Part II

mentioned resolution of the Organization of African
Unity;

"5. Requests all States to assist the Organization
of African Unity in the attainment of this objective;

"6. Requests the Organization of African Unity,
in accordance with Article 54 of the Charter of the
United Nations, to keep the Security Council fully
informed of any action it may take under the present
resolution;

"7. Requests the Secretary-General of the United
Nations to follow the situation in the Congo and
to report to the Security Council at the appropriate
time.

The question remained on the list of matters with
which the Security Council is seized.\footnote{The following were subsequent communications on
this question received during the period covered by this Supple-
ment: S/6138 of 5 January 1965 and S/6172 of 3 February

\textbf{SITUATION IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA}

\textbf{Decision} of 6 May 1965 (1202nd meeting):

(i) Requesting the United Kingdom Government
and all Member States not to accept a unilat-
eral declaration of independence for South-
ern Rhodesia by the minority government;

(ii) Requesting the United Kingdom to take all
necessary action to prevent a unilateral decla-
ration of independence;

(iii) Requesting the United Kingdom Government
not to transfer under any circumstances to the
colony of Southern Rhodesia, as at present
governed, any of the powers or attributes of
sovereignty, but to promote the country's at-
tainment of independence by a democratic
system of government in accordance with the
aspirations of the majority of the popula-
tion;

(iv) Further requesting the United Kingdom Gov-
ernment to enter into consultations with all
concerned with a view to convening a con-
ference of all political parties in order to
adopt new constitutional provisions accept-
able to the majority of the people of Ro-
desia, so that the earliest possible date may
be set for independence;

(v) Deciding to keep the question of Southern
Rhodesia on its agenda

By letter \footnote{S/6294 and Add.1, \textit{O.R.}, 20th yr., Suppl. for Apr.-June
1965, pp. 45-47.} dated 21 April 1965 the representatives
of Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Re-
public, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Dahomey, Demo-
cratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana,
Guinea, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Liberia, Libya, Madag-
scar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger,
Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Su-
dan, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Republic,
United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta and Zamb-
ia, requested the President of the Security Council
to convene an urgent meeting of the Council to exa-
nine "the very serious situation" existing in Southern
Rhodesia.

In the explanatory memorandum attached to the
letter it was stated that the situation in Southern Roo-
desia was such as to endanger international peace and
security in Africa and throughout the world, and that

\footnote{\textit{1194th meeting: para. 6.}}

\footnote{\textit{1194th meeting: para. 7.}}

\footnote{\textit{1194th meeting: para. 8.}}

\footnote{\textit{1194th meeting: para. 6.}}

it was necessary that the Council should consider the
situation as a matter or urgency. It further stated that
despite resolutions 1747 (XVI), 1760 (XVII), 1883
(XVIII) and 1889 (XVIII) of the General Assem-
by, the efforts of the Special Committee established
under resolution 1654 (XVI) and of the United Na-
tions Secretary-General, and the repeated appeals made
by the African Heads of State and Government, the
United Kingdom had done nothing to apply resolu-
tion 1514 (XV) to "its colony of Southern Rhodesia".
Moreover, the intensification of repressive measures
against the African nationalist leaders, the decision to
hold elections on the basis of the Constitution of
1961, and the threats of "the so-called Prime Minis-
ter of the Territory to proclaim the independence" of
Southern Rhodesia without regard for the opinion of
the African inhabitants, had resulted in a deterioration
of the situation, and had been characterized as constitu-
ting "a threat to international peace and security".

At the 1194th meeting on 30 April 1965, after the
representative of the United Kingdom had reaffirmed
reservations made at the 1064th meeting regarding the
lack of competence of the Council on the mat-
ter,\footnote{\textit{1194th meeting: para. 6.}} the Council adopted\footnote{\textit{1194th meeting: para. 7.}} its agenda and con-
sidered the question at the 1194th to 1202nd meetings,
held between 30 April and 6 May 1965. The repre-
sentatives of Senegal and Algeria were invited to take
part in the discussion.\footnote{\textit{1194th meeting: para. 8.}}

