this week as a result of an earthquake. I request the Chinese representative to convey to his Government and to the families of the deceased our sincere sympathy.

15. Once again the Council has before it a complaint against a racist régime, namely South Africa, which has infringed the sovereignty and territorial integrity of another independent State, namely, the Republic of Zambia. My delegation strongly believes that the Council bears a good deal of responsibility for South Africa's unprovoked aggression on Zambia by having

failed to condemn many previous violations committed by the Zionist racist State, Israel, against several Arab and African nations.

16. On 11 July 1976, the town of Sialola in Zambia was subjected to an attack by air and land committed by South African military forces which resulted in the slaying of 24 people and the injuring of more than 40 others. It is obvious that the *apartheid* régime in South Africa is determined to continue the policy of aggression against its neighbours and its own deprived black population. The latest murderous attack on Zambia was preceded by 13 other provocative acts in 1976 alone. Very recently, the *apartheid* forces invaded neighbouring Angola and tried to prevent the birth of the new Angolan nation. In addition to those acts of aggression against sovereign neighbouring States, South Africa has continued its illegal occupation of Namibia and the suppression of the nationalist movements seeking self-determination in the region. The utter disregard by the South African régime of black African nations and peoples and its cruelty in dealing with them is best demonstrated by the harsh and inhuman treatment of the black majority of South Africa itself.

17. It was only a few weeks ago that the South Africans fired into a peaceful demonstration of unarmed students in Soweto and provoked the confrontations which took the lives of hundreds of blacks in one of the worst massacres since that at Sharpeville. In the view of my delegation, those inhumane and cruel policies, applied internally and externally, are but a consistent expression of the *apartheid* philosophy. This racial segregation and discrimination is deeply rooted in the foundations of the white minority racist régime of South Africa and is clearly manifested by the totality of laws governing citizenship rights, land ownership, civil rights and personal status, and other laws which exclude the indigenous black majority of the population from the enjoyment of their most elementary rights in their homeland. The success of the national liberation movements in achieving their independence will undoubtedly encourage the South African black majority to strive for their own independence with self-confidence. Therefore, South Africa is expected to crush and national liberation movements and the newly-formed independent nations surrounding it, as demonstrated by its aggression against Zambia.

18. As more and more countries realize the danger to world peace and stability of the South African racist and expansionist policies, those countries practising such policies are getting more isolated and have to rely on each other—to the extent that a Pretoria-Salisbury-Tel Aviv axis has been formed.

19. When, in the early 1960s, Israel was seeking acceptance from the world community, it had to play a hypocritical role by showing sympathy to African States and criticizing the *apartheid* policy in South Africa, while at the same time maintaining strong

economic and trade ties with the racist régime in Pretoria. Soon after the Israeli occupation of Arab territories in June 1967, the international community condemned such occupation. At this point, Israel started to turn its back on world opinion by ignoring the demands for immediate withdrawal from the occupied territories. It was in this context that, according to the Israeli daily *Ha'aretz*, of 1 December 1967, General Chaim Herzog, the chief representative of the Zionist settler-State, questioned Israel's then negative stand towards South Africa and expressed his hopes for better military co-operation between the Zionist settler-State and South Africa by saying:

"Why should Israel adopt this stand towards South Africa for fear of losing support among African States when others continue to supply tanks and planes to Pretoria without endangering their influence in black Africa?"

Also in this context, the Prime Minister of the white minority régime of South Africa stated, according to *The New York Times* of 30 April 1970, that

"Israel, like South Africa, is confronted with its Arab inhabitants. Both South Africa and Israel are in a sense intruder States... We view Israel's position and problems with understanding and sympathy."

20. With this I wish, on behalf of the Arab Group, to express our full support for the legitimate struggle being waged by the majority of southern African peoples against the policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination. We denounce the *apartheid* régime's acts of aggression against the Republic of Zambia. This flagrant attitude of belligerency has been condemned and deplored in numerous United Nations resolutions, in particular Security Council resolution 300 (1971), in which the Council called upon "South Africa to respect fully the sovereignty and territorial integrity of [the Republic of] Zambia;". We also denounce the policy of "bantustanization" of the indigenous population of South Africa. It is indeed the responsibility of the United Nations and, above all, the Security Council to condemn the *apartheid* régime of South Africa for its racist and expansionist designs, which constitute a serious threat to world peace and security.

21. The Council must undertake the necessary action now to put an end to the evil forces in South Africa which are implementing an inhuman and barbaric law and repressive measures against the peoples who have risen against injustice.

22. Mr. AKHUND (Pakistan): Mr. President, although my delegation has had the opportunity to do so on a previous occasion, I should like, as this is the first time I have spoken in the Council this month, to offer you my most sincere congratulations on your

assumption of the presidency of the Council and to say what a great personal pleasure it is for me to be here under your leadership.

23. I join you and others who have spoken before me in expressing, on behalf of my delegation, deep shock and grief to our colleague from China at the loss of human life and the destruction caused by the earthquakes on 27 and 28 July in the north-east of his country. I would request him to convey to the victims of the disaster the deepest and most sincere sympathy of the people and the Government of my country.

24. In our meeting of 27 July [*ibid.*], the Foreign Minister of Zambia explained in detail, and with great moderation, his country's complaint against South Africa. The facts, as narrated by him, point to the planning and execution by South Africa of a military action against a transit camp of the Namibians 30 kilometres inside Zambian territory. That the number of the dead, injured and missing totals almost 100 is an indication of the dimensions and gravity of the attack. Furthermore, as the Foreign Minister of Zambia has explained, this was only the latest in a series of acts of provocation, intrusion and aggression committed by South Africa against his country.

25. The representative of South Africa did not deny the occurrence of this military action against Zambia. He stated that the South African Government had no knowledge of the attack on a Zambian village and that it had at no time authorized such an attack. Such transparent equivocations can deceive no one. The facts speak for themselves. An attack did occur at Sialola in Zambia on 11 July, and this fact is not disputed by anyone. The attackers could only have been trained South Africans operating from bases in Namibia.

26. In examining this question, some basic considerations must be taken into account.

27. In the first place, this is not the first time that the Security Council has considered the violation of Zambia's sovereignty by South Africa. In its resolution 300 (1971), after examining a complaint by Zambia, the Security Council called upon "South Africa to respect fully the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Zambia". In the same resolution the Council also decided to consider any further attacks with the seriousness they deserved.

28. Secondly, we must take cognizance of the fact that the attack of 11 July cannot have been other than a premeditated and planned military action by the South African armed forces.

29. Thirdly, military action by South Africa against its neighbours, including the attack of 11 July which we are now considering, has been mounted from the Territory of Namibia—a Territory which is the direct

responsibility of the United Nations and where South Africa's continued presence constitutes an internationally wrongful act and a breach of international obligations in conformity with resolution 301 (1971) and the advisory opinion on the same subject given by the International Court of Justice on 21 June 1971.¹ All indications are that, instead of withdrawing from Namibia as called for by the Council, the South African régime is busy devising ways of retaining its stranglehold on the Territory and is meanwhile strengthening its military presence there.

30. Nor can we ignore, in considering the present case, the fact that South Africa has taken illegal measures to define its area of action and influence as extending to the whole of Africa south of the Sahara, and has arrogated to itself the right to take military action in any of the countries situated there.

31. In the light of these considerations, we share the general view expressed by the participants in this debate that South Africa should be condemned for its violation of Zambian sovereignty on 11 July. The Security Council must call upon South Africa to desist from such acts in the future, and to observe scrupulously the principles of the Charter relating to respect for sovereignty of States, and non-interference by Member countries in one another's affairs.

32. Furthermore, the Council cannot but take note of the fact that the military attack of 11 July was mounted from bases in Namibia. In this connexion, it is pertinent to note that Council resolution 301 (1971) and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice place Member States under the obligation to recognize the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia. Furthermore, Council resolution 269 (1969) recognized the legitimacy of the struggle of the people of Namibia against the illegal presence of the South African authorities in the Territory, and enjoined all States to increase their moral and material assistance to the people of Namibia in their struggle against foreign occupation. The Council, therefore, in any decision it takes on the Zambian complaint, cannot ignore South Africa's military occupation of Namibia.

33. Like all the members of the Council and Members of the United Nations, Pakistan wishes to see conditions of real peace and harmony established in southern Africa. We have to recognize the fact that prevailing conditions in southern Africa are not conducive to the establishment of a lasting peace in that area. This is due to three factors: first, the continued and illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa; secondly, the policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination followed by South Africa in its own territory as well as in Namibia; thirdly, the continued domination of Southern Rhodesia by the illegal Smith régime. These three factors are repugnant to the principles and provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and contrary to the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. They are the obstacles

which stand in the way of a peaceful evolution of the situation in southern Africa.

