right to vote.\footnote{ibid. para 2} The Council considered the item at the 2007th and 2009th meeting on 24 and 25 May 1977.

At the 2007th meeting the Secretary-General submitted the report of the Mission for the consideration of the Council. He noted that it was vital for Lesotho to receive from the international community the assistance to overcome the economic difficulties with which it was faced. He expressed the hope that the Security Council would endorse the two programmes recommended by the report.\footnote{ibid., paras 3-17.}

At the same meeting the representative of Mauritius introduced, on behalf of the non-aligned members of the Council, the draft resolution\footnote{S/12335, adopted without change as resolution 407 (1977).} sponsored by Benin, India, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritius, Pakistan, Panama and Romania.

The representative of Lesotho declared that the implementation of the recommendations of the report would enable the Government and the people of Lesotho to uphold and abide by the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, effectively to implement the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations and to safeguard their independence and sovereignty.\footnote{ibid., paras 1-19.}

At the 2009th meeting, the representative of India noted that the Security Council was dealing with a situation which was very special and which, apparently, had not been envisaged by those who drafted the Charter of the United Nations. Even so, the Charter provided the General Assembly and the Security Council with ample general powers to rectify situations which were the direct consequences of the discredited policies of the Pretoria régime.\footnote{ibid., paras 20-29.}

The representative of France voiced the wish that the unanimous position of the international community in the matter under consideration would prompt those responsible for the situation which had been imposed on Lesotho to face up to reality. The common attitude of the Security Council should help them to understand that it was an illusion for them to hope to obtain international recognition for any of the entities which they might set up artificially.\footnote{ibid., paras 30-40.}

At the same meeting, the representative of the USSR reiterated that the inter-governmental relations should be based on such principles as the rejection of the use of force or the threat of the use of force, respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, the inviolability of State frontiers, non-interference in internal affairs and the peaceful settlement of disputes. He said that the Security Council not only should condemn the racist policies of South Africa but also adopt more effective measures which would put an end to the aggression and other hostile activities of the racists and their supporters against independent African States.\footnote{ibid., paras 41-53.}

Then the draft resolution was adopted unanimously without a vote.\footnote{ibid., paras 54-63.}

It reads as follows:

**The Security Council.**

Recalling its resolution 402 (1976) of 22 December 1976,

Taking note of the letter dated 18 April 1977 addressed to all States by the Secretary-General in accordance with paragraph 8 of resolution 402 (1976),

Having examined the report of the Mission to Lesotho, appointed by the Secretary-General in accordance with resolution 402 (1976),

Having heard the statement of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Lesotho,

Noting with deep concern the continued acts of coercion and harassment against the people of Lesotho by South Africa in complete disregard of resolution 402 (1976),

Reaffirming its endorsement of General Assembly resolution 31/6 of 26 October 1976 on the so-called independent Transkei and other bantustans,

Fulfilly aware that the decision of the Government of Lesotho not to recognize the bantustan Transkei has imposed a special economic burden upon Lesotho,

Convinced that international solidarity with Lesotho, as a neighbouring State of South Africa, is essential to counteract effectively South Africa’s policy to coerce Lesotho into recognizing the so-called independent Transkei,

1. **Commends** the Government of Lesotho for its decision not to recognize the so-called independent Transkei;
2. **Expresses its appreciation** to the Secretary-General for having arranged to send a Mission to Lesotho to ascertain the assistance needed;
3. **Takes note with satisfaction** of the report of the Mission to Lesotho;
4. **Fully endorses** the assessment and recommendations of the Mission to Lesotho under resolution 402 (1976);
5. **Further fully endorses** the appeal made by the Secretary-General in his letter of 18 April 1977 to all States for immediate financial, technical and material assistance to Lesotho;
6. **Welcomes** the establishment by the Secretary-General of a special account at Headquarters to receive contributions to Lesotho;
7. **Requests** the United Nations and the organizations and programmes concerned, including the Economic and Social Council, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the United Nations Development Programme and the World Health Organization, to assist Lesotho in the fields identified in the report of the Mission to Lesotho;
8. **Requests** the Secretary-General to give the matter of assistance to Lesotho his continued attention and to keep the Security Council informed;
9. **Decides** to remain seized of the question.