Speaking on behalf of all the States members of the
Organization of African Unity, the representatives of
Senegal* and Algeria* stated at the 1194th and
1197th meetings that recent events and statements
clearly indicated that Southern Rhodesia had proceeded
along the path of illegality, injustice and outrageous
repression and that the objective of the Govern-
ment of Southern Rhodesia was to obtain a comfort-
able majority in the elections which were set for 7
May 1965, so that they would be able to proclaim
independence. They accused the United Kingdom of
strengthening the capabilities of the "racist" Govern-
ment of Southern Rhodesia by putting at its disposal
the air power of the Federation of Central Africa after
the dissolution of that Federation in December 1963;
and of placing the interests of the settlers over those of
the African majority. As a result, a minority had
been given the power to legislate and to decide the
destiny of the African majority. Their adoption of
certain "racist and repressive legislation" clearly indi-
cated the policy that would be pursued.

The representatives saw the recent agreements that
Southern Rhodesia had concluded with Portugal and
South Africa as an attempt by Mr. Smith "to provide
against all kinds of foreseeable difficulties". Recalling
that by resolutions 1747 (XVI), 1760 (XVII), 1883
(XVIII) and 1889 (XVIII), the General Assembly
had requested the Administering Authority of the Ter-
ritory of Southern Rhodesia to take a certain number
of measures to restore security in the interior of the
country, they asserted that it was "high time" for the
United Kingdom to take action in conformity with
those resolutions. They further contended that since
Southern Rhodesia was still a British colony and sub-
ject to the Crown, the United Kingdom could legally
use force as it had done in the past, "to admit the
contrary would be to recognize the right of accession
for a colony which does not yet fulfil the conditions
for normal accession to independence”. In suggesting measures that might be employed they recalled the proposals set forth in the draft resolution drawn up by the Special Committee (S/6300), namely that: (1) the elections of 7 May should be prevented from taking place; (2) all persons who had been arbitrarily arrested should be released and all discriminatory laws promulgated under the 1961 Constitution should be abolished; and (3) public freedoms and civil liberties should be restored and Southern Rhodesia should be prepared for independence by convening a constitutional conference. On the other hand, if the United Kingdom allowed Mr. Smith to set up a régime based on white supremacy, thereby creating a South Africa type situation with its inherent danger to international peace and security, then the United Kingdom should bear full responsibility for the serious consequences which would emerge.110

At the 1194th and 1197th meetings held between 30 April-4 May 1965, the representative of the United Kingdom outlined the policy of his Government regarding Southern Rhodesia in the following terms: (1) the British Government must be satisfied that any basis on which it is proposed that independence should be granted was acceptable to the people of the country as a whole; (2) it was not by unconstitutional or illegal action that a way forward must be sought, but by negotiation; and (3) no one must be left in any doubt of the true constitutional position or of the political and economic consequences which would flow from an illegal declaration of independence. Those principles were reaffirmed in a statement on 27 October 1964, which concluded as follows:

“In short an illegal declaration of independence in Southern Rhodesia would bring to an end relationships between her and Britain, would cut her off from the rest of the Commonwealth, from most foreign governments and from international organizations, would inflict disastrous economic damage upon her, and would leave her isolated and virtually friendless in a largely hostile continent.”111

He recalled the efforts of his Government to get negotiations started and suggested that so long as there was any prospect of negotiation aimed at avoiding or preventing disaster it should be pressed to the very end. He further stated “to abandon negotiation now would surely be an act of irresponsibility. To do anything in this Council or any where else to make negotiation more difficult, to wreck what hopes there are for peaceful progress, to take any action here which might contribute to the very disaster we most want to prevent — surely that would be a course to be universally condemned”. Moreover, the British Government considered that while the responsibility for bringing Rhodesia forward to independence rested with the United Kingdom alone, Rhodesia was self-governing in its internal affairs. Consequently, the decision to hold elections on 7 May was a decision for the Rhodesian Government, and the United Kingdom Government had no responsibility and no authority over that matter. In conclusion, the representative of the United Kingdom warned “that no good but only harm could come from calling for unconstitutional action”, which his Government would not take.112

At the 1199th meeting on 5 May 1965, the representative of the Ivory Coast introduced a draft resolution 113 jointly sponsored by Jordan and Malaysia. As revised on the same date 114 the draft resolution provided that the Council would inter alia, request the United Kingdom Government and all United Nations Members not to accept a unilateral declaration of independence for Southern Rhodesia by the minority Government, and would further request the United Kingdom Government to implement certain other measures.