34. The political arrangements currently prevailing in southern Africa are based on gross injustice and, as long as they remain basically unaltered, tension and conflict will continue to mount in the region and the Security Council will remain perpetually seized of these issues. It would, of course, be ideal if this state of affairs could be changed by the voluntary action of those who are responsible for it. We noted that the South African representative, in his statement here, recognized that:

“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.”

“... ”

“What was anathema yesterday can become acceptable tomorrow—but not in an atmosphere of tension and terror and not under threat.” [*Ibid.*, paras. 63 and 65.]

We agree with those sentiments, but find them quite at variance with the policies of his Government.

35. The Pretoria régime remains inflexible in pursuing its racist policy: it continues to defy world public opinion, both as regards *apartheid* and as regards South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, where it has strengthened and increased its military presence. It is building up a military capability which is bound to be alarming to its neighbours and, as has been mentioned, has openly declared its intention, in pursuit of self-proclaimed security interests, to operate at will in all of the area south of the Sahara, thereby disregarding the sovereignty and territorial integrity of other States and violating the Charter. South Africa continues to commit acts of intervention and aggression against its neighbours, such as the one the Council is considering at present. While paying lip-service to the idea of dialogue and détente, the Pretoria régime is, we are told, financing, organizing and encouraging subversive elements in Zambia and other neighbouring African States.

36. The violence, the threats, the provocations thus come from South Africa itself, and their targets are the oppressed people of South Africa, the occupied Territory of Namibia and South Africa's African neighbours.

37. These actions controvert the assertions made by South Africa's spokesman and friends that South African policy is slowly but steadily evolving and that time and patience will bring about a transformation of the situation. Such considerations cannot in any case weigh against the evidence of a flagrant armed attack on one of the States Members of the United Nations,

or deflect the Council from acting decisively in fulfilment of its responsibilities.

38. Mr. KADUMA (United Republic of Tanzania): Mr. President, first of all I should like to thank you most sincerely for the remarks you made on Tuesday [1944th meeting] in welcoming me to the Security Council. This is the first time that I have participated in these meetings and I therefore look forward to receiving your guidance, as well as that of all the representatives here present. For my part, you may be assured of my fullest co-operation.

39. Secondly, I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your assumption of the very high office of President of the Council for the month of July. I trust that under your efficient and skilled guidance the Council will be able to arrive at an amicable solution which is satisfactory to the conscience of all well-meaning delegations here that are genuinely interested in the promotion of world peace and in the welfare of the people of Namibia and southern Africa.

40. Thirdly, I wish to join you, Mr. President, and all representatives who have spoken before me in expressing, on behalf of the party, the Government and the people of the United Republic of Tanzania, the deepest sympathy to the Party, the Government and the people of the People's Republic of China for the calamity that has befallen them. I should like to request the representative of the People's Republic of China to convey my country's condolences to the bereaved families of all those who have lost their lives in this most unfortunate incident.

41. The events of 11 July 1976 were described very clearly on Tuesday by my brother, the Foreign Minister of the Republic of Zambia. I therefore do not intend to repeat them here nor indeed is it necessary for me to do so. What I want to add is that to those of us who are well acquainted with the developments in southern Africa, the incident of 11 July came as no surprise. For the outrageous acts of aggression which the racist South African régime has perpetrated against the Republic of Zambia are manifestly a response to the threat that the régime is seeing in the rapidly mounting liberation pressure being exerted by the freedom fighters of Namibia and Zimbabwe. These acts of provocation by South Africa are an indication of the desperation and isolation in which the Vorster minority régime is finding itself. The panicking Vorster régime is looking for a scapegoat. This scapegoat is not only the Republic of Zambia; South Africa's futile efforts are in effect directed towards the whole of free Africa. The Council must, therefore, look at the problem in this wider context: hence the need to internationalize the conflict.

42. The representative of the racist Government of South Africa once again clearly chose to come to the Council with a barrage of misleading assertions and

even clear-cut distortions. As the Council is fairly familiar with the *apartheid* régime's capacity to indulge in such postures, I need not abuse the indulgence of my colleagues to expose what must to them also be an obvious misrepresentation of facts. Furthermore, my colleague, the Foreign Minister of Zambia, has already effectively demolished all such deliberate falsifications. I should none the less like to note with interest the absurd claim by the representative of the *apartheid* régime that South Africa has sought and continues to seek a peaceful solution to the situation in the region. Mr. Botha and the régime he represents should know better. The Council need hardly be reminded that the cause of the disturbances in southern Africa is the very system that his régime is trying to defend. The whole world has condemned *apartheid* and the whole world has declared it a crime against humanity. I have yet to see criminal acts that make a peacemaker of the perpetrator.

43. The Council, rather than allowing itself to be distracted by such absurdities, must therefore, face up to its responsibilities if it is to merit the role of peacemaker for the world community in general and the people of southern Africa in particular. What is required of the Council is that it take concrete action to meet the requirements of the fast-deteriorating situation in southern Africa. For I am sure that we shall all regret our inaction in the matter. We cannot deny a people fighting for a just cause their right to self-determination.

44. To us, South Africa's criminal acts against the Republic of Zambia are just the beginning of greater violations of peace in that region. South Africa must know that to commit aggression against Zambia is to commit aggression against Tanzania, and indeed against the whole of independent Africa. For the sake of clarity, I shall take this opportunity to remind the Council in general and South Africa in particular of Africa's stand on the matter.

45. In the first place, Africa has committed itself to the total liberation of the continent. This commitment is spelled out in many well-known documents, including the Lusaka Manifesto of 1969² and the Dar es Salaam Declaration on southern Africa adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in April 1975. In these documents, Africa has stated categorically that if freedom in southern Africa cannot be achieved by peaceful means, then it will be achieved by force. Being a self-respecting people, we refuse to accept South Africa's subjugation of the African peoples of southern Africa. As we have stated before, until all of Africa is free, no African State can regard itself as being free.

46. What we are asking South Africa and the international community to do is to accept our sincerity and to believe us. The Fascist Portuguese authorities laughed at the Lusaka Manifesto, treating it with contempt. They did not take seriously Africa's commit-

ment to fight for its freedom. Given the massive support that colonial Portugal received from some of its allies, the authorities in Lisbon considered their position powerful and secure, and they even had a false sense of invincibility. Thus Africa was left with no alternative but to support actively the armed struggle of our brothers in the former Portuguese colonies. We all know the consequences of that struggle: the Portuguese empire crumbled.

47. As my brother the Foreign Minister of the Republic of Zambia said, it is Africa which is a peacemaker and not South Africa and its collaborators. I should like to take this opportunity once again to renew our offer of the Lusaka Manifesto to South Africa. They still have time to make peace with us. But if they persist with their white-supremacist arrogance, they will have to go the Portuguese way. For they must know by now that no nation, however mighty, can defeat the determination of a people to be free. We saw it happen in Viet Nam and in Cambodia, where the whole arsenal of American technology crumbled before a people otherwise presumed to be helpless. We have also seen it happen in Guinea-Bissau, in Mozambique and in Angola, where Portuguese imperialism, notwithstanding the support that it received from some of its North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies, succumbed to the African cause. As if this was not enough, South Africa attempted its colonialist venture in Angola. They know what happened on that occasion.

48. Let me assure the Council that Africa is not bloodthirsty, nor is it working for a racist policy in reverse. Indeed, it is an exercise in self-deceit for South Africa and its collaborators to pretend that they are fighting against communism. For the struggle in southern Africa is a struggle against only one ideology: the ideology of exploitation, oppression and privilege. It is also a struggle for only one ideology: the ideology of equality, freedom and justice. No reasonable man can ask us to forgo our freedom. For ours is a just cause, and we shall win.

49. When I started my submission, I argued that South Africa was deliberately misleading the Council. To demonstrate its aggressive designs towards the rest of Africa, South Africa recently adopted a notorious piece of extraterritorial legislation which purports to give it the right of intervention in all African countries south of the equator. My President, in a speech at Quilimane, Mozambique, on 6 February 1976, termed this law "the most arrogant piece of legislation ever heard of". This legislation seeks to legalize the dispatch of South African troops to these African countries in order to fight for South African interests. As my President stated in his speech, this law is a big challenge to Africa's freedom. Free Africa has no alternative but to defy this wanton South African aggression. No peaceful Government can enact a law which seeks to put its Government permanently at war with its neighbours. The recent events at Sialola

are just such proof of this war-mongering by South Africa. The South African racists are in effect resisting the truth and are just fighting against the current of history. In this adventure, they will fail miserably.