COMPLAINT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF BOTSWANA AGAINST THE ILLEGAL REGIME IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA CONCERNING VIOLATIONS OF ITS TERRITORIAL SOVEREIGNTY


By a letter dated 22 December 1976\footnote{ibid., following the President's statement (para. 98) adopted as resolution 407 (1977).} the representative of Botswana submitted his Government’s complaint that the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia had committed serious acts of aggression against Botswana,

\footnote{S/12292, OR, 31st Year, Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1976, p. 56.}
the most recent of which had occurred between 17 and 19 December 1976. The letter also quoted the Vice-President of Botswana as stating that since 27 December 1966 there had been 31 such violations of Botswana's territorial sovereignty by forces of the illegal régime. In a further letter dated 12 January 1977 the representative of Botswana transmitted additional information concerning his Government's complaint.

In a letter dated 11 January 1977 the representative of Morocco, in his capacity as Chairman of the African Group of nations at the United Nations, expressed the African Group's support for Botswana's request for an urgent meeting of the Council with expectation that the Council would take the necessary measures.

At the 1983rd meeting on 12 January 1977 the Security Council decided to include the letter of 22 December 1976 from Botswana in its agenda, which was adopted without objection, and the matter was considered at five meetings held in two sessions: between 12 and 14 January and on 24 and 25 May 1977.

In the course of the three meetings held during the first session, the President, with the consent of the Council, invited the representatives of Botswana, Cuba, Equatorial Guinea, the German Democratic Republic, Kenya, Lesotho, Mali, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Togo, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia and Zambia, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

At the 1983rd meeting the Minister for External Affairs of Botswana opened the discussion by listing and describing some of the specific incidences when violations of Botswana's territorial sovereignty had occurred since 1966. The violations had often consisted of overflying Botswana's air space by military aircraft of the illegal régime, actual air landings inside Botswana, and crossings into Botswana by groups of soldiers on foot, particularly those of the commando type known as the Selous Scouts, who made clandestine and sporadic incursions into the country. He reported that those raids had often resulted in harassment of citizens of Botswana, some of whom had been illegally abducted, and that the invaders had often mounted bombing raids which had resulted in loss of human life, physical injury to persons and damage to property. He said that those incidences manifested unprompted acts of war by the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia, which had declared the entire Botswana-Southern Rhodesia border area a war zone. Nevertheless, he affirmed, Botswana was determined to defend itself within the limits of its resources and would maintain its resolve to assist the victims of oppression in southern Africa. In view of the increase in expenditure on self-defence at the cost of development programmes, he appealed to the United Nations and to the international community in general for financial assistance to Botswana in order to enable the country to sustain its infrastructure.

The representative of Mauritius said that the attacks against Botswana must be seen in the light of the struggle of the freedom fighters of Zimbabwe against the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia; that struggle had the full backing of the whole membership of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), and that backing was in conformity with the relevant United Nations resolutions which affirmed and reaffirmed the legitimacy of the struggle of all people striving for their freedom and independence. Out of desperation in view of its impending defeat, he said, the illegal régime had resorted to indiscriminate acts of aggression against its neighbours on the pretext of the so-called policy of hot pursuit of the freedom fighters. He therefore urged the Council to treat the situation as a threat to peace in the area and take decisive measures.

The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya said that the troubles in the region stemmed from the denial to the people of Zimbabwe of their rights to self-determination and independence and the adamant clinging to power by the illegal minority régime there in defiance of various efforts by the Security Council and General Assembly to put an end to that régime. In order to ameliorate the situation he suggested that the Council should: ensure the removal of the illegal régime and the granting of independence to the people of Zimbabwe; condemn the illegal régime for its acts of aggression against Botswana; call for effective enforcement by all States of the sanctions against the illegal régime and the extension of those sanctions to South Africa, a country that continued to defy world public opinion and the relevant United Nations resolutions.