At the 1201st meeting on 5 May 1965, the representative of the USSR introduced amendments 115 to the joint draft resolution. As revised 116 the amendments called for deletion of operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft resolution, and their replacement by a request to the United Kingdom to cancel the elections set by the Government of Southern Rhodesia for 7 May on the basis of the Constitution of 1961; and for the deletion from paragraph 5 of the words “not to transfer under any circumstances to its colony of Southern Rhodesia, as at present governed, any of the powers or attributes of sovereignty, but to promote the country's attainment”, and their replacement by the words “to take the necessary measures for the immediate granting to Southern Rhodesia...”

At the 1202nd meeting on 6 May 1965, the Council voted upon the draft resolution and the amendments before it. The USSR amendments were not adopted. There were one vote in favour, 2 against with 8 abstentions.117

The joint draft resolution was adopted by 7 votes in favour to none against, with 4 abstentions.118 It read as follows: 119

“The Security Council,

“Having examined the situation in Southern Rhodesia,

“Recalling General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, 1747 (XVI) of 28 June 1962, 1760 (XVII) of 31 October 1962, 1883 (XVIII) of 14 October 1963 and 1889 (XVIII) of 6 November 1963, and the resolutions 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, especially its resolution of 22 April 1965 (A/AC.109/112),

“Endorsing the requests which the General Assembly and the Special Committee have many times addressed to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to obtain:

“(a) The release of all political prisoners, detainees and restrictees,

“(b) The repeal of all repressive and discriminatory legislation, and in particular the Law and
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Order (Maintenance) Act and the Land Apportionment Act,

"(c) The removal of all restrictions on political activity and the establishment of full democratic freedom and equality of political rights.

"Noting that the Special Committee has drawn the attention of the Security Council to the grave situation prevailing in Southern Rhodesia and, in particular, to the serious implications of the elections announced to take place on 7 May 1965 under a constitution which has been rejected by the majority of the people of Southern Rhodesia and the abrogation of which has repeatedly been called for by the General Assembly and the Special Committee since 1962,

"Deeply disturbed at the further worsening of the situation in the Territory due to the application of the aforementioned Constitution of 1961 and to recent events, especially the minority Government's threats of a unilateral declaration of independence,

"1. Notes the United Kingdom Government's statement of 27 October 1964 specifying the conditions under which Southern Rhodesia might attain independence;

"2. Notes further and approves the opinion of the majority of the population of Southern Rhodesia that the United Kingdom should convene a constitutional conference;

"3. Requests the United Kingdom Government and all States Members of the United Nations not to accept a unilateral declaration of independence for Southern Rhodesia by the minority Government;

"4. Requests the United Kingdom to take all necessary action to prevent a unilateral declaration of independence;

"5. Requests the United Kingdom Government not to transfer under any circumstances to its colony of Southern Rhodesia, as at present governed, any of the powers or attributes of sovereignty, but to promote the country's attainment of independence by a democratic system of government in accordance with the aspirations of the majority of the population;

"6. Further requests the United Kingdom Government to enter into consultations with all concerned with a view to convening a conference of all political parties in order to adopt new constitutional provisions acceptable to the majority of the people of Rhodesia, so that the earliest possible date may be set for independence;

"7. Decides to keep the question of Southern Rhodesia on its agenda."

Decision of 12 November 1965 (1257th meeting).

(i) Condemning the unilateral declaration of independence made by a racist minority in Southern Rhodesia;

(ii) Deciding to call upon all States not to recognize this illegal racist minority regime in Southern Rhodesia and to refrain from rendering any assistance to this illegal regime

By letter 420 dated 11 November 1965, the permanent representative of the United Kingdom informed the President of the Security Council that the authorities in Rhodesia had made an announcement, purporting, illegally and unilaterally to declare independence for Rhodesia. The United Kingdom Government wished to inform the Security Council of the situation which had been created and of the steps which it was taking to meet the situation. Consequently, an urgent meeting of the Council was requested.

On 10 November 1965, the President of the General Assembly transmitted to the Security Council the texts of two resolutions (2012 (XX) and 2022 (XX)) adopted by the General Assembly on 12 October 1965 and on 5 November 1965 respectively, concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia. In his letter 421 to the Council, the President of the General Assembly referred to paragraphs 12 and 13 of resolution 2022 (XX), in which the General Assembly "draws the attention of the Security Council to the threats made by the present authorities in Southern Rhodesia . . ." and "to the explosive situation in Southern Rhodesia which threatens international peace and security."