50. We therefore view the Sialola attack with the greatest concern. In using force against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Zambia, South Africa has violated the Charter of the United Nations as well as international law. It is an act of aggression which should be condemned in the strongest possible terms by all men of peace. Indeed, if this wanton aggression is not condemned by this august body of the United Nations, which is responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, we shall run the risk of giving licence to the racists to continue their massacre of innocent people. We in Tanzania vehemently condemn this aggression and pledge our total solidarity with Zambia.

51. On the other hand, mere condemnations, without any sign of stern measures being taken against South Africa, will not help to bring peace to the region. The Council will recall its condemnation in March of this year of South Africa's aggression against the People's Republic of Angola. We all know that nothing tangible has come of that resolution [resolution 387 (1976)]. South Africa has not only refused to compensate Angola for destroyed property, and to restore to it all the stolen property, but instead it is continuing to commit aggression against that country as it is doing against Zambia.

52. Besides, in a vain effort to stem the tide of the popular uprising within its territory, the Vorster clique has resorted to its powerful instruments of repression through its police and army. The Soweto massacres, in which hundreds of innocent African school-children were killed and maimed, are a precursor of the kind of conflict brewing in South Africa. These massacres are an extension of racial discrimination and *apartheid*. The Council considered the matter in June, and, as was explicated of it, condemned these brutal murders too.

53. Thus, despite these repeated condemnations, South Africa goes on to defy international opinion. It has shown no respect for the United Nations, or for the Council. For instance, it still illegally occupies the international Territory of Namibia in spite of numerous General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. South Africa has turned a blind eye to resolution 366 (1974), which called on it to withdraw from Namibia. Even resolution 385 (1976), adopted unanimously in January, which called for free elections in Namibia under United Nations supervision, has fallen on deaf ears.

54. Instead, South Africa continues with its absurd and untenable so-called Windhoek constitutional talks. These talks cannot succeed because they do not represent the true feelings of Namibians. Without the

participation and support of the authentic representatives of Namibia—namely, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)—no talks can succeed. South Africa must face the inevitable by accepting to hold discussions with SWAPO. Otherwise, time is fast running out for Vorster. Let this self-imposed colonial Power know that, with the independence of Mozambique and Angola, freedom has come to the borders of South Africa and Namibia. It must therefore accept these changed circumstances or be changed by force.

55. South Africa must realize that, despite its arsenal of repressive machinery, the concept of "might is right" has been buried. What befell Portuguese colonialism in Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique and Angola is sufficient proof that right is now might. If South Africa cannot see this writing on the wall, it can only mean unnecessary bloodshed on a larger scale, which could have been avoided had the Fascist rulers of South Africa realized in time the irresistible trend. History will hold Vorster and his fellow racists responsible for the inevitable conflagration in that part of our continent.

56. A war is raging on in southern Africa. Freedom fighters in Namibia and Zimbabwe have taken up arms. Africa has no alternative but to support these valiant fighters. We believe that it is in our interest to support this noble struggle because our own survival as a free and sovereign State hinges on a free Africa. We further believe that freedom is for all or it is for none. Tanzania has no more right to be free than has Namibia. We have to do all we can to end this shameful scourge of colonialism which has reared its ugly head for too long on the African continent.

57. The struggle in southern Africa is a struggle for freedom. It is not a struggle for or against East or West. Those who look upon the struggle as a Power-bloc conflict are misleading the world. We therefore expect the world by now to have seen the hollowness of this ridiculous argument. We would also expect all nations of good will to support our liberation efforts. At least they should do nothing to hinder them. For our cause is justice and peace.

58. South Africa is now behaving like a drowning person not only because of the physical threat posed by the freedom fighters but also because of the moral threat from free Africa. It is afraid of the freedom torch which is shining near its boundaries. It is afraid because the victories ushering in independence elsewhere in southern Africa will encourage the majority of South Africans to rebel against the Vorster tyranny. This panic has now taken the form of Bantustans and the so-called independent homelands. Vorster unwisely believes that by this policy of divide and rule he will have breathing space. Need we say that these frantic, meaningless manœuvres are bound to fail? Have they not received a slap in the face as a result of the refusal of some patriots to be hoodwinked by this mock independence?

59. What, then, should the Council do? As the supreme body for the maintenance of international peace and security, it should tell South Africa in no uncertain terms that the Council can brook no aggression. The Council should therefore strongly condemn South Africa for its latest act of aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Zambia. The Council should condemn the use of the international Territory of Namibia by South Africa to mount aggression against free Africa.

60. South Africa should be exposed for its sinister motives against free Africa in attacking Zambia. South Africa cannot blackmail Zambia from supporting the liberation struggle, for no threat, however great, can stop the liberation of southern Africa.

61. The recent attacks on Zambia have shown that it is too much to expect a racist minority to listen to the voice of reason. It can be defeated only by the use of force. We in Tanzania are confident that justice will triumph in southern Africa and that Africa will be free.

62. The Security Council has a clear responsibility to face this latest South African intransigence with firmness and without equivocation. For it must be stated that this latest aggression against an African State comes less than six months after the Council categorically condemned South Africa's aggression against Angola. The authorities in Pretoria have not only ignored the Council's demands of March of this year but have, indeed, proceeded to make the policy of aggression a constant practice against African States. The Vorster régime has also ignored the collective demand of the Council made in both its resolutions of January and March this year [*resolutions 385 (1976) and 387 (1976)*] calling upon that régime not to use the international territory of Namibia to mount aggression against African States. Therefore, as we deliberate on this important question, it is imperative to take account of this behaviour of the racist authorities in Pretoria. Thus, we must draw the necessary conclusions from the arrogance and contempt they have shown for the Council. Clearly, it is not sufficient to condemn South Africa's persistent aggressions against independent African States. Nor is it adequate to issue warnings, however strong and solemn they may be. The time has certainly come to adopt effective measures, including those provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter. For if the Security Council continues to adopt condemnatory resolutions and issues persistent warnings without putting some teeth into them, we run the serious danger of perpetual arrogance and intransigence on the part of the Vorster régime in addition to the danger of projecting the United Nations as a helpless institution in the face of clear-cut aggression and defiance. This, then, is the challenge before the Council.

63. Mr. BENKHAYAL (Libyan Arab Republic): First, I should like to welcome the presence among

us today of the Foreign Ministers of Zambia and the United Republic of Tanzania.

64. I wish also to express my delegation's condolences to the Chinese delegation on the earthquake that very recently struck the People's Republic of China and left so many victims, as well as our condolences to the Zambian delegation on the wanton aggression by the racist régime of South Africa, which also took its toll of victims.

65. Six months have passed since the Security Council discussed the question of Namibia, and adopted its resolution 385 (1976) of 3 January 1976, condemning the South African military buildup in Namibia and any utilization of the international Territory as a base for attacks on the neighbouring countries. The Security Council has convened three times since then to discuss additional acts of aggression committed by this same racist régime against the people of Africa in Namibia, Angola and Zambia.

66. In March 1976 the Security Council focused on the aggression of the racist régime against an independent African State, the People's Republic of Angola. The Security Council adopted resolution 387 (1976) on 31 March, strongly condemning South African aggression against the People's Republic of Angola, and demanding that South Africa desist from utilizing the international Territory of Namibia to mount aggressive acts against the People's Republic of Angola, or any neighbouring African countries.

67. During June 1976 the Council centred upon the killings and violence perpetrated by the *apartheid* régime in South Africa in Soweto and other areas. In its resolution 392 (1976), the Council clearly condemned the South African Government for the massive killings and violence directed against the Africans, including schoolchildren and students, as well as others opposing racial discrimination. In addition, the Council called upon that racist Government to terminate immediately the violence aimed at the African people and to undertake urgent steps to eliminate *apartheid* and racial discrimination.

68. It is evident to all of us that the South African racist régime blatantly defies the foregoing resolutions, and continues to commit acts of massive violence against the indigenous people of South Africa.

69. Although only one month has passed since the Council discussed the killing and violence perpetrated by the *apartheid* régime in South Africa, in Soweto and other areas, the South African régime has initiated aggression against an independent and sovereign African State, the Republic of Zambia, while also utilizing the international Territory of Namibia. These recent acts of aggression demonstrate outright defiance by the South African régime of resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly which have clearly determined that South Africa's intervention and presence in Namibia are illegal.

70. The aggression committed against the African people by racist régimes has become progressively more blatant. At the beginning of this month, the Zionist racist régime engaged in flagrant aggression against the Republic of Uganda. The continuing aggression committed by the racist régimes in South Africa, Zimbabwe and Palestine against the African people provide substantial proof of broad collaboration among these racist régimes to halt the Africans' continuation of their struggle against under-development, colonialism, imperialism and racism. These three racist régimes, supported by the imperialist countries, are working to intimidate the African States and peoples and to force them to resign themselves to the *status quo*.