The representative of Venezuela also underlined that there could be no peace for Botswana so long as it was surrounded by the apartheid-practising countries in southern Africa; it was therefore necessary to ensure the attainment of independence in Namibia and the change of conditions in both Southern Rhodesia and South Africa.

At the 1984th meeting on 13 January 1977 the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zambia recalled similar previous attacks on the neighbouring countries, including his own, by the forces of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia and said that such attacks were a clear manifestation of the minority racist régimes intentions in southern Africa, that is, to destabilize the neighbouring countries and to manipulate the local populations into submission through the system of divide and rule. The object of those régimes was to ensure their own perpetuation. Furthermore, he said that the illegal régime aimed at forcing Botswana to abandon its stand on racism, oppression and on giving refuge to freedom fighters and victims of such injustices. He too called for the condemnation of the illegal régime and also appealed to the Council to ensure that Botswana received generous assistance from the United Nations and the international community in order to enable the country to maintain its development programmes.

---

1441 OR 32nd Year Suppl for Jan-March 1977, p 4
1442 Ibid, p 3
1443 Ibid, preceding para 18
1444 For details concerning these invations, see chapter III
1445 Ibid, paras 24-44
1447 Ibid, paras 50-63
1448 Ibid, paras 96-106
1449 Ibid, paras 108-113
1450 1984th mtg, paras 5, 24
The representative of Panama urged the Council to reach a consensus in condemning the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia and also expressed the hope that the Council would show interest in the procedures under way, referring to the Geneva Conference on Zimbabwe at the time, for agreement on the constitutional future of that country in accordance with the relevant resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and Security Council.\(^{1424}\)

The representative of China stated that the violation of Botswana’s territorial sovereignty was undoubtedly contrary to the Charter of the United Nations. He noted, however, that the situation in southern Africa was aggravated by the contradictory and self-serving policies pursued in the region by the super-Powers: one Power supporting and aiding the racist, minority régime and the other exploiting the nationalist liberation movements. He expressed the conviction that the people of southern Africa would nevertheless heighten their vigilance, strengthen their unity and persevere in the struggle until complete victory was achieved.\(^{1425}\)

The representative of Canada said that the Security Council had two primary and overriding responsibilities: to do everything possible to stop the violations of Botswana’s territorial sovereignty, and to assist the country in its special economic hardship resulting from the defence obligations imposed upon it. In that connection he mentioned specific assistance programmes already extended to Botswana by his Government on a bilateral basis.\(^{1426}\)

The representative of the United Republic of Tanzania said that the humanitarian act of Botswana in accepting refugees from the oppressive illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia was in conformity with the OAU call to all States to render assistance to the people of Zimbabwe in their struggle for their freedom. He therefore invited the Council to bear in mind that the attack against Botswana constituted also an attack against the principles and ideals for which the OAU stood. He said that mere condemnation of the illegal régime was not enough, and urged that in addition the Council should extend against the régime all the mandatory sanctions provided for under Article 41 of the Charter.\(^{1427}\)

The representative of India referred to the position of Botswana, which, like Lesotho, he characterized as being surrounded by hostile, illegal régimes. For that reason those two countries merited special consideration and assistance from the United Nations. With regard to the complaint under discussion he said that his delegation would support any action to liquidate the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia and to provide the assistance needed by Botswana.\(^{1428}\)

The representative of the United States said that the best solution to the problem of relations among the neighbouring countries in the area lay in the advent of majority rule in Southern Rhodesia; for that reason his delegation had been instructed by his Government to follow closely and support the negotiations by the United Kingdom Government under way on Southern Rhodesia’s future.\(^{1429}\)

At the 1985th meeting on 14 January 1977 the representative of Mozambique said that as one of the countries in the area that had suffered similar attacks from the racist, minority régimes in Southern Rhodesia and South Africa, Mozambique had sympathy for Botswana in its plight and fully deplored the acts of aggression committed against that country. He reiterated that Botswana deserved the full support of the international community so as to enable the country to cope with the resulting economic hardships.\(^{1430}\)

