

incident of 12 October, having been admitted and denounced by the responsible Government, which had also apologized and offered compensation and guarantees, did not call for outright condemnation, but might rather have provided the opportunity to explore means by which the danger of such acts of violence breaking out might be averted.⁶⁹⁰

At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America stated that the revised draft did not reflect adequately the contents of the communication submitted by Portugal to the Security Council, which explained the Portuguese Government's response, and followed the standard acceptable procedure in international law for rectification of international incidents. The revised draft did not refer to the need to get at the more basic causes of tension in the region, nor to the need to search for some form of peaceful settlement on the part of the parties concerned in the conflict. As to the direction in which the Council should head in dealing with this problem, the United States delegation would continue to press its suggestion of November 1971 to establish a commission to investigate border incidents and to report periodically to the Security Council on progress toward a satisfactory settlement in the region.⁶⁹¹

QUESTION CONCERNING THE SITUATION IN TERRITORIES UNDER PORTUGUESE ADMINISTRATION

In the course of its meetings in Addis Ababa, the Security Council considered among other issues the question concerning the situation in Territories under Portuguese administration and adopted resolution 312 (1972) relating to this question.⁶⁹²

Decision of 22 November 1972 (1677th meeting): resolution 322 (1972)

By letter⁶⁹³ dated 7 November 1972 addressed to the President of the Security Council the representatives of Algeria, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Dahomey, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Zaire and Zambia requested a meeting of the Security Council to examine the situation in the Territories under Portuguese domination. In the letter, it was pointed out that the situation in those Territories came under discussion while the Security Council was examining several complaints made by African States relating to the acts of aggression by Portugal against their sovereignty and territorial integrity. The letter also stated that the situation in the Territories had evolved since 1963 in favour of national liberation movements. As a

result of that progressive trend, the Security Council was asked to take the necessary measures to bring the Government of Portugal to recognize the right of self-determination and independence of the African peoples under its domination and draw up a time-table for the transfer of power to the authentic representatives of the African peoples of Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique.

By letter⁶⁹⁴ dated 15 November 1972 addressed to the President of the Security Council the representative of Portugal expressed regret that the Security Council should have been convened on a request that was misconceived. He stated that the question at issue was beyond the competence of the Security Council, there being no dispute prevailing between Portugal and any of the States whose representatives had requested a Council meeting. The situation in the Portuguese Territories was a matter within the domestic jurisdiction of a Member State and as such, under Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, expressly excluded from consideration by the United Nations.

In a letter⁶⁹⁵ dated 15 November 1972 to the President of the Security Council the Secretary-General conveyed the text of resolution 2918 (XXVII) relating to the question of Territories under Portuguese administration adopted by the General Assembly and drew attention to paragraph 7 of the resolution in which the General Assembly recommended that the Security Council should urgently consider taking all effective steps with a view to securing the full and speedy implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and of the related decisions of the Council.

The Secretary-General also conveyed the report⁶⁹⁶ dated 11 July 1972 on the implementation of Security Council resolution 312 (1972), containing the replies of Governments to his inquiry concerning action, taken or envisaged by them in implementation of paragraph 6 of that resolution.

At the 1672nd meeting on 15 November 1972 the Security Council adopted⁶⁹⁷ the agenda and considered the question at the 1672nd to 1677th meetings between 15 and 22 November 1972. At the 1672nd meeting on 15 November the representatives of Burundi, Ethiopia, Liberia, Madagascar, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, United Republic of Tanzania, Saudi Arabia and Tunisia were invited⁶⁹⁸ to take part in the discussion without the right to vote. At the same meeting the Security Council agreed to a request made by the representatives of Somalia and the Sudan, and invited⁶⁹⁹ under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, Mr. Marcelino dos Santos, Vice-President of the Frente de Libertação de Moçambique (FRELIMO), Mr. Gil Fernandes, member of the Superior Council of PAIGC and Mr. Manuel Jorge of the Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola (MPLA). Subsequently, at the 1673rd meeting on 16 November the representatives of Uganda⁷⁰⁰ and

⁶⁹⁰ 1669th meeting, paras. 38-40.

⁶⁹¹ *Ibid.*, paras. 41-46.