71. It is indeed no accident that the Council should have been convened twice within this month to consider acts of aggression against African peoples and against African States by the racist régimes in Palestine and in South Africa. It is clear that peace and security are continuously threatened by the existence of the racist régimes in South Africa, Zimbabwe and Palestine, all supported by the imperialist Powers.

72. The events that have taken place in Uganda and in Zambia during this month are part of a comprehensive plan designed by the imperialist forces and their intelligence organs to bring the African States under their domination. These imperialist forces also attempt to create differences and dissension among the African States, in order to prevent them from constituting a major force challenging the aspirations of the imperialist forces.

73. It is clear that manipulative tactics are at present being undertaken on the African continent, and that a striking parallelism exists between the policies of the two racist régimes, in South Africa and Palestine, and that there is an alliance between them to destroy unity and the liberation movements in Africa. In addition, a concentrated propaganda campaign has been launched against the progressive countries in Africa, in order to mould public opinion by providing false and distorted information regarding the policy of these progressive States.

74. This campaign reflects a preliminary step to destroy these progressive forces and to eliminate their revolutionary spirit, which has become a major obstacle challenging imperialism and colonialism. These forces should realize that their malicious designs will never be achieved, regardless of these efforts. The people's volition constitutes a solid rock, rendering the imperialist manoeuvres ineffective, as the events in Viet Nam and Angola so clearly show.

75. The question under discussion is very clear. The racist régime of South Africa committed flagrant aggression against an independent African State, the Republic of Zambia, using the Territory of Namibia, which is illegally occupied by that racist régime. This

marked the fourteenth act of wanton aggression by the racist régime of South Africa, which flagrantly violated the territorial integrity of Zambia, threatening international peace and security.

76. It is very interesting to note the statement which South Africa's representative made in the Security Council on 27 July [1944th meeting], in which he attempted to deny the act of aggression committed by his régime against Zambia. During the current debate, there were no other alternatives available to the South African representative. However, last March during the Council's deliberations on the situation in Angola, the South African régime chose another tactic by shrewdly withdrawing its forces from the territory of Angola as soon as it became clear that this matter would be reviewed by the Council. We have repeatedly witnessed the South African régime's tactics of committing flagrant aggression and presenting a cover-up for such criminal action, as is clearly demonstrated by the document circulated to us today [S/12157].

77. In his statement before the Council, the South African representative stressed the importance of seeking a peaceful solution to the problem under discussion. It is ironic that this representative, who spoke on behalf of a régime which promotes the racist policy of *apartheid* and is illegally occupying Namibia, can say that South Africa wishes to promote conditions of peace in an atmosphere of understanding. What kind of peace can the South African representative be implying?

78. During October 1971, the Security Council discussed a similar flagrant act of aggression by the racist régime of South Africa against the Republic of Zambia. During that debate, the Council adopted resolution 300 (1971), paragraph 3 of which reads as follows:

"Further declares 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."

79. The facts are well known. The problem is well known to us. The United Nations has been discussing this problem for 30 years now and, in the humble view of my delegation, what we need now is effective action to terminate this blatant and illegal aggression against the African people and to put at end to the South African minority régime's defiance of United Nations resolutions.

80. We call upon all nations, particularly the developed countries and the Western Powers, conscientiously to implement the relevant resolutions of the United Nations by discontinuing all economic and military assistance to the racist minority régime in South Africa.

81. It is abhorrent and appalling that the aggressive racist and Fascist régime of South Africa is still receiving economic and military aid from many Powers, despite the repeated calls for an arms embargo against it. Those who are helping South Africa must know that they are helping our enemy, our bitterest and worst enemy in Africa. This international hypocrisy must come to an end. They must choose between Africa and the enemies of Africa.

82. Earlier this month the Council failed to adopt a resolution concerning the act of aggression by the Zionist racist régime against Uganda. The reasons for that failure are well known to all members of the Council. The reasons that prevented a real solution of that issue set a dangerous precedent within the Council by distorting the issues and camouflaging the truth. We hope that the Council will approach the question currently under discussion with a clearer vision and adopt a proper resolution to deal effectively with this issue. If the Council fails again, it will be reinforcing a dangerous pattern which could prove to have extremely harmful repercussions for world peace and security.

83. With regard to the continual flagrant acts of aggression committed by the racist régime of South Africa against the Republic of Zambia and other countries in the region, in defiance of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, my delegation urges the Security Council: first, to take appropriate measures, including action under Chapter VII of the Charter; secondly, strongly to condemn the racist régime of South Africa for its aggression against the Republic of Zambia; and, thirdly, strongly to condemn the racist régime of South Africa for using the international Territory of Namibia as a base for aggression against the Republic of Zambia and other African countries.

84. The Libyan Arab Republic again reaffirms its pledge to support any effective and relevant action that may be taken by the Council against the South African racist régime, and it will spare no effort to ensure that its African brothers in Zambia and Namibia enjoy its assistance and support in their struggle against the racist minority régime in South Africa.

85. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Before stating the position of the delegation of the Soviet Union on the question before us, I should like to make two preliminary comments which have no bearing on it.

86. My delegation would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the delegation of the United States on the successful landing of an automatic interplanetary station—Viking I—on Mars. This is a scientific and technical achievement which is an important contribution to the study of cosmic space and opens up new possibilities for further conquering space in the

interest and for the benefit of all humanity. The further development of international co-operation in the conquering of space, the foundations of which were laid by the launching of the first Soviet artificial earth satellite and the first flight by a Soviet man in space, is fully in accordance with the interests of peace and mankind.

87. I should also like to express, on behalf of the Soviet delegation, our condolences to the delegation of China with respect to the earthquake that took place in China and which led to the loss of human life and considerable material damage. Unfortunately, mankind is still not in a position to avoid these scourges, the suffering and consequences of which are well known to the Soviet people. Similar tragic surprises sprung on us by the planet on which we live illustrate the fact that it is necessary for all mankind to combine its scientific and creative efforts in order to make sure that we can establish peace on earth and avoid such foreseeable phenomena as earthquakes.

88. Before expressing the views of our delegation on the item before us, I should also like to say a few words directed to you, Mr. President. I think that we are approaching the conclusion of the discussion of the complaint by Zambia concerning the South African racist régime's actions against the people of that country. I should like to express the hope that the Council will wisely and correctly, and in accordance with the desires of the people of Zambia and of the whole of Africa, conclude the discussion of this question under your presidency by adopting a resolution which really puts an end to the events that we have witnessed.

89. This is not the first time this year that the Council is discussing a question concerning the activities and practices of the South African racists. The gross violations of the human dignity of the indigenous population, the repression of that population, which has been subjected to countless humiliations and the attacks on neighbouring countries have become the standard practice of the racist régime.

90. Has not the time now come for us to say—to paraphrase a Latin expression—"How much longer will the South African régime try the patience of the Security Council?"

91. Just recently, the Security Council, in its resolution 392 (1976), decisively condemned the Government of South Africa for its mass killings and violence against the African population of that country, and quite rightly pointed out that the racist, inhuman policy of *apartheid* has become a crime against the conscience and dignity of mankind and a serious threat to international peace and security. Representatives of African countries recently freed from the colonial yoke and representatives of the socialist countries have called many times on the Council to adopt the most decisive

measures against the racist régime of South Africa. However, some members of the Security Council have stubbornly objected—and continue to object—to that, sometimes referring to the internal nature of the events taking place in South Africa, and at other times stating that they do not consider it a threat to peace for the leaders in Pretoria to engage in such actions. Our delegation and other delegations have drawn the Council's attention to the fact that if we do not enact the most decisive sanctions as provided for by the Charter of the United Nations against the racist South African régime—sanctions provided for by decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly—the racists, who have usurped power and who are oppressing the majority of the native population of South Africa, may enlarge the scope of their crimes and may extend these actions to neighbouring African countries and regions of Africa.

92. The ink had not yet dried on resolution 392 (1976), in which the Council called on the Government of South Africa to adopt urgent measures to eliminate *apartheid* and racial discrimination, when all of us became witnesses to a new criminal act by the South African régime, this time going beyond the borders of that racist fiefdom.

93. This time the racists have chosen as their victim the people of Zambia, an independent African country which is hundreds of miles from the borders of that bastion of racism.