The representative of the Federal Republic of Germany said that his Government considered the unilateral declaration of independence by the régime in Southern Rhodesia to be illegal, and that the Government had strictly applied the Security Council sanctions imposed against the illegal illegal régime since 1968, even before the Federal Republic was a member of the United Nations. What was now required was support for the Geneva Conference sponsored by the United Kingdom and extension of assistance to Botswana; for its part the Federal Republic Government was already co-operating with the Government of Botswana in certain development programmes.\(^{1431}\)

The representative of the German Democratic Republic said that the aggression committed against Botswana was deplorable and he wondered how the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia was able to disregard world opinion with such impunity. He suggested that the situation required the Security Council to institute stern measures against both the Pretoria and Salisbury régimes, namely: to extend the sanctions and to ensure their strict implementation against Southern Rhodesia, to impose a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa, to isolate the two racist régimes politically, and to recognize and support the national liberation movement.\(^{1432}\)

In the course of the 1985th meeting, the representative of Mauritius introduced a draft resolution co-sponsored by the delegations of Benin, India, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritius, Pakistan, Panama, Romania and Venezuela,\(^{1433}\) which was subsequently adopted without change at the same meeting as resolution 403 (1977).\(^{1434}\) He said that the draft resolution concentrated on three main objectives: the cessation of hostilities, the despatch of a mission by the Secretary-General and the question of financial and other assistance to Botswana.\(^{1435}\)

\(^{1424}\) Ibid., paras 36-39.

\(^{1425}\) Ibid., paras 54-58.

\(^{1426}\) Ibid., paras 91-104.

\(^{1427}\) Ibid., paras 111-117.
The representative of the USSR referred to the policy of his Government in southern Africa and declared that only by the elimination once and for all of the illegal racist régimes there would the people of southern Africa be able to enjoy conditions of peace and stability. But the acts of provocation and aggression against its neighbouring countries showed that the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia was resorting to such methods in efforts to maintain its racist, minority domination in the country. In the circumstances, he said that his delegation supported the draft resolution before the Council.\[^{1434}\]

The representative of the United Kingdom informed the Council that his Government already provided substantial economic aid to Botswana and would continue to do so. With regard to Botswana's specific complaint he said that it stemmed from the continuing problem of Southern Rhodesia, which had to be resolved if peace was to be maintained in the area. In that connection he referred to the course of the negotiations under way in Geneva and announced that in efforts to maintain the momentum and goodwill necessary for those delicate negotiations, his delegation would be obliged to abstain on the draft resolution before the Council.\[^{1437}\]

Similarly, the representative of the United States, citing the desire of his Government to maintain its contribution to the United Kingdom's effort, announced his delegation's intention to abstain from the vote.\[^{1438}\]

The draft resolution was then put to vote and was adopted as resolution 403 (1977) by 13 votes to none with 2 abstentions (the United Kingdom and the United States).\[^{1439}\] The text of the resolution reads as follows:

---

**The Security Council.**

Taking note of the letters dated 22 December 1976 (S/12262) and 12 January 1977 (S/12275) from the Permanent Representative of Botswana to the United Nations, and having heard the statement of the Minister for External Affairs of Botswana concerning hostile acts against Botswana by the illegal minority régime in Southern Rhodesia,

Gravely concerned at the dangerous situation created by the provocative and hostile acts committed by the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia against the security and well-being of Botswana,

Reaffirming the inalienable right of the people of Southern Rhodesia to self-determination and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, and the legitimacy of their struggle to secure the enjoyment of such rights as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations,

Recalling its resolutions 232 (1966) of 16 December 1966 and 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968, by which it determined and reaffirmed respectively that the situation in Southern Rhodesia constituted a threat to international peace and security,

Taking note of General Assembly resolution 31/154 of 20 December 1976,

**Convinced** that the recent provocative and hostile acts perpetrated by the illegal régime against Botswana aggravate the situation,

Deeply grieved and concerned at the loss of human life and damage to property caused by the acts of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia against Botswana,