By letter 422 dated 11 November 1965, the representatives of Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Dahomey, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta and Zambia, requested the President of the Security Council to convene an "emergency meeting of the Security Council to consider the situation created in Southern Rhodesia as a result of the unilateral declaration of independence" by the white minority Government there. The letter stated that the unilateral declaration of independence of Southern Rhodesia had created "a threat to international peace and security."

By letter 423 dated 11 November 1965, the representatives of Afghanistan, Ceylon, Cyprus, Ghana, India, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Morocco, Pakistan, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Turkey and Uganda requested the President of the Security Council to consider the grave situation in Southern Rhodesia arising out of the unilateral declaration of independence by the "white minority Government". The letter stated that the unilateral declaration of independence aggravated an already explosive situation and threatened international peace and security.

By letter 424 dated 11 November 1965, the President of the General Assembly transmitted to the Security Council the text of resolution 2024 (XX) of the General Assembly adopted on 11 November 1965, in which it was recommended that the Security Council consider the situation in Southern Rhodesia as a matter of urgency.

At the 1257th meeting on 12 November 1965, the Security Council decided to include the question on its agenda 425 and considered it at the 1257th to 1265th

meetings held between 12 and 20 November 1965. The representatives of Algeria, India, Pakistan, Ghana, Zambia, Sierra Leone, Senegal, Mali, Nigeria, Portugal, South Africa, the United Republic of Tanzania, and later, the representatives of Guinea, Ethiopia, Mauritania, Gambia, Jamaica, Somalia and Sudan were invited to take part in the discussion.428 Portugal and South Africa 429 declined the Security Council’s invitation to participate in the discussion of the question.

In his initial statement before the Council at the 1257th meeting on 12 November 1965, the representative of the United Kingdom explained that the United Kingdom had asked for the immediate meeting of the Security Council in connexion with the situation in Southern Rhodesia resulting from the declaration of independence made by a racist minority. The British Government regarded that as illegal and invalid since only the British Parliament had the right and authority to accord independence to Southern Rhodesia. He pointed out that the attempt to establish in Africa an illegal régime based on minority rule was a matter of world concern. That was the main reason why the question had been brought before the Security Council. After describing the measures which the United Kingdom had taken to deal with the illegal declaration and restore the rule of law in Southern Rhodesia, he asked for the goodwill, co-operation and active support of all those who accepted the principles set out in the resolution adopted by the General Assembly. The representative made it clear that the British Government did not “believe the use of military force can solve this problem”. He called on every State Member of the United Nations to refuse to recognize the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia, to prohibit all export of arms to that country, to impose exchange control restrictions, to deny all the advantages in trade and to ban the import of Southern Rhodesian tobacco and sugar. He considered that “I shall and all Members of the United Nations support us sincerely in applying these measures, the effect on the Southern Rhodesian economy will be severe indeed”.429

At the same meeting, speaking on behalf of the African States, the representative of Ghana 430 reviewed the history of the problem and pointed out that by his unilateral declaration of independence, Mr. Ian Smith and his “racist accomplices” had precipitated a serious crisis which posed a threat of immense proportions to peace and security in the world. He observed that the act had not come as a surprise. The African States had warned the United Kingdom, as far back as 1963, of the dangerous consequences of transferring powerful armed forces to the “racist minority” Government of Southern Rhodesia. The African States had then requested the Security Council to call upon the Government of the United Kingdom not to transfer to its colony of Southern Rhodesia any powers or attributes of sovereignty until the establishment of a fully representative Government, and not to transfer to the colony of Southern Rhodesia the armed forces and aircraft, as envisaged by the Central African Conference of 1963. However, the Government of the United Kingdom showed disregard for those apprehensions and warnings by vetoeing the draft resolution then submitted by Morocco, Philippines and Ghana. He declared that the “unilateral declaration of independence would have serious repercussions in Africa” and further stated that at the recent African summit conference, held in Accra from 21 to 25 October, the Heads of State and Government adopted a resolution on Southern Rhodesia, operative paragraph 3 of which read:

“Calls upon the United Nations to regard any such unilateral declaration of independence as constituting a threat to international peace, and to take the steps that such a situation requires in accordance with the Charter and to help to establish a majority Government in Southern Rhodesia.”