⁶⁹² For relevant proceedings see in this chapter the procedural history of the meetings in Addis Ababa under the heading "Consideration of questions relating to Africa with which the Security Council is currently seized and the implementation of the Council's resolutions", pp. 99, 101-102.

⁶⁹³ S/10828, *OR*, 27th yr., *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1972*, p. 30.

⁶⁹⁴ S/10833, *OR*, 27th yr., *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1972* p. 47.

⁶⁹⁵ S/10836, *GAOR*, 27th session, *Suppl. No. 30*.

⁶⁹⁶ S/10734, *OR*, 27th yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1972*, pp. 59-62.

⁶⁹⁷ 1672nd meeting, following para. 1.

⁶⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, paras. 2-3, 216.

⁶⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, para. 4.

⁷⁰⁰ 1673rd meeting, paras. 2-3.

Morocco⁷⁰¹ and at the 1674th meeting on 17 November the representative of Cuba⁷⁰² were also invited to participate.

At the 1672nd meeting on 15 November 1972, at the opening of the discussion, the representative of Liberia* urged the Security Council to deplore the armed repression by Portugal of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde to deprecate Portugal's continued violations of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of independent African States neighbouring on those Territories. He called upon the Security Council to reaffirm the inalienable rights of the peoples in territories under Portuguese administration to self-determination and independence and to affirm that the national liberation movements of those Territories were the legitimate representatives of the peoples with whom Portugal should enter into negotiations immediately with a view to arriving at a solution to the armed conflict that prevailed in those Territories. Finally, he appealed to all States, particularly the military allies of Portugal, to put an end to the sale or supply of weapons to Portugal.⁷⁰³

At the same meeting the representative of Sierra Leone* stated that the continued refusal of Portugal to recognize the legitimate aspirations of the peoples of the Territories under its control for self-determination constituted a permanent source of international friction and a constant threat to international peace. To remedy that situation Portugal would have to abandon the fiction that those Territories were provinces, not colonies, recognize the liberation movements of the peoples in those Territories and enter into negotiations with those peoples to decide on the steps towards an early exercise of the rights of self-determination.⁷⁰⁴

The representative of Ethiopia* recalled that the Security Council, by resolution 312 (1972) of 4 February 1972 had recognized the legitimacy of the struggle of the peoples under Portuguese domination to achieve their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. As a logical consequence of this resolution and in view of the progressive developments that had taken place in the struggle for liberation, the Security Council should consider recognizing those movements as the legitimate representatives of the peoples in the Territories concerned. The international community should give effective moral and material assistance to those national liberation movements. It was time for the Security Council to consider declaring an arms embargo against Portugal, because its aggressive activities threatened peace and stability on the African continent.⁷⁰⁵

At the same meeting the representative of Saudi Arabia* suggested that the Secretary-General might appoint an emissary to deal with the question concerning the situation in territories under Portuguese administration, as he had done with the question of Namibia. The Trusteeship Council might be reactivated, or a representative of the Secretary-General might make a fact-finding tour. In the

long run there was no alternative to giving freedom to the Africans living in Portuguese Territories.⁷⁰⁶

At the 1673rd meeting on 16 November 1972, the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania* said that peace was incompatible with colonialism. Portugal had used its colonial Territories to attack independent African States. Those acts alone had constituted a serious threat to international peace and security, justifying action by the Council under Chapter VII of the Charter. At the same time the Security Council must reaffirm the legitimacy of the struggle which was waged by the liberation movements, and recognize these as sole and authentic representatives of the people.⁷⁰⁷

At the same meeting Mr. dos Santos, addressing the Council on behalf of FRELIMO, asserted that the development of the national liberation struggle in Mozambique had shown that FRELIMO was unchallenged and undoubtedly leader of the people of Mozambique. The granting of the status of observer to FRELIMO by the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations constituted international recognition of that reality. It also meant that FRELIMO exercised *de facto* political authority over the people of Mozambique, extending to the liberated areas and to the areas still under colonial domination. The United Nations should further contribute to the liberation struggle by direct assistance from the United Nations, States Members and the specialized agencies and by the cessation of any further assistance to Portugal on the part of States Members and national and international organizations. FRELIMO, however, was ready to negotiate with the Government of Portugal on behalf of the entire people of Mozambique as soon as Portugal recognized their right to self-determination and national independence.⁷⁰⁸