Noting with appreciation Botswana's decision to continue to give asylum to political refugees fleeing from inhuman oppression by the illegal racist minority régime,

Realizing the need for Botswana to strengthen its security in order to safeguard its sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence,

Reaffirming the legal responsibility of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland over Southern Rhodesia, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations,

1. **Strongly condemns** all acts of provocation and harassment, including military threats and attacks, murder, arson, kidnapping and destruction of property, committed against Botswana by the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia;

2. **Condemns** all measures of political repression by the illegal régime that violate fundamental rights and freedoms of the people of Southern Rhodesia and contribute to instability and lack of peace in the region as a whole;

3. **Deplores** all acts of collaboration and collusion which sustain the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia and encourage defiance with impunity of the resolutions of the Security Council, with adverse consequences for peace and security in the region;

4. **Demands** the immediate and total cessation of all hostile acts committed against Botswana by the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia;

5. **Takes cognizance** of the special economic hardship confronting Botswana as a result of the imperative need to divert funds from ongoing and planned development projects to hitherto unplanned and unbudgeted security measures necessitated by the urgent need effectively to defend itself against attacks and threats by the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia;

6. **Accepts** the invitation of the Government of Botswana to dispatch a mission to assess the needs of Botswana in carrying out its development projects under the present circumstances and, accordingly, requests the Secretary-General, in collaboration with appropriate organizations of the United Nations system, to organize with immediate effect financial and other forms of assistance to Botswana and to report to the Security Council not later than 31 March 1977;

7. **Requests** the United Nations and the organizations and programmes concerned, including the Economic and Social Council, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Development Programme, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the International Fund for Agricultural Development, to assist Botswana in carrying out the ongoing and planned development projects without interruption as stated in paragraph 5 and envisaged under paragraph 6 of the present resolution;

8. **Appeals** to all States to respond positively in providing assistance to Botswana, in the light of the report of the Mission of the Secretary-General, in order to enable Botswana to carry out its planned development projects;

9. **Decides** to remain seized of the matter.

After the vote the Secretary-General made a statement in which he informed the Council that pursuant to the request in the resolution just adopted he would carry out the responsibilities indicated, and that he was arranging to assign to the mission to Lesotho established by him under resolution 402 (1976)\[^{1440}\] the additional mandate to visit Botswana as well and ascertain the situation there.\[^{1441}\]

The representative of Canada said that in view of Canada's substantial involvement in development programmes with Botswana already in progress, his Government intended to study carefully the impact of any proposals arising out of paragraph 6 of the resolution.\[^{1442}\]

---

\[^{1434}\] See the item entitled "Complaint by Lesotho against South Africa", p. 294
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\[^{1439}\] Ibid., paras. 202
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The representative of Botswana expressed his Government's deep appreciation for the sympathy and solidarity with his country shown by various delegations in their statements, and expressed gratitude to the Council for the resolution just adopted, despite the regrettable abstentions by the United Kingdom and United States.1443


On 28 March 1977 the Secretary-General issued the report of the mission to Botswana1444 assigned there pursuant to resolution 403 (1977). The report described the situation of Botswana and recommended a number of new development programmes. It also suggested ways in which assistance to Botswana could be effected by the international community to enable the country to continue with its normal development, the cost for which the report estimated at $53.5 million over the following three years. By a letter dated 18 April 1977,1444 the Secretary-General transmitted the report to all Member States and members of the specialized agencies.

At the 2006th meeting on 24 May the Security Council included the Secretary-General's report in its agenda, which was adopted without objection,1446 and resumed its consideration of the complaint by Botswana at two meetings held on 24 and 25 May 1977.

