



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FIFTH YEAR

**1532**<sup>nd</sup>

MEETING: 12 MARCH 1970

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1532) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia:	
Letter dated 3 March 1970 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9675);	
Letter dated 6 March 1970 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Algeria, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Congo (Democratic Republic of), Dahomey, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, the Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, the People's Republic of the Congo, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, the United Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, the Upper Volta and Zambia (S/9682) .....	1

#### NOTE

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

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

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

## FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SECOND MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 12 March 1970, at 3 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Joaquín VALLEJO ARBELAEZ  
(Colombia).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Burundi, China, Colombia, Finland, France, Nepal, Nicaragua, Poland, Sierra Leone, Spain, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Zambia.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1532)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia:

Letter dated 3 March 1970 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9675);

Letter dated 6 March 1970 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Algeria, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Congo (Democratic Republic of), Dahomey, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, the Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, the People's Republic of the Congo, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, the United Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, the Upper Volta and Zambia (S/9682).

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

### Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia

Letter dated 3 March 1970 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9675);

Letter dated 6 March 1970 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representa-

tives of Algeria, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Congo (Democratic Republic of), Dahomey, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, the Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, the People's Republic of the Congo, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, the United Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, the Upper Volta and Zambia (S/9682)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): In accordance with the decision previously taken by the Council I propose now to invite the representatives of Algeria, Senegal and Pakistan to take places at the Council table.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. N. Harbi (Algeria), Mr. I. Boye (Senegal) and Mr. S. A. Karim (Pakistan) took places at the Security Council table.*

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to inform the Council that I have just received a communication from the representative of Yugoslavia [S/9697] in which he asks to be invited to participate in this debate without the right to vote. If there are no objections, and with the consent of the Council, I propose to invite that representative to take a place at the Council table.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. L. Mojsov (Yugoslavia) took a place at the Security Council table.*

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Security Council will now continue the consideration of the question on its agenda. Before calling on the first speaker on the list, I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to the draft resolution co-sponsored by Burundi, Nepal, Sierra Leone, Syria and Zambia, which has been circulated as document S/9696.

4. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, before beginning the statement by the Soviet delegation on the question under discussion, I should like to say how glad we are that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zambia—a country which is closer than all the other States of Africa to the country in which the situation

we are now discussing has arisen—is taking part in our meetings, and I also want to express our satisfaction at the fact that a large number of representatives of other countries have expressed the wish to take part in the discussion of this question, which is important not only for Africa but for the whole world. I should also like to express our regret that, apparently for some unsurmountable reasons, the ministers of two African States who, according to earlier information, were intending to take part in the discussion of this question in the Council, are not present at the meeting.

5. I cannot refrain from observing, either, that the problem which the Security Council is discussing is in the full sense of the word a pan-African problem. This is confirmed by two circumstances. First, the Organization of African Unity specially authorized the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zambia and two other ministers to bring the question of Southern Rhodesia before the Security Council as an important and urgent matter directly related to the situation in Africa and to peace in Africa. Secondly, this question is being discussed at the request of about forty African States. These two facts indicate—and make it quite clear to the Security Council—that the problem under discussion is in the full sense of the word a pan-African problem and that all African peoples and States are interested in its solution.

6. As you are aware, this is not the first time that the Security Council is considering the question of the situation in Southern Rhodesia—a situation which is becoming increasingly explosive with the consolidation in this African country of the illegal anti-African racist and Fascist régime, which has enslaved the Zimbabwe people—a people of four million—and is creating a threat to the other peoples of Africa.

7. It cannot be said that the Security Council has not taken any measures against this régime. On 16 December 1966 the Council in its resolution 232 (1966) instituted partial economic sanctions covering fifteen main commodity groups in which trade with Southern Rhodesia was prohibited. On 29 May 1968, the Council adopted its well-known resolution 253 (1968), which provided for considerably more extensive economic sanctions and other boycott measures. These decisions of the Council were taken within the framework of Chapter VII, Article 41, of the United Nations Charter; and, under the terms of Article 25 of the Charter, they are mandatory for all Member States.

8. The purpose of these measures was to place the racist and Fascist régime of Southern Rhodesia in a position in which it would be unable any longer to remain in power, and its elimination would clear the way for the liberation of the African people of Zimbabwe, for the establishment by that people of a truly independent State and for the removal of the threat posed by the racists in Southern Rhodesia to the security of the neighbouring States of Africa.

9. It is well-known that many States, guided by these legitimate objectives, are complying strictly with the Security Council decisions on Southern Rhodesia.

They are not maintaining any economic, political or other relations or ties with the Southern Rhodesian racists. The Soviet Union is one of the States which are complying fully with these decisions of the Council and implementing them strictly, believing that they are designed to help liberate the African people of Zimbabwe from colonialist and racist oppression.

10. However, the actual course of events in Southern Rhodesia shows that these decisions of the Security Council have not led to positive results—they have not led to the liberation of the Zimbabwe people from the murderous tyranny of the racist régime. In fact, as the representatives of the African countries have already pointed out in their statements, sanctions have failed. They have not stopped the Southern Rhodesian racists, and have not thwarted their criminal plans and policy. On the contrary, these plans are gradually being put into effect. Last year, the illegal Salisbury régime adopted a racist “constitution”. Now this régime has declared Southern Rhodesia a “republic”. In other words, what has happened is that the power of the racists has been consolidated and strengthened and another Fascist and racist régime has been established in southern Africa alongside the régime of the same kind in South Africa. An inhuman system of racial oppression has been set up in the image and likeness of the systems already existing in southern Africa.