At the same meeting the representative of Somalia stated that the time had come for positive measures in regard to the situation in the Portuguese colonies, measures that went beyond the affirmation of principles and the moderate calls for action that had been made in Addis Ababa in February 1972. Portugal's refusal to act in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples had led to the large-scale colonial wars waged by the Portuguese Government against the peoples of all the African Territories under its domination. The liberation struggle had been declared legitimate by the General Assembly of the United Nations and by the Security Council itself. The Security Council now had sufficient cause to invoke Chapter VII of the Charter and impose an arms embargo on Portugal so that it would not be assisted in its unjust war of repression against African peoples under its domination.⁷⁰⁹

On behalf of Guinea, Somalia and the Sudan, the representative of Somalia then introduced a draft resolution⁷¹⁰ which he said was designed to redress the situation in the Territories and to update previous resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

⁷⁰¹ 1673rd meeting, para. 116.

⁷⁰² 1674th meeting, paras. 2-3.

⁷⁰³ 1672nd meeting, paras. 52-56.

⁷⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, paras. 143-160.

⁷⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, paras. 190-201.

⁷⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, paras. 238-243.

⁷⁰⁷ 1673rd meeting, paras. 18-31.

⁷⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, paras. 109-114.

⁷⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, paras. 123-125, 137-138.

⁷¹⁰ S/10834, OR, 27th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1972, pp. 47-48.

Under it, the Security Council would, *inter alia*, (a) affirm that national liberation movements of the Territories under Portuguese domination were the legitimate representatives of the peoples of those Territories; (b) call upon the Government of Portugal to enter into negotiations with the national liberation movements of Angola, Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde and Mozambique with a view to arriving at a solution to the armed conflict and subsequent accession to independence; (c) appeal to all Governments, specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system and non-governmental organizations to assist, morally and materially, the liberation movements of those Territories in their struggle for self-determination and independence; (d) impose an arms embargo on Portugal as long as it refused to renounce its policy of colonial domination; and (e) establish an *ad hoc* committee of five members of the Security Council to be charged with the implementation of the arms embargo.⁷¹¹

At the same meeting Mr. Fernandes, speaking on behalf of PAIGC, stated that during the 10 years of armed struggle, the people of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde, under the leadership of PAIGC had made enormous progress. Almost three-quarters of their national territory had been liberated from colonial domination and two-thirds of Guinea (Bissau) was under their effective control. He confirmed the proposal made by PAIGC in Addis-Ababa to set a time-limit for the departure of Portuguese troops and to send a delegation of the Security Council to see the Portuguese Prime Minister and make concrete proposals for the beginning of negotiations. He also said that his people had just completed elections for their first national assembly which was due to meet in the near future and proclaim a State.⁷¹²

At the 1674th meeting on 17 November the representative of the USSR stated that in southern Africa the world was seeing a new and special kind of neo-colonialism: collective colonialism. In the Territories occupied by Portugal, it was not only the Portuguese colonialists who held sway but the international monopolies with headquarters in various capitals and large cities of Western countries. In those circumstances, the Council should set definite deadlines for the transfer of power to the true representatives of the African peoples of Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique. If Portugal violated the Security Council's decision that power be handed over to the peoples of those countries, then the Council should consider declaring sanctions against Portugal. With regard to the draft resolution sponsored by Guinea, Somalia and the Sudan, his delegation saw three important elements in that text. (a) The appeal to Portugal to begin negotiations with the national liberation movement. (b) The recognition of the national liberation movements as the legal representatives of their people. (c) The appeal to all States that were helping Portugal to put an end to such assistance. The Soviet Union supported the draft resolution and felt that the Security Council should immediately decide to put a stop to the delivery of arms and war materials to the Portuguese colonialists.⁷¹³

The representative of the Sudan emphasized that should the Council succeed in persuading the NATO Powers to withdraw their military and financial assistance to Portugal, Portugal itself would be greatly helped to face reality. If it failed to do so, the Council could invoke Chapter VII of the Charter and apply total sanctions to the whole of southern Africa for a start. Finally, if those efforts failed, the Council might have to consider as a final attempt, a new innovation such as a declaration of independence for those Territories under Portuguese domination.⁷¹⁴