94. As has already been reported here in the most convincing statement by the Foreign Minister of Zambia, Mr. Mwale [*ibid.*], in 1976 alone, South Africa has perpetrated against that African country 14 utterly uncalled for acts of military aggression and thus threatened peace and security in that region. A particularly gross provocation took place on 11 July this year, when a group of military personnel, with air support, attacked the village of Sialola killing or wounding dozens of people. Now, nobody here can accept the idea, as some have already said, that those military aircraft came from Mars or some other planet: they could only come—and in fact did only come—from Namibia, which is illegally, unfairly, and contrary to decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, being kept under the yoke of the racist régime of South Africa. That Territory, unlawfully occupied by South Africa, has been turned into a base for flagrant acts of aggression against neighbouring African countries, as a number of representatives from African countries have pointed out in the course of earlier Council discussions with respect to South Africa's policies.

95. Attention was drawn to the fact that, as in the case of the aggression against Angola, the South African racists perpetrated this attack against Zambia from the very Territory of Namibia, which they illegally occupy. Such utilization of Namibia as a base for aggression has been condemned by the United

Nations. I will not list all of the specific resolutions; there are quite a number of them. However, in resolution 387 (1976) the Council demanded that South Africa desist from using "the international Territory of Namibia to mount provocative or aggressive acts against the People's Republic of Angola or any other neighbouring African State".

96. Now, what did the South African racists do? They simply ignored that decision of the Security Council, too. Thus they grossly violated both the Charter and all the other decisions concerning South Africa adopted by the United Nations.

97. The attack of 11 July on Zambia by South African military forces is another link in the endless chain of aggressive acts committed by South Africa, and we think that, if the Council does not take appropriate action, this development can lead to even greater provocative and hostile acts by the South African racists against other African countries that have recently freed themselves from colonialism.

98. The purpose of these acts by the South African racists is clear. They wish to frighten the peoples of independent African countries and force them to give up their solidarity with the national liberation movements and stop them from giving assistance and support to those national liberation movements. Suffice it to note that Pretoria's aggressiveness has sharply increased, especially recently when, under pressure from liberation forces in the southern part of Africa, the peoples of Mozambique, Angola and other countries dealt quite a blow to the racists and colonialists by freeing themselves from the colonial yoke. The inglorious end of the racists' aggression against Angola had an immense impact. It has shown that the arch-racists in South Africa are incapable of opposing peoples that desire to live in freedom and justice.

99. Fearful for the future of *apartheid* and racial discrimination in Africa, the ruling circles in Pretoria, by repressing members of the liberation movements, and by acts of naked aggression against independent African countries, are trying to put off the downfall of their administration of South Africa in general. The peace-loving stance which the representative of South Africa adopted before us is only a false mask. The appeal for a dialogue on co-operation that he made here is a lying appeal: his appeal for patience and peace is also simply a lie. It is an attempt to gain time to delay the demise of their régime.

100. The speech made by the representative of South Africa here [*ibid.*] was full of appeals for making peace with the other countries of Africa. He even called on the Council not to condemn or criticize South Africa. But the Council and the peoples of southern Africa expect more from South Africa than lying appeals for peace and statements about the good will of the Government of South Africa: they want

concrete actions. It would be better if the representative of South Africa told the Security Council why his Government is stubbornly continuing its illegal occupation of Namibia; why the Pretoria régime is implementing the cruel, inhuman policy of *apartheid* in his country; why South Africa is mounting attacks against independent African States; and why South Africa is arming so incredibly fast and has recently been training its troops and mercenaries. It is arming and training its armed forces in order to oppose the resistance of its own population and to try the strength of the liberated neighbouring African countries.

101. The blatant aggression by South Africa against Angola and Zambia continues, as does the occupation by force of Namibia and the cruel repression of all opposition to the inhuman policy of *apartheid* in that country. All this shows that the racist régime in South Africa prefers to talk to the liberated African peoples from a position of strength and only from a position of strength. It is no secret to anybody here that the arsenals of South Africa are now replete with weapons which the leaders in Pretoria are ready to use, not only against their own people but also against other peoples in Africa. The responsibility for this must be borne not only by the racist régime of South Africa but also by those Powers in the West which are helping South Africa to strengthen its military forces, which are providing it with a surfeit of weapons and assisting it in building military bases and airfields, which are engaging in broad-based economic co-operation with it and have expanding contacts with it in other fields. The South African régime is relying heavily on this assistance from members of NATO. The countries interested in maintaining the South African racist régime are not only co-operating extensively with South Africa but are also showing a willingness to increase their military assistance to it, thus helping to make it more aggressive.

102. This sort of balancing act between feigned opposition to, and covert support of, *apartheid* is something that the Western countries have recently been engaged in. They have been closing their eyes to the activities of the transnational corporations and the business dealings between them and South Africa, including deals involving the buildup of a nuclear potential. Behind the backs of the Africans, certain Western countries are expanding their relations with South Africa, at a fairly high level. In the course of these contacts and dealings—and this fact has even been admitted by the press in South Africa—it was decided that there is to be further expansion of contacts and relationships in all fields. Now what is this? I call it support. You can verbally object to racism and *apartheid* and speak against the continuation of the present policies and practices of the racist régime; but if you help it, if you engage in extensive economic relations with it, if you sell it weapons, if you help it to build bases, what is that if not direct support to strengthen and uphold that régime? It is significant that as those relations have increased, the

aggressiveness of South Africa has likewise been increasing. The contacts between Vorster, the head of the South African *apartheid* régime, and a number of statesmen not only strengthen his position, as the South African press has said, but also give him the assurance—and this was said by a South African paper—that the NATO countries “have entered into an unofficial alliance designed to save South Africa for the West”.

103. In these circumstances, the question of adopting immediate and effective measures to put a speedy end to the aggressive activities of the racist régime of South Africa against independent African countries has now become one of the burning issues of today, and unless the Security Council provides a solution thereto, it will not be fulfilling its direct responsibilities according to the Charter.

104. In the statements of the representatives of the African countries, we have noted many facts and we have at the same time heard convincing arguments to the effect that, this time, the Council must not confine itself simply to the adoption of just any resolution. The Council must adopt a resolution that will ensure the full implementation of all earlier decisions of both the Council and the General Assembly with regard to South Africa. The representatives of Zambia [*ibid.*], Benin and Madagascar [*1945th meeting*], the Foreign Minister of the United Republic of Tanzania, the representative of Libya and representatives of other African countries have amply demonstrated that time is fast running out, and that the South African régime can no longer continue its past policies and practices.

105. The peoples of Africa that are the victims of the terror of the racist régime of South Africa are expecting from us, the Security Council, not simply one more condemnation of such kinds of criminal activity. They expect the Council to take concrete and effective measures that will put an end once and for all to the shameful practices and inhuman policy of aggression of South Africa against its own people and against neighbouring African countries. It is those practices and that policy which have created a crisis that has reached the boiling-point in the region of southern Africa. It is those practices and that policy that are threatening the whole of Africa with a new widespread war.

106. I think it is appropriate at this time to recall the appeal of the Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe which was held at the end of June 1976 in Berlin, calling for

“strict compliance with the trade embargoes imposed on racist régimes under United Nations resolutions, severance of relations with the Government of the Republic of South Africa by all States, and, most important, a complete stop to all arms supplies to that Government.”¹³

107. In the view of the delegation of the Soviet Union, the Security Council has the right—not only the right, but the duty—to apply against the racist aggressors the strictest sanctions provided for in the Charter. In this situation, the racist régime of South Africa must be totally and completely isolated in the international arena and an embargo binding upon all countries must be placed on the delivery of weapons and on economic and other assistance.

108. The policy of the Soviet Union as regards the struggle against the racist régime of the Republic of South Africa and against other racist régimes is consistent. It is directed towards the severance of all types of relationships and co-operation with that régime. As was mentioned in the TASS statement of 23 June 1976:

“The Soviet Union decisively and consistently condemns the criminal policy of *apartheid* and calls for the application of effective measures aimed at the isolation and boycott of the South African régime and the implementation of the decisions adopted by the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity and other international organizations, who demand the liquidation of *apartheid* and all racial discrimination, and the granting to the African majority of the right to live in conditions of peace and freedom” [*S/12117*].

109. True to its principled policy of support for colonial and subject peoples fighting for their liberation, the Soviet Union will continue to exert every effort towards the complete eradication of the colonial and racist régimes, which present one of the most serious threats to peace and security on the African continent. Our deeply felt solidarity with the national liberation movements is well known to all. The Soviet Union has given and will continue to give assistance to those liberation movements in Africa until the final liquidation of neo-colonialism, racism and *apartheid* is achieved.