In pursuance of that resolution, the African States had come to the Security Council and called upon the Council to take appropriate action under Chapter VII 431 of the Charter, since every act of Southern Rhodesia definitely constituted a threat to international peace and security. The African representatives had not come to the Council to endorse half-hearted measures of doubtful efficacy which the United Kingdom Government intended to take. What were required were stronger and more and more effective measures to be taken to crush the rebellion.432

At the same meeting the representative of Senegal 433 stated that the act perpetrated by the Government of Southern Rhodesia was a true act of international piracy. If the rebellion went unpunished it would damage the moral standing of the British Commonwealth; it would undermine the authority of the United Nations Charter and international peace and security in Africa. He observed that the steps the United Kingdom proposed were economic sanctions. He appealed to all Member States to support the actions of the United Kingdom but asserted that “the most vigorous measures, including resort to force” should be used.434

At the 1258th meeting on 12 November 1965, the representative of Jordan proposed that the Council adopt a preliminary resolution condemning the illegal action of the minority group in Salisbury. The Security Council adopted the draft resolution by 10 votes to none, with 1 abstention.435

The resolution read: 436

“The Security Council,

“1. Decides to condemn the unilateral declaration of independence made by a racist minority in Southern Rhodesia;

“2. Decides to call upon all States not to recognize this illegal racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia and to refrain from rendering any assistance to the illegal régime.”

Decision of 20 November 1965 (1256th meeting):

(1) Determining that the situation resulting from the proclamation of independence by the illegal authorities in Southern Rhodesia is extremely grave, that the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Nor-

---
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thern Ireland should put an end to it and that its continuance in time constitutes a threat to international peace and security;

(ii) Reaffirming its resolution 216 (1965) of 12 November 1965, and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960;

(iii) Condemning the usurpation of power by a racist settler minority in Southern Rhodesia and regarding the declaration of independence by it as having no legal validity;

(iv) Calling upon the Government of the United Kingdom to quell this rebellion of the racist minority;

(v) Further calling upon the Government of the United Kingdom to take all other appropriate measures which would prove effective in eliminating the authority of the usurpers and in bringing the minority régime in Southern Rhodesia to an immediate end;

(vi) Calling upon all States not to recognize this illegal authority and not to entertain any diplomatic or other relations with this illegal authority;

(vii) Calling upon the Government of the United Kingdom, as the working of the Constitution of 1961 has broken down, to take immediate measures in order to allow the people of Southern Rhodesia to determine their own future consistent with the objectives of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV);

(viii) Calling upon all States to refrain from any action which would assist and encourage the illegal régime and, in particular, to desist from providing it with arms, equipment and military material, and to do their utmost in order to break all economic relations with Southern Rhodesia, including an embargo on oil and petroleum products;

(ix) Calling upon the Government of the United Kingdom to enforce urgently and with vigour all the measures it has announced, as well as those mentioned in the previous paragraph;

(x) Calling upon the Organization of African Unity to do all in its power to assist in the implementation of the present resolution, in conformity with Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations;

(xi) Deciding to keep the question under review in order to examine what other measures it may deem necessary to take.

The representatives of Mali, * India, * Nigeria, * and the USSR, speaking at the 1258th meeting recalled resolutions 1747 (XVI), 1755 (XVII) and 1760 (XVII) of the General Assembly, and pointed out that the General Assembly reaffirmed the fact that Southern Rhodesia was a Non-Self-Governing Territory within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter, and that the United Kingdom was completely responsible for the Territory. They then enumerated the efforts deployed at the United Nations and by the Organization of African Unity, to lead the United Kingdom to change the course of the dangerous evolution of that situation in Southern Rhodesia.