Mr. Jorge, speaking on behalf of MPLA, informed the Council that MPLA controlled more than one-third of the territory of Angola. In those liberated areas, the new Angola State was rising. The Portuguese Government pursued its colonial war by concentrating most of its armed forces in Angola. He maintained that Portugal was strengthening its ties with the South African and Rhodesian racists and officially requesting members of NATO to establish military bases in Angola. The Security Council, he continued, should invite Portugal once again to halt its war of aggression and recognize the right to self-determination and independence of the Angolan people in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) thus making it possible for Portugal to negotiate with MPLA, the sole land legitimate representative of the Angolan people.⁷¹⁵

At the same meeting the representative of Uganda stated that the brand of Portuguese colonialism in Africa was outside the spirit and intention of Chapter XI, Article 73 of the Charter of the United Nations. That Article demanded of all colonial Powers to advance their colonial peoples to freedom and self-determination. It was in pursuance of that Article that resolution 1514 (XV) containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples had been adopted by the General Assembly on 14 December 1960. Any colonial situation was of a temporary nature and the ultimate objective had to be the self-determination and independence of the colonized people. Uganda was willing to abide by whatever decisions the Council took in hastening the self-determination and independence of all Portuguese colonies.⁷¹⁶

At the 1676th meeting on 21 November the representative of Yugoslavia supported the suggestion that the Security Council should consider declaring the independence of the Territories if its other actions proved fruitless. Yugoslavia also supported the call to all States to end the supply of weapons to Portugal and any measures to ensure such an embargo. It was Yugoslavia's position of principle to support the initiatives of the African States, and he considered that the setting up of a subsidiary *ad hoc* body of the Security Council to deal exclusively with the decolonization process in the Portuguese-held Territories was indicated. It was essential to assist in establishing contacts leading to negotiations between Portugal and its legitimate partners the national liberation movement—on the basis of the right to self-determination and independence.⁷¹⁷

⁷¹¹ 1673rd meeting, paras. 141-147.

⁷¹² *Ibid.*, paras. 172-194.

⁷¹³ 1674th meeting, paras. 8-32.

⁷¹⁴ *Ibid.*, paras. 68-72.

⁷¹⁵ *Ibid.*, paras. 97-105, 128-133.

⁷¹⁶ *Ibid.*, paras. 146-161.

⁷¹⁷ 1676th meeting, paras. 19-27.

The representative of Somalia stated that, following consultations, the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document S/10834 had decided to withdraw it and submit instead two separate draft resolutions.⁷¹⁸ The first of these (S/10838) would reaffirm the inalienable right of the peoples of Angola, Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde and Mozambique to self-determination and independence and call upon the Portuguese Government to enter into negotiations with the true representatives of the peoples of those Territories to enable them to achieve self-determination and independence. Before turning to the second draft resolution (S/10839), he introduced some further amendments to the first one (S/10838),⁷¹⁹ whereby *inter alia* the words "under the direction of their national liberation movements" were to be deleted from the last part of operative paragraph 1. Then he presented the second draft (S/10839) which embodied the measures to be taken against Portugal, including an arms embargo and the establishment of an *ad hoc* committee to investigate the flow of arms to Portugal.⁷²⁰

At the same meeting the representative of China supported the two draft resolutions submitted by Guinea, Somalia and the Sudan. He said that the Security Council should severely condemn Portugal for its colonial wars and its armed aggression against neighbouring African countries. A strict arms embargo and sanctions should be applied against Portugal and all countries should be called upon to give greater assistance and support to the national liberation movements in the Portuguese colonies.⁷²¹

At the 1677th meeting on 22 November the representative of India stated that the United Nations should declare the Portuguese colonies independent countries over which Portugal would no longer have legal authority. Because South Africa and Zimbabwe had continued to help Portugal, India had repeatedly suggested that complete and comprehensive sanctions be imposed against South Africa, Zimbabwe and Portugal. There was not much prospect of a negotiated settlement with Portugal. Independence should not be the subject of negotiation—only its timing and method of achievement. Should those measures fail,—and the objective indications were that they would, then the Security Council would be prepared for much more determined action.⁷²²

The representative of Somalia, on behalf of the sponsors, introduced some textual changes in the first draft resolution contained in document S/10838/Rev.1 that had been accepted by the sponsors in the course of informal consultations. That acceptance, he explained, did not necessarily signify satisfaction with the changes; in view of the political realities and differences of opinion among the members of the Council, the sponsors had no alternative but to agree to the more flexible but unsatisfactory text.