110. The Security Council needs more than fact-finding missions. It needs to take action that will free southern Africa from all practices that prevent the peoples of that area from living in freedom and independence. The Foreign Minister of the United Republic of Tanzania, Mr. Kaduma, spoke not only for his own people but for the peoples of all Africa. Will the leaders in Pretoria understand? If they do, well and good. If they do not, all the worse for them. The whole of Africa must be free and it will be free, whatever the objections of the colonialists and racists and their supporters. Our delegation is ready to adopt the most effective measures to ensure that the decisions of the Security Council help the people of Zambia and the peoples of other African countries to save themselves from the aggressive acts of South Africa.

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

112. Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia): Mr. President, allow me at the outset to thank you and, through you, the other members of the Security Council for acceding to my delegation's request to be allowed to participate in the debate. As I am participating in the deliberations of the Council for the first time since your assumption of the presidency for the month of July, permit me also, even in these final days of the month, to extend my warm felicitations to you and to express the confidence of my delegation that under your wise and dedicated leadership the Council will rise to the challenge and fulfil the mandate entrusted to it by the Charter.

113. May I also seize this opportunity to express to the delegation of the People's Republic of China the deep sorrow of my delegation at the loss of life and the destruction of property sustained by the people of China as a result of the devastating earthquake that hit their country recently. While expressing the sympathy and solidarity of the Government and people of Ethiopia with the Government and people of China, and particularly the families of the bereaved, we are confident that the industrious people of China, with their indomitable spirit, will overcome the material loss sustained.

114. My delegation has asked to participate in this debate not only to add the voice of Ethiopia to those that have preceded us in their expressions of deep indignation at the wanton killings of those proud sons and daughters of Africa on the sad day of 11 July at Sialola, but also to register here its deep concern at the alarming developments that have taken place in southern Africa since the beginning of this year and, more specifically, the persistent violations by the South African authorities, directly or in collusion with the rebel Ian Smith régime, of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of independent African States in the region; and to request the Council to take urgent and effective action to bring such a situation to an end in accordance with the responsibility entrusted to it by the Charter.

115. Not content with their illegal occupation of the international Territory of Namibia and their avowed policy of breaking up that Territory into ethnic ghettos in clear violation of the Charter and countless resolutions of the United Nations, the South African authorities have for some time now been embarked upon the exportation of their sinister policies of *apartheid* and bantustanization to the rest of Africa. Unsuccessful in their covert and overt attempts at subverting the political unity and economic independence of Angola, they have turned their attention once more to Zambia. In just the first six months of this year they have violated the territorial integrity of the Republic of Zambia 14 times, the latest violation being the air and land attack on Sialola on 11 July, with its high toll in human life, not to speak of the destruction of property.

116. The facts surrounding this latest aggression have been clearly and comprehensively presented by the Foreign Minister of Zambia [1944th meeting] and my delegation is very grateful for that presentation. My delegation feels that these revealing facts will help the Council to consider the item in a responsible, dispassionate and businesslike manner.

117. What was the response of the representative of South Africa [*ibid.*] to these serious charges? He not only denied that his Government had had any hand in them—a denial which my delegation did not find surprising—but also denied all knowledge that the incident had taken place in the first instance. Is the Council to believe this pure and simple denial? I think not. For a change, the South African troops did not attack villages at random. They attacked a particular village, Sialola, the SWAPO transit camp. Is it difficult, then, to impute a motive to South Africa here? We do not think so.

118. As the Foreign Minister of Zambia indicated, the South African authorities hope, through their attacks on camps such as Sialola, to force African Governments, in particular Governments of front-line States, to withdraw their support from the liberation movements which have embarked upon armed struggle as a last resort to free themselves from South African colonial oppression and thereby rid themselves also of the humiliation of *apartheid*. There can therefore be no doubt that the South African authorities not only knew of this incident but also authorized it. A mere denial of knowledge of this violation cannot and should not absolve South Africa of its responsibility for these crimes.

119. The South African representative also dwelt at length on one important point to which I feel I must revert. While categorically denying that his Government had committed any act of aggression, he sought to promote the hollow and cynical policy of dialogue. It was done cleverly, I must admit.

120. While his call for trust and togetherness and the resolution of differences peacefully between States of the region are nothing more than stratagems designed to show that a reasonable, conciliatory and even daring South Africa is emerging, these overtures are clearly attempts to force those African States which feel aggrieved by South Africa to begin talks with Pretoria. Could this be an indication of a new policy, a policy of attacking your neighbours with impunity and inviting them to hold bilateral talks, thereby promoting a policy of empty dialogue, which was rejected when it was originally offered but could perhaps now be forced upon Africa?

121. The South African representative has also attempted to convey the impression that the authorities in Pretoria are doing everything possible to expedite the process of independence for Namibia, sometimes even in the face of great opposition from the white

population. The idea here, of course, is to appeal to those members of the Council who have in the past felt that signs of progress, however slight, should be encouraged. Without going into the merits of this policy of encouragement of small gains, we submit that in the case cited by the representative of South Africa, there is no progress to speak of. Council members are aware of the sham nature of the Constitutional Conference which is taking place in Namibia, as they have access to impartial sources. They cannot be persuaded that this sinister policy of fragmentation is progress towards self-determination for the people of the international territory of Namibia. The Council cannot be a party to the dismemberment of a people which aspires to build one united Namibia.

122. The Republic of Zambia has fallen victim to the repeated aggression of South Africa only because it implemented faithfully the obligation placed upon every Member of the United Nations. As one of the front-line States, it has been the unfortunate fate of Zambia to bear a disproportionate responsibility in morally and materially assisting the people of Zimbabwe and Namibia to free themselves from colonial oppression and rid their country of the heinous crime of *apartheid*. Should, therefore, the same international community that placed such a heavy burden on Zambia sit idly by and watch Zambia suffer at the hands of racist Pretoria, or should it come with immediate and commensurate help? To my delegation, the answer is obvious. Those who fail to show their solidarity with Zambia, those who deny it assistance now, must know that they are directly aiding racism to grow and international gangsterism to flourish in southern Africa.

123. South Africa, in committing aggression against the Republic of Zambia, not only violated a cardinal rule of the Charter but also used a Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations to bring about that violation. The international Territory of Namibia, for which the United Nations is directly responsible, has been used to violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a State Member of the United Nations. This dual violation of South Africa should not go unpunished. The United Nations cannot continue to be ignored. It is not only Zambia that is asking that justice be done: the whole of Africa demands it. Indeed, by resolution 490 (XXVII) adopted at the twenty-seventh session of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity held at Port Louis, Mauritius, the OAU solemnly declared that any act of aggression by the South African régime against any independent African State is an act of aggression against the whole of Africa.

124. My delegation requests the Security Council to condemn in the strongest possible terms South Africa's wanton killing of innocent persons, its repeated violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the peace-loving sister African Republic of Zambia, its continued illegal occupation of Namibia and its use of

the Territory as a staging ground for ceaseless incursions into the territories of neighbouring African States. Above all, we request the Council to adopt all the necessary measures under Chapter VII of the Charter in order to deal effectively with this intransigence of South Africa.

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

126. Mr. MWANGAGUHUNGA (Uganda): Mr. President, allow me to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of July and to reiterate our satisfaction at the way you have been leading the Council. This was already stated to you by my Minister for Foreign Affairs early this month, when Uganda's complaint against Israeli aggression was before the Council.

127. I should like to join you and others who have spoken before and to convey, through you, to the Government and people of the People's Republic of China the sympathy and grief of the Government and people of Uganda on the recent catastrophe caused by the earthquake, with the resultant destruction of life and property.

128. I should like to welcome the Foreign Ministers of Zambia, the United Republic of Tanzania and Mozambique, who have come to participate in this very important debate regarding the blatant violation on 11 July of Zambia's airspace, sovereignty and territorial integrity by the forces of the racist régime of South Africa, which resulted in the death of 24 people and injury to 45 people. In that connexion, I should like to inform the Council that Field Marshal Idi Amin Dada, Life President of the Republic of Uganda, on behalf of the Government and people of Uganda sent a message on 24 July to the President of the Republic of Zambia, Mr. Kenneth David Kaunda, condemning the raid by South Africa—a raid which came in the wake of Israel's invasion of Uganda. The President of Uganda pledged Uganda's solidarity with the gallant people of Zambia in standing firm against the racist régime in Pretoria. My Government has asked the Uganda delegation to repeat in the strongest terms during this debate this condemnation of South Africa's aggression against Zambia.