11. The Security Council has already stated in its resolutions that the situation in Southern Rhodesia constitutes a threat to international peace and security. The General Assembly, for its part, has with full justification described the whole policy of the racist régime in that country as a crime against humanity. The latest events show that the situation in Southern Rhodesia is sharply deteriorating and that the threat to peace, far from diminishing, is in fact increasing.

12. The Soviet delegation has listened with close attention to the statements made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zambia and the representatives of certain other African countries, who know the situation in Southern Rhodesia better than many of us do. They have all expressed justified and legitimate alarm concerning the fate of the Zimbabwe people and the fate of peace in Africa and of international peace.

13. The position of the Soviet Union on this question has recently been expressed in a special statement by the official agency TASS. This statement has been issued today, 12 March 1970, as a Security Council document [S/9700]. The delegation of the USSR would like to make some comments on the situation which has arisen and on the measures which the Security Council should take.

14. What, in fact, is happening? How is it that a situation has arisen in which the Security Council is taking decisions whose effective implementation would help to liquidate the racist régime of foreign oppressors in Southern Rhodesia; but the result is quite the opposite? In fact, the racist régime in Salisbury continues to exist, and is moreover stabilizing and consolidating itself.

15. The fact is that a number of influential States—and, we must say frankly here, nearly all of them are members of one and the same NATO military bloc—are protecting the racist régime in Southern Rhodesia. Some of them, in spite of the decisions of the Security Council, are giving it open support. To mention these States by their names, they are first of all, the Republic of South Africa, Portugal, the United States of America, the Federal Republic of Germany, some other States which are allied to them and, finally and above all, the State which bears the main and direct responsibility for the emergence of the racist régime in Southern Rhodesia and for its existence until now—the United Kingdom.

16. The roles played by these States in emasculating the Security Council resolutions on sanctions and nullifying their significance differ in form, but are identical in their essence and effects. South Africa and Portugal are openly disregarding the Council's decisions and are continuing to develop extensive trade, transport, military and all other kinds of relations with Southern Rhodesia. The United Kingdom, and also the Federal Republic of Germany, the United States of America and certain other States, are in their statements supporting the Security Council's decisions on sanctions, but in reality they are conducting large-scale trade and developing economic relations with the Republic of South Africa and Portugal and through them—in fact—with Southern Rhodesia itself.

17. The representatives of the African countries have already referred to this aspect of the matter here. Additional evidence is to be found in the statistics produced by the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. These statistics show that in eight months of last year alone, for example, the value of exports from the United States of America to the Republic of South Africa was \$18.8 million higher than for the same period in 1968; exports from the United Kingdom increased by \$17.5 million; West Germany increased its exports to the country ruled by the South African racists—the bitterest enemies of the peoples of Africa—by \$38.4 million; Japan over the same period increased its exports to that country by \$48 million, and so on. It is scarcely surprising that a considerable proportion of the goods exported by these countries to South Africa ultimately find their way across the unchecked frontiers between the Republic of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia and reach the markets for which they were in fact originally intended, the markets of racist Southern Rhodesia.

18. Another integral part of the machinery for thwarting sanctions against Southern Rhodesia is the activity and investments of imperialist monopolies. The facts set forth in a United Nations Secretariat working paper<sup>1</sup> prepared for the Committee of Twenty-Four<sup>2</sup> show that the activities of these foreign monopolies

in Southern Rhodesia are continuing to expand, in spite of all the decisions taken by the United Nations. For example, in paragraph 68 of this document it is stated that in the first nine months of 1969 mining companies of Western countries members of the same NATO military bloc received forty-one exclusive prospecting concessions in Southern Rhodesia. The concessions granted so far cover an area of more than 6,000 square miles, of which 3,271 square miles in the territory of Southern Rhodesia were granted in 1969—in other words, quite recently. The imperialist monopolies which have thus quite recently—since the introduction of sanctions by the Security Council—received concessions in Southern Rhodesia include United States, United Kingdom and Netherlands companies, and companies based in other countries dominated by United Kingdom and United States capital although they are formally registered in South Africa.

19. This is the second and very important means of getting round sanctions. In the light of these facts and the documentary data, we are bound to agree with the view expressed by the New York *Wall Street Journal*, which is very well informed on economic and financial matters. In September 1969 this newspaper contained the following statement on the question of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia: “The sanctions program, which began with all the elements of a spy novel”—those were the words used “spy novel”—“may be degenerating into a gumshoe comedy”. This newspaper knows what it is referring to and what it is talking about.

20. The failure of economic sanctions has also been officially recognized by the Security Council committee, which is normally known as the Sanctions Committee, in paragraph 48 of its report of 12 June 1969 to the Council [S/9252].

21. There is yet another aspect of the matter, which is related not to the economic but to the direct political support received by the racist régime of Salisbury. What we are referring to here is the maintenance until recently of consular and other missions in Southern Rhodesia, which have in fact served as screens for political and diplomatic relations between a number of Western countries and the Southern Rhodesian racists. Until very recently the United States of America, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Greece and other Western European countries—not to mention South Africa and Portugal—have, as is well known, been maintaining consular missions at Salisbury. There is no doubt that in this way the Governments of Western countries have been giving considerable political support to the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia. Now there has been a rush, on the part of a number of countries, to close their consulates in Southern Rhodesia. It would be a good thing if this rush were followed by a rush to withdraw investments from Southern Rhodesia and to terminate economic and other relations of all kinds with the racist régime in that country.

22. The Soviet delegation has drawn attention merely to some of the manoeuvres which are