⁷¹⁸ S/10838, revised as S/10838/Rev.1, and adopted without further change as resolution 322 (1972) and S/10839, *OR*, 27th yr., *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1972*, p. 51.

⁷¹⁹ S/10838/Rev.1. Subsequently adopted as resolution 322 (1972).

⁷²⁰ 1676th meeting, paras. 63-77.

⁷²¹ *Ibid.*, paras. 80-92.

⁷²² 1677th meeting, paras. 18-28.

He added that they would not press for a vote on the draft resolution contained in document S/10839.⁷²³

The representative of France emphasized that in the process leading to self-determination, the administering Power had to play the main role and any proposal that ignored this commonsense finding would be doomed to failure, as the history of decolonization amply confirmed. The Council would be incorrect if it sought to deny Portugal the peace and the responsibility to which it was entitled in the process in which the Council was inviting it to participate. Certain recent statements and letters of the Portuguese authorities seemed to be signs of movement toward constructive discussions. The sponsors of draft resolution contained in document S/10838/Rev.1 had wisely focused their attention on two points: reaffirmation of the inalienable right of the peoples to self-determination and the necessity to put an end to military or repressive operations as soon as possible, so that peaceful methods of negotiation might begin. Therefore the French delegation would support draft resolution S/10838/Rev.1 as a whole, but it did not consider the situation as falling under the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter and would not be able to support the draft resolution in document S/10839.⁷²⁴

At the same meeting the representative of the United Kingdom stated that in the view of his delegation it was for the administering Power in accordance with Chapter XI of the Charter and not the Security Council or the General Assembly to determine the modalities through which self-determination was to be brought about. Accordingly, he would vote in favour of the draft resolution in document S/10838/Rev.1 as orally revised. As for the draft resolution contained in document S/10839, it could only have led to the prolongation of deadlock and confrontation and therefore, his delegation was pleased that it was not being pressed to the vote.⁷²⁵

At the same meeting the representative of the United States requested that a separate vote be taken on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution S/10838/Rev.1 in order to enable the United States to express its reservations regarding that paragraph.⁷²⁶

As the sponsors, under rule 32 of the provisional rules of procedure, objected to a separate vote on operative paragraph 2, the draft resolution as a whole was put to the vote and adopted unanimously.⁷²⁷ The resolution read as follows:

The Security Council,

Having examined the situation in Angola, Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde, and Mozambique,

Recalling its resolution 312 (1972) of 4 February 1972,

Also recalling General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and 2918 (XXVII) of 14 November 1972, on the question of Territories under Portuguese administration,

⁷²³ *Ibid.*, paras. 40-46.

⁷²⁴ *Ibid.*, paras. 51-62.

⁷²⁵ *Ibid.*, paras. 65-72.

⁷²⁶ *Ibid.*, para. 76.

⁷²⁷ *Ibid.*, para. 83. Adopted as resolution 322 (1972).

Taking note of the reports of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

Considering that the Organization of African Unity recognizes the liberation movements of Angola, Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde, and Mozambique as the legitimate representatives of the peoples of those Territories,

Having heard the statements of the representatives of Member States and of Mr. Marcelino dos Santos, Mr. Gil Fernandes and Mr. Manuel Jorge, who were invited under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure to participate in the consideration of the question,

Conscious of the urgent need to avert further human suffering and material losses by the peoples of Angola, Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde, and Mozambique and to achieve a negotiated solution to the armed confrontation that exists in those Territories,

1. *Reaffirms* the inalienable right of the peoples of Angola, Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde, and Mozambique to self-determination and independence, as recognized by the General Assembly in its resolution 1514 (XV), and the legitimacy of the struggle by those peoples to achieve that right;

2. *Calls upon* the Government of Portugal to cease forthwith its military operations and all acts of repression against the peoples of Angola, Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde, and Mozambique;

3. *Calls upon* the Government of Portugal, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), to enter into negotiations with the parties concerned, with a view to achieving a solution to the armed confrontation that exists in the Territories of Angola, Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde, and Mozambique and permitting the peoples of those Territories to exercise their right to self-determination and independence;

4. *Requests* the Secretary-General to follow developments in the situation and to report periodically to the Security Council;

5. *Decides* to remain actively seized of this matter.