Considering the situation in Southern Rhodesia as "a threat to international peace and security", they requested that the Council should examine it in the light of the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter, and invite the United Kingdom to take effective measures, including recourse to force, to restore normal conditions in Southern Rhodesia so that the Zimbabwe people might benefit fully from the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The measures taken by the United Kingdom were inadequate and inappropriate in the context of the Southern Rhodesian problem. Economic sanctions alone were not enough. The measures did not include a total embargo on British exports to Southern Rhodesia, including especially oil. The embargo on tobacco would not have any immediate effect on the economy of Southern Rhodesia inasmuch as the recent harvest of tobacco had already been sold. Moreover, it was pointed, out, for economic sanctions to have any visible effect on Southern Rhodesia it would be necessary to ensure that both South Africa and Portugal would not undermine the whole undertaking. In conclusion it was declared that the fact that the matter had been before the Security Council should not be interpreted as an intention on the part of the African countries to abandon any initiative for taking action if the Security Council were to abdicate its responsibilities or if any action by the Council were to be blocked by a veto, as had happened in September 1963. At their various meetings, the African Heads of State or Government had taken decisions on the question of Southern Rhodesia, and it would be very wrong indeed to think that those decisions would not be carried out. 436

The representatives of Pakistan, * Algeria, * the Ivory Coast, Sierra Leone, * Ethiopia, * the United Republic of Tanzania, * Zambia, * Malaysia, Mauritania, * Jamaica, * Sudan, * Somalia, * and Jordan at the 1259th to 1264th meetings, held between 13 and 19 November 1965, stated that the illegal unilateral declaration of independence made by the Southern Rhodesian authorities had threatened international peace and security. The developments and events in Southern Rhodesia had given cause for the serious concern which had been expressed in the resolution passed by the Heads of African States and Governments at their conference at Accra in October 1965, which had called upon the United Kingdom to regard any such unilateral declaration of independence as constituting a threat to international peace, and to take the steps that such a situation required in accordance with the Charter in order to help to establish a majority Government in Southern Rhodesia. They pointed out that the United Nations, in its Committee of Twenty-Four, in the General Assembly and in the Security Council, had been seized of the question of Southern Rhodesia for a considerable time. The present state of affairs in Southern Rhodesia was the responsibility of the United Kingdom, which did not comply with resolutions 1747 (XVI), 1760 (XVII) 1889 (XVII) and 2022 (XX) of the General Assembly. They stated that the Council should conduct its deliberations in the light of Chapter VII under the terms of Articles 39 to 51. Noting that the measures proposed by the United Kingdom for dealing with crises were inadequate, they advocated "the most vigorous measures", including resort to force, to counter "the

436 1258th meeting: paras. 31-136.
The Council agreed that it should be given priority of consideration. At the 1265th meeting on 20 November 1965, the President (Bolivia) informed the Council that Bolivia and Uruguay had modified operative paragraph 1 of their draft resolution.

At the same meeting the Council voted upon the joint draft resolution before it. The joint draft resolution was adopted by 10 votes in favour to none against with 1 abstention. The resolution 411 read as follows:

"The Security Council,

"Deeply concerned about the situation in Southern Rhodesia,

"Considering that the illegal authorities in Southern Rhodesia have proclaimed independence and that the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, as the administering Power, looks upon this as an act of rebellion,

"Noting that the Government of the United Kingdom has taken certain measures to meet the situation and that to be effective these measures should correspond to the gravity of the situation,

"1. Determines that the situation resulting from the proclamation of independence by the illegal authorities in Southern Rhodesia is extremely grave, that the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland should put an end to it and that its continuance in time constitutes a threat to international peace and security;

"2. Reaffirms its resolution 216 (1965) of 12 November 1965 and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960:

"3. Condemns the usurpation of power by a racist settler minority in Southern Rhodesia and regards the declaration of independence by it as having no legal validity;

"4. Calls upon the Government of the United Kingdom to quell this rebellion of the racist minority;

"5. Further calls upon the Government of the United Kingdom to take all other appropriate measures which would prove effective in eliminating the authority of the usurpers and in bringing the minority régime in Southern Rhodesia to an immediate end;

"6. Calls upon all States not to recognize this illegal authority and not to entertain any diplomatic or other relations with it;

"7. Calls upon the Government of the United Kingdom, as the working of the Constitution of 1961 has broken down, to take immediate measures in order to allow the people of Southern Rhodesia to determine their own future consistent with the objectives of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV);

"8. Calls upon all States to refrain from any action which would assist and encourage the illegal régime and, in particular, to desist from providing it with arms, equipment and military material, and to do their utmost in order to break all economic relations with Southern Rhodesia,
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including an embargo on oil and petroleum products;

"9. Calls upon the Government of the United Kingdom to enforce urgently and with vigour all the measures it has announced, as well as those mentioned in paragraph 8 above;

"10. Calls upon the Organization of African Unity to do all in its power to assist in the implementation of the present resolution, in conformity with Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations;

"11. Decides to keep the question under review in order to examine what other measures it may deem necessary to take."