At the 2006th meeting the President, with the consent of the Council again invited the representatives of Botswana and Sierra Leone at their request to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.1447

At the same meeting the Secretary-General made a statement in which he introduced the report on Botswana before the Council. He said that in asking him to make an appraisal of the situation of Botswana the Council had recognized the main problem of the country to consist in the diversion of development funds to security requirements. But he noted also that the country was shouldering a heavy financial burden in catering to the influx of refugees from Southern Rhodesia and South Africa. In view of the importance Botswana attached to its livestock industry he drew particular attention to the country's difficulties in carrying out veterinary control programmes bordering on Southern Rhodesia. He concurred with the mission's assessment that in all Botswana would need some $53 million to maintain its existing and new programmes for the following three years. He announced that as part of the measures he proposed to mobilize assistance for Botswana he intended to convene a meeting at Headquarters on 6 June 1977 of all the Governments interested in contributing, to which he would invite the Minister for External Affairs of Botswana.1448

The representative of Mauritius, after reviewing some of the salient points of the report, introduced a draft resolution1449 co-sponsored by Benin, India, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritius, Pakistan, Panama, Romania and Venezuela. He analysed the relevant operative paragraphs of the draft resolution in the course of which he drew special attention to the role to be played by the Secretary-General and the United Nations specialized agencies in implementing the recommendations of the report.1450

The Minister for External Affairs of Botswana said that even as the Council had convened to consider the report of the mission to Botswana further acts of aggression were continuing to be committed against his country by the forces of the illegal régime. He recounted a number of such attacks which had occurred before 2 March and 16 May 1977 of which he said the most serious had been the bombardment of the Francistown Mopane Club by about 150 troops of the illegal régime in helicopters and troop-carriers, who had employed heavy machinery and had tossed hand grenades into the club premises.1451

The representative of Sierra Leone, speaking on behalf of the African Group at the United Nations, condemned the aggressive attacks committed against Botswana and, in view of the findings and recommendations of the mission, he urged the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus as a natural consequence to resolution 403 (1977).1452

At the 2008th meeting on 25 May 1977 all the other 13 members of the Council made statements in which they variously commented on the findings and recommendations of the mission's report; they commended the work of the mission and expressed their appreciation for the Secretary-General's role. Some of them urged unanimous adoption of the draft resolution before the Council; others reiterated their delegations' position presented at meetings during the first session. The representatives of the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany, Canada, the United States and France1453 referred to their Governments' existing or proposed bilateral co-operation with Botswana, or the assistance being rendered by the European Economic Community and indicated that relevant discussions with the Government of Botswana would be undertaken in the light of the mission's report.

At the conclusion of the 2008th meeting the draft resolution contained in document S/12334 was adopted unanimously as resolution 406 (1977), the text of which reads as follows:

The Security Council.
Recalling its resolution 403 (1977) of 14 January 1977,
Taking note of the letter dated 18 April 1977 (S/12326) addressed to all States by the Secretary-General in accordance with paragraph 8 of resolution 403 (1977),

1441 Ibid., paras. 222-227.
1443 S/12326, OR, 32nd Yr., Suppl. for April-June 1977, p. 36.
1444 2006th mtg., preceding para. 1.
1445 For details of these invitations, see chapter III.
1446 2006th mtg., paras. 7-17.
1448 2006th mtg., paras. 18-20.
1449 Ibid., paras. 32-48.
1450 Ibid., paras. 52-60.
1451 2008th mtg., paras. 5-8, 12-19, 47-46, 53-56 and 72-76, respectively.
Recalling further its resolutions 232 (1966) of 16 December 1966 and 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968, by which it determined and reaffirmed, respectively, that the situation in Southern Rhodesia constituted a threat to international peace and security,

Having examined the report (S/12307) of the Mission to Botswana established under resolution 403 (1977),

Having heard the statement of the Minister for External Affairs of Botswana on the continued attacks and acts of provocation by the illegal racist régime in Southern Rhodesia against Botswana,

Convinced that international solidarity with Botswana, as a neighbouring State to Southern Rhodesia, is essential for the promotion of a solution to the question of Southern Rhodesia,

1. Expresses full support for the Government of Botswana in its efforts to safeguard its sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence;

2. Expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General for having arranged to send a Mission to Botswana to ascertain the assistance needed;