COMPLAINT BY ZAMBIA

Decisions of 2 February 1973 (1691st meeting): resolution 326 (1973) and 327 (1973)

By letter⁷²⁸ dated 24 January 1973 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of Zambia informed the Council that on 9 January 1973 the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia closed the border between Southern Rhodesia and his country and imposed an economic blockade against it. Since that date the illegal régime also had committed numerous acts of subversion and sabotage against Zambia and deployed its troops, together with 4,000 from South Africa, along the border. Those troops had committed a series of violations against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of his country. In view of those acts of aggression, constituting a serious threat to international peace and security, he requested that a meeting of the Security Council should be convened as a matter of urgency.

In a letter⁷²⁹ dated 23 January 1973 addressed to the President of the Council, Guinea, Kenya and the Sudan associated themselves with Zambia's request for a meeting of the Council to examine the situation on the Zambian border, subsequently, Yugoslavia also associated itself with that request.⁷³⁰

⁷²⁸ S/10865, OR, 28th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1973, p. 31.

⁷²⁹ S/10866, *Ibid.*

⁷³⁰ S/10869, *Ibid.*, p. 38.

In a letter⁷³¹ dated 26 January 1973 addressed to the President of the Council, the representative of South Africa transmitted a message from the South African Minister of Foreign Affairs drawing attention to a statement by his Prime Minister regarding the complaint by Zambia. The statement emphasized South Africa's non-interference in the domestic affairs of other countries and denied the charge that South African troops had been deployed along the border between Zambia and Southern Rhodesia.

In a letter⁷³² dated 29 January 1973 addressed to the Secretary-General the representative of Zambia transmitted a message from the President of Zambia stating that tension had continued to rise as more people were killed by land mines on Zambian soil by forces of the Smith régime and South Africa. The Zambian President urged the Council to put an end to the critical situation and to ensure the withdrawal of South African troops.

At the 1687th meeting on 29 January 1973 the Security Council adopted⁷³³ the agenda and considered the question at the 1687th to 1691st meetings between 29 January and 2 February 1973. At the 1687th meeting on 29 January the representatives of Zambia, Algeria, Chile, Egypt, Ghana, Morocco, Senegal, Somalia, United Republic of Tanzania and Zaire were invited, at their request to take part in the discussion without the right to vote.⁷³⁴ Subsequently, at the 1689th meeting on 31 January the representative of Cuba⁷³⁵ and at the 1690th meeting on 1 February the representatives of Cameroon and Guyana⁷³⁶ were also invited to participate.

At the 1687th meeting on 29 January 1973, the representative of Zambia* stated that the closure by the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia of its border with Zambia on 9 January was an act of aggression aimed at inflicting serious damage to Zambia's economy in order to put pressure on Zambia not to support the liberation movement of the people of Zimbabwe. The current crisis had been exacerbated by the collusion of the Salisbury and Pretoria régimes. South African troops had moved into Southern Rhodesia in 1967 and had remained there as an occupation force. Both régimes had repeatedly carried out military incursions into Zambia. He described a series of nine incidents perpetrated in January 1973, that had involved border crossings, firing against villagers and the laying of mines inside Zambia, all of which had resulted in loss of life and serious injuries. Referring to the mandatory sanctions imposed by the Council against Southern Rhodesia he said that his Government had decided to establish permanent alternative routes for its trade and to abandon the southern route altogether. His delegation recommended that the Council should: (1) condemn Southern Rhodesia's acts of aggression against Zambia, including economic blockade and military threats; (2) condemn the Government of South Africa for the presence of its forces in Southern Rhodesia; (3) demand the immediate withdrawal of South African forces from Southern Rhodesia;

⁷³¹ S/10870, *Ibid.*, pp. 38-39.

⁷³² S/10877, OR, 28th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1973, p. 41.

⁷³³ 1687th meeting, preceding para. 1.

⁷³⁴ *Ibid.*, paras. 1-3.

⁷³⁵ 1689th meeting, para. 3.

⁷³⁶ 1690th meeting, para. 7.