In view of the adoption of the draft resolution of Bolivia and Uruguay, the representatives of the Ivory Coast 445 and the United Kingdom 446 stated that they would not press for a vote on the draft resolutions which they had respectively introduced.

SITUATION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By letter 447 dated 1 May 1965, the permanent representative of the USSR requested the President of the Security Council to convene an urgent meeting in order "to consider the question of the armed interference by the United States in the internal affairs of the Dominican Republic."

At the 1196th meeting on 3 May 1965, the Council decided 448 to include the question in the agenda. The representative of Cuba was invited to participate in the discussion.449

The Council considered the question at its 1196th, 1198th, 1200th to 1204th, 1207th to 1209th, 1212th to 1223rd, 1225th to 1233rd meetings held between 3 May and 26 July 1965.

Decision of 14 May 1965 (1208th meeting):

(i) Calling for a strict cease-fire;

(ii) Inviting the Secretary-General to send, as an urgent measure, a representative to the Dominican Republic for the purpose of reporting to the Council on the situation;

(iii) Calling upon all concerned in the Dominican Republic to co-operate with the representative of the Secretary-General in the carrying out of that task.

At the 1196th meeting on 3 May 1965, the representative of the USSR stated that the Council had been convened to deal with an armed intervention of the United States in the internal affairs of the Dominican Republic. Under the "false pretext of protecting American lives" fourteen thousand United States troops had already been landed on the territory of the Dominican Republic, and the city of Santo Domingo had actually been taken over by the United States forces. On 28 April, over 405 United States marines had landed on Dominican territory and even if the United States version of its actions was to be accepted those troops would have been more than sufficient to evacuate United States citizens whereupon they would have been removed from that country. But even after the question of convening the Security Council to consider the matter had been raised, 1700 more marines and 2,500 paratroopers were sent to the Dominican Republic. Moreover heavy armaments and even tanks had been utilized by the United States units in engagements with "patriotic" Dominican forces. It was thus clear that what was intended to be saved was a "reactionary dictatorship of the militarists" against which the Dominican people had taken up arms. Besides, no longer a secret being made of plans to keep United States troops in the Dominican Republic even after order had been re-established in that country.

Furthermore, the representative of the USSR maintained that in sending troops to the Dominican Republic, the United States had not ascertained beforehand the view of the members of the Organization of American States (OAS), but had put before it a fait accompli as it had only been convened after their landing in Santo Domingo. Under those circumstances the concern and apprehension with which the other countries of the Americas viewed the interference by the United States troops was understandable.

The "aggression" committed by the United States against the Dominican Republic was fraught with the most serious consequences for the maintenance of international peace and security. The Security Council should therefore condemn the armed intervention of the United States in the internal affairs of the Dominican Republic as a violation of international peace and as an action incompatible with the obligations assumed by the United States under the United Nations Charter. The Council should further call upon the Government of the United States immediately to withdraw its troops from the territory of the Dominican Republic.

At the same meeting the representative of the United States explained that despite the efforts of his Government and the Organization of American States to build a stable and free society capable of economic and political development, the people of the Dominican Republic had suffered from constant turmoil and political conflict since the overthrow of the Trujillo dictatorship. During the previous week that instability "erupted" and officials who had governed that country for a year and a half were violently forced out. As rival groups strove to capture power fighting broke out between and among them and the Dominican Republic was left without effective government for some days. As the situation deteriorated certain of the contending forces indiscriminately distributed weapons to civilians and as armed bands began to roam the streets of Santo Domingo, looting, burning and sniping, law and order completely broke down, and several foreign embassies were violated.

In the face of uncontrollable violence, the Government which had replaced the Reid Cabral Government also quickly crumbled in a few days. In the absence of any governmental authority, Dominican law enforcement and military officials informed the United States Embassy that the situation was completely "out of control", that the police and other authorities could no longer give any guarantee concerning the safety of citizens of the United States or of some thirty other countries. Faced with that emergency, the United States on 28 April had dispatched the first of its security forces sent to Dominican territory. Since their arrival, nearly 3,000 foreign nationals from thirty
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