129. Mr. Mwale, the Foreign Minister of Zambia, set forth in detail before the Council [*ibid.*] a chain of incidents illustrating South Africa's aggression against his country since it became independent. His country has in the past complained to the Security Council and the Council has found South Africa to be an aggressor. The Council has now before it another complaint of aggression committed by South Africa against Zambia, on 11 July, 30 kilometres inside Zambian territory at Sialola in the Kaungo-Mashi area of the Western Province. His detailed analysis of the aggression and the motives of South Africa are clear. He succinctly informed the Council:

“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 the 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.” [*Ibid.*, para. 19.]

130. This is a clear case of aggression by the racist régime of Pretoria against Zambia. South Africa is in the dock to answer this latest charge of aggression against Zambia, an independent sovereign State and a member of OAU and of the group of non-aligned countries. But what defence did the Council hear from the representative of South Africa against this charge of aggression? Addressing the Council on 27 July [1944th meeting], after a detailed account had been given by the Foreign Minister of Zambia, the representative of South Africa said:

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

131. This is not the first time that South Africa has tried to evade the issue of its ignominious aggression by using unbelievable stories, subterfuges and side-tracking manoeuvres in the Security Council. Its shameful invasion of Angola—when it was all the time denying its aggression there until its mercenaries were brought before the cameras in Luanda—is still fresh in the minds of the members of the Council. If South Africa thinks that it can hoodwink the Council and side-track it from the issue of its aggression against Zambia, it has miserably failed to explain where the invaders of Zambia came from or to convince the Council that it is in control of its terrorist murderers who are poised to attack independent African countries. Perhaps Pretoria has given these aggressors a green light to attack any independent sovereign State in Africa south of the Sahara, as it says these are in its field of military operations. South Africa’s recent obnoxious laws regarding the so-called right of hot pursuit up to the equator are just a cover-up for its projected aggression against independent African States on the continent.

132. South Africa is an incorrigible violator of international law, the Charter of the United Nations and standards of decency against the black people of Africa, and it is a ruthless aggressor. It has persistently

flouted the resolutions of the United Nations requesting it to quit Namibia, which it occupies illegally. As though that was not enough insult and injury to the people of Namibia, it has used that Territory to mount aggression against independent African nations like Angola and now Zambia. If the Council does not take a firm stand against it, there is every likelihood that, with its massive military buildup in the area, many more acts of aggression will be mounted by South Africa from that illegally occupied Territory against independent African countries.

133. South Africa has been telling the world that it wants peace and stability in southern Africa, and the representative of the Pretoria régime repeated that hollow assertion to the Council on 27 July. If South Africa wants peace and stability in the region, why does it not emulate the spirit and ethos that is conducive to that peace? Why does it not relinquish Namibia, which it occupies illegally? Why does it not desist from staging acts of aggression from that Territory? Why does it not put pressure on the rebel régime in Salisbury to grant majority rule to the people of Zimbabwe? Why does it not work for the eradication of the evils of *apartheid* on its own doorstep? It wants peace and stability in the region, but on its own terms. South Africa should not expect black Africa to be inebriated with the empty pious aspirations of the racists that peace will come within the limits of the *status quo*. Prime Minister Vorster and his supporters may think that they have good intentions for southern Africa, if indeed these intentions are good, but the road to hell is paved with good intentions.

134. South Africa has so far shown itself incapable of a peaceful transition towards majority rule in the area and of uprooting the evils of *apartheid*. Time is running out for Salisbury and Pretoria to effect a peaceful change. Events in Mozambique and Angola have clearly shown that people cannot be held in perpetual subjugation against their will. The writing is on the wall for Mr. Vorster and his supporters. The buffer zones to the north of the racist régimes of Pretoria and Salisbury have crumbled and will not be erected again. The liberation movements, with the support of all peace-loving people in the world, are closing in. The noose is tightening, for these liberation movements know that the only language the racists of southern Africa understand is the language of force. The Sharpeville and Soweto massacres, the invasion of Angola and the recent aggression committed against Zambia will not intimidate the liberation movements, the front-line countries and the people of Africa from following their objective for the total liberation of our continent.

135. Africa and the whole world have their eyes on the Council to see what action it will take against South Africa in this clear case of aggression against a country that has left no stone unturned in the quest for a peaceful solution in the southern African region, a country that is the father of the Lusaka Manifesto²

and whose peace overtures have been persistently abused by the racist régime of South Africa.

136. In expressing our solidarity with Zambia's stand against the racist régime of South Africa and condemning in the strongest terms the blatant aggression committed against a sister country and a member of OAU, my delegation requests the Council to take the action requested by Zambia. Uganda strongly endorses the request of Zambia—that is:

“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.” [*Ibid.*, para. 39.]

137. The Uganda delegation appeals to the Council, to adopt at the end of its deliberations, a unanimous resolution embodying those requests. After all, South Africa has already been condemned for similar acts of aggression against Zambia in resolution 300 (1971). The Council must reiterate this condemnation and go further.

138. As far as Uganda is concerned, our views on South Africa have been made abundantly clear in the past, and our strong support for the liberation movements in southern Africa is incontestable. We shall continue to give moral and material support to these liberation movements until our whole continent is free and the evils of *apartheid* are totally eradicated. It is only when the whole of Africa is free and independent that we shall be able to live in peace and harmony and to enhance prosperity for our people.

139. The aggression by the racist régime of South Africa against Zambia was an affront to the whole continent of Africa—an attempt to intimidate front-line countries and a desperate last stand to demoralize the liberation movements in southern Africa. Such manoeuvres cannot succeed, for we are solidly behind Zambia, the other front-line countries and the liberation movements in a concerted effort for the total liberation of Africa.

140. To the Zambians we say: “Stand firm, as you always have. We are all with you. Africa will win. Long live Africa.”

141. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Botswana, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

142. Mr. MOGAMI (Botswana): Mr. President, I wish first of all to express to you and to the members of the Security Council the gratitude of my delegation for this rare opportunity to address the Council. I am pleased to extend to you personally our congratulations upon your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of July. It has been a very busy month indeed.

143. May I also take this opportunity to extend to the delegation of China our deep grief at the severe earthquake which has just recently struck that country. A delegation from my country will be in China shortly, and I am sure that it will convey the condolences of the people and Government of Botswana to the Government and people of China.

144. I wish also to take this opportunity to express our gratitude to the three African Foreign Ministers who are here: the Minister of Zambia, the Minister of the United Republic of Tanzania and the Minister of Mozambique. I am sure that we shall all—both within and outside the Council—benefit from their participation.

145. My country is one of the so-called front-line States bordering both South Africa and Zambia, as well as the Territory of Namibia. South Africa and Zambia are the principal parties involved in the question under consideration by the Council. The desire of my delegation to participate in this discussion is therefore not a surprise, in view of our intimate involvement in developments in that area.

146. But beyond the obvious considerations of geopolitical relationships in the southern African sub-region, there are other important considerations which motivate our desire to participate in this discussion; for indeed it is worthwhile that all of us should look down the road as we consider the question under discussion—an issue so unwarranted, and yet so fraught with serious consequences for stability, peace and security in the region; an issue which cannot be considered as a new, isolated act of military provocation against Zambia by South Africa.

147. The attention of the Council has been drawn time and again to the implications of the dangerous situation in the southern African region, and it is the earnest hope of my delegation that all the members of the Council have by today fully grasped the potentially explosive nature of the situation. A while ago, the pronouncements of our leaders—that is, the Presidents, Ministers and others in positions of leadership in Africa—on the situation in South Africa might have sounded to outsiders like perhaps an exaggeration which did not merit immediate and vigorous attention. Current developments show that these pronouncements were, in fact, timely. Now, as it appears that we now know better the gravity of the situation there, we hope that the Council will enter the final stages of this discussion with a clear vision of why and how

it could assist in the process of creating a free, independent South African society fit for a decent and dignified human life, and with a firm commitment thereto; for otherwise, this goal—that is, the creation of such a society in southern Africa—will be achieved through brutal struggle.

148. In his opening address to the Council two days ago, the Foreign Minister of Zambia [1944th meeting] presented a detailed and well-documented account of the numerous incidents of border violations and acts of military provocation against Zambia by South Africa. I believe the Council has since had time to reflect upon that statement.

149. The representative of South Africa also informed the Council two days ago [*ibid.*] that his Government had no knowledge of the attack by its armed forces against Zambia on 11 July, and that his Government had not authorized that particular military operation against Zambian territory. However, my delegation believes the Council has taken note that the fact of the attack against Zambia by a South African armed unit was not denied by the representative of South Africa. Considering the 13 other similar incidents of action against Zambia by South Africa's armed forces between January and July 1976, the issue of who sanctioned the fourteenth attack—that is, the attack of 11 July—against Zambia by a South African military unit appears to my delegation to be immaterial or irrelevant, particularly as South Africa's representative has admitted that there have been incidents and that his Government was aware of them.