3. Takes note with satisfaction of the report of the Mission to Botswana (S/12307);

4. Fully endorses the assessment and recommendations of the Mission to Botswana under resolution 403 (1977);

5. Further fully endorses the appeal made by the Secretary-General in his letter of 18 April 1977 (S/12326) to all States to give the matter of assistance to Botswana their most urgent attention and to provide Botswana with the financial and material help it urgently needs;

6. Welcomes the establishment by the Secretary-General of a special account at Headquarters to receive contributions for assistance to Botswana through the United Nations;

7. Requests the United Nations and the organizations and programmes concerned, including the Economic and Social Council, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the United Nations Development Programme and the World Health Organization, to assist Botswana in the fields identified in the report of the Mission to Botswana;

8. Requests the Secretary-General to give the matter of assistance to Botswana his continued attention and to keep the Security Council informed;

9. Decides to remain seized of the matter.

COMPLAINT BY BENIN


In a letter dated 26 January 1977, the representative of Benin requested, in accordance with Article 35 of the Charter, that a meeting of the Security Council be convened for the purpose of discussing the cowardly and barbarous aggression committed by the imperialists and their mercenaries against the People's Republic of Benin.

The letter charged that on 16 January 1977 a commando unit of mercenaries, brought by a military aircraft, had attacked the airport and city of Cotonou but had been forced to retreat, abandoning a considerable quantity of weapons and ammunition after causing the loss of some lives and material damage.

By a letter dated 4 February 1977, the representative of Guinea transmitted a message from the President of Non-Aligned Countries a communiqué issued by that body regarding the attack on Cotonou, a letter dated 8 February 1977 (S/12284, ibid., pp. 7-8) from the representative of Jordan who as Chairman of the Arab Group transmitted a communiqué from that group; a letter dated 8 February 1977 (S/12285, ibid., p. 8) from the representative of Rwanda who as Chairman of the African Group reported that the African countries had expressed unanimous support for Benin's request.

Draft resolution S/12282 was subsequently revised and adopted as resolution 404 (1977). For the text of the original draft see OR, 32nd yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1977, p. 16-17.

Further, the representative of Benin opened the discussion with a very detailed description of the events of 16 January 1977 at Cotonou and charged that the aim of the act of aggression carried out by a group of mercenaries was to immobilize the armed forces of Benin and to place the city under military occupation as a first stage.

He pointed out that the mercenaries carried highly sophisticated equipment in large quantities and gave rise to severe fighting leading to death and injury of soldiers and civilians as well as to substantial material damage. He accused imperialist and neo-colonialist Powers of having instigated this attack and called for the special Security Council mission to ascertain the facts, to determine who was responsible and who carried out the armed aggression and to help assess the damage caused. He also expressed hope that in a second phase appropriate action should be taken to prevent the recurrence of such barbaric acts of aggression by mercenaries.

At the 1986th meeting, the representative of Benin opened the discussion with a very detailed description of the events of 16 January 1977 at Cotonou and charged that the aim of the act of aggression carried out by a group of mercenaries was to immobilize the armed forces of Benin and to place the city under military occupation as a first stage.

He pointed out that the mercenaries carried highly sophisticated equipment in large quantities and gave rise to severe fighting leading to death and injury of soldiers and civilians as well as to substantial material damage. He accused imperialist and neo-colonialist Powers of having instigated this attack and called for the special Security Council mission to ascertain the facts, to determine who was responsible and who carried out the armed aggression and to help assess the damage caused. He also expressed hope that in a second phase appropriate action should be taken to prevent the recurrence of such barbaric acts of aggression by mercenaries.

The representative of Mauritius also condemned the mercenary attack on Cotonou and called for the dispatch of a Security Council mission of inquiry to Benin as soon as possible. In this connexion he introduced a draft resolution co-sponsored by the delegations of Benin, Libyan Arab Republic and Mauritius under which the Council would decide to send such a mission to investigate the de facto aggression.

Members of the Security Council and other speakers joined the representative of Benin in denouncing the attack on Cotonou and in seeking the establishment of the relevant facts surrounding the act of aggression by a Council mission.

Several representatives underlined