150. The Republic of Zambia, in our view, has a valid complaint against the South African Government. The root cause of these attacks should not escape the attention of the Council. My country takes a serious view of such acts of military provocation. We ourselves have suffered wanton armed provocation and senseless acts of brutality by hostile racist elements of the minority régimes, along our northern borders as well as deep inside our country. These attacks could lead to serious consequences of such magnitude as to engulf the black independent African States in ugly and bloody racial strife—a grim event that would deal a merciless blow to world peace and security. The United Nations, and the Security Council in particular, should note that such attacks are meant to intimidate and harass the African countries which support the cause of justice, freedom and racial equality in southern Africa. It is with this consideration in mind that we pose a query to the Council: Will the Council deny Zambia the redress that it seeks, in spite of the validity of its complaint and taking into account the known root cause of such attacks?

151. A third party is involved in the question under consideration: that is to say, the Territory of Namibia. The United Nations and the Security Council have determined that South Africa's presence there is illegal, and the United Nations and the Security

Council have demanded South Africa's withdrawal from the Territory. In disregard for, and defiance of, the decisions and resolutions, that is to say the authority, of the Council, the South African Government is using its illegal presence in Namibia to perpetrate unlawful military attacks against an independent Zambia which would otherwise be enjoying friendly and peaceful relations with the people of a free and independent Namibia. Using the Territory that it occupies illegally, South Africa conducts a series of military operations into Zambia, a country whose sole interest in the subregion is national independence, racial equality and peace and prosperity for all.

152. Again my delegation poses a query to the Council: Will the Council remain silent, in spite of the disregard of its authority by South Africa, with regard to the status of Namibia? The illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa threatens innocent lives in the neighbouring village communities of the countries to the north. In Zambia alone many lives have been lost as a result of the attacks staged from Namibia. Botswana cannot accept that South Africa should use its illegal presence in Namibia for attacks against Zambia. Furthermore, seen against the background of the current struggle in Southern Rhodesia, the occupation of Namibia diminishes the prospects for peace and stability in the region, and, taking into account the tension brought about by the system of *apartheid*, the chances of racial strife are further increased. Bold initiatives by African States to avert this eventuality have come to naught.

153. My delegation is aware that the Council has met several times before to consider similar acts of aggression against Zambia. With reference to the current meeting, the Foreign Minister of Zambia has rightly reminded the Council of its undertaking contained in Council resolution 300 (1971). We know that the Council will in due course decide what appropriate measures it wishes to take on this occasion.

154. The acts of armed provocation under consideration are not limited, temporary, rare occurrences but, quite to the contrary, they indicate a consistent and sustained pattern of threats against Zambia for what it stands for in the subregion, and further undermine that country's territorial integrity. The front-line countries in the region stand and speak with one voice for freedom, racial equality and justice, in spite of their geopolitical situation. It is a burden cast on them by historical circumstances. It is a burden which they shoulder with no apologies. Even their invasion is not likely significantly to alter the course of events now unfolding in the subregion. To muzzle them now either through sheer force of arms or economic leverage simply because they stand for justice would probably do more harm than good. Indeed, such an action would not only threaten the security of the neighbouring countries in the region, but would pose a threat to international peace and security as well.

The struggle for liberation and racial equality is being waged with more vigour in this region now. Independent Africa has not relented in its commitment to this struggle. We support this struggle because we see in it a move towards the realization of justice.

155. My delegation welcomes the exposure by Zambia of these unfriendly acts of provocation. We condemn these provocations for the fact that they undermine Zambia's territorial integrity and sovereignty. We condemn them because they destroy precious and innocent human life. These acts have to be condemned because they heighten tension and jeopardize prospects for peace in the subregion and create a state of insecurity. We condemn them because they are carried out from Namibia in defiance of the decisions of the Council. We ask, in solidarity with Zambia and its people, that the Council unite in likewise condemning such unnecessary provocations.

156. In conclusion, I wish to state that my delegation has paid close attention to the views expressed before the Council, and we shall continue to do so. We have also noted the appeal which the representative of South Africa has made. He said: "I appeal to the Council not to mete out condemnations, criticisms and pejoratives to South Africa" [*ibid.*, para. 68].

157. But of course the Council is considering a matter concerning which criticism cannot be avoided, particularly taking into account the status of the Territory of Namibia as well as the violation of Zambia's territorial integrity and sovereignty. My delegation, I am happy to say, can do very well without pejoratives.

158. In his concluding remarks, the Foreign Minister of Zambia made an appeal to the Council. We understand and support that appeal, and we hope that it will receive the sympathy it deserves.

159. The PRESIDENT: The next and last speaker is the representative of Yugoslavia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make a statement.

160. Mr. MUJEZINOVÍC (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, I should like first of all to thank you and the members of the Council for giving me the opportunity to address this respected gathering.

161. At the same time I would like to avail myself of this opportunity to express to the delegation of the friendly People's Republic of China our sincere condolences and feelings of solidarity in connexion with the grave natural calamity that has inflicted severe losses in life and property on the people of China.

162. Allow me to extend the most cordial greetings of my delegation to the representative of Zambia, a friendly non-aligned country, the Minister for Foreign

Affairs, Mr. Mwale. Yugoslavia has for years been developing the most cordial and friendly relations with this proud and outstanding non-aligned African country in every field of life.

163. Zambia plays an important role in the struggle for the complete liberation of Africa from colonialism, racial discrimination and the system of *apartheid*. From the first days of its independence, Zambia has been an active Member of the United Nations and member of the non-aligned movement and has constantly upheld the implementation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

164. At the same time I should like to express a warm welcome to the Foreign Ministers of the United Republic of Tanzania and Mozambique.

165. The recent grave violation of the territorial integrity of Zambia and the continuing aggressive acts by the military forces of the racist régime of South Africa against that peace-loving African country are nothing new to the Security Council. In October 1971, in its resolution 300 (1971), the Council called upon South Africa to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Zambia and resolved that in the event that South Africa continued its aggressive actions against Zambia the Council would again meet and take appropriate steps in the spirit of the provisions of the Charter. South Africa answered this warning from the Council with a premeditated, aggressive military attack against the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Zambia on 11 July, causing 24 deaths and severe injuries to 45 persons, as well as the destruction of property. As was stated by the Foreign Minister of Zambia [*1944th meeting*], it was only the last of 14 attacks and provocations perpetrated against Zambia in recent months. So the South African minority racist régime has once again openly challenged the authority of the Council.

166. In the first half of this year the Council had to discuss on several occasions the acts of aggression carried out by the racist régime of South Africa against independent and sovereign neighbouring African States. Thus, in January [*resolution 385 (1976)*], the Council condemned the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia, which is under the Mandate of the United Nations. Two months later [*resolution 387 (1976)*], the Council strongly censured South Africa for aggression against the People's Republic of Angola. As recently as June [*resolution 392 (1976)*], Council had to express its sharp condemnation of the massacre of innocent students by the racist régime of South Africa as a result of the abhorrent oppression which that régime has for years been practising against the black majority population of South Africa, which, with full justification, is rebelling more strongly and widely against slavery and racism. All this clearly demonstrates the aggressive nature and goals of the racist régime and the danger it represents to the independence of African countries and to peace and

security in Africa and beyond it. That is why the Security Council must most seriously consider the military attack by South African forces on Zambia both as an attack on that country's independence and as a threat to peace and security. My delegation therefore believes that the Council should discuss the application of effective measures, based on the Charter, against the racist régime of South Africa to prevent it from threatening the independence of African countries, further violating the Charter and the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, and endangering peace and security in Africa.

167. In conformity with its obligations and authority, the Security Council should strongly condemn the aggression by South Africa against Zambia and compel South Africa to compensate Zambia for the material and other damage caused by the aggressive acts of its military forces.

168. Finally, the Council should undertake effective measures to compel South Africa to withdraw from Namibia, which it occupies illegally, and to stop its aggression against the Namibian people.

169. In its struggle against the racist régimes of Ian Smith and Vorster for the liberation of the peoples of

Zimbabwe, Namibia and Azania and for the defence of its own independence, Zambia will continue to have our full and friendly help and support.

170. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of China, who wishes to say a few words.

171. Mr. CHOU Nan (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): Before the conclusion of today's meeting, I wish to express, in the name of the Chinese delegation, our sincere thanks to the Foreign Minister of the United Republic of Tanzania and the distinguished representatives of many other countries for their sympathy on the earthquake which occurred in eastern Hopei province of China, and I shall convey their cordial feelings to the Chinese Government and people.

The meeting rose at 6.35.p.m.

Notes

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

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

³ A/31/124, annex, p. 19.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استلم 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销处均有发售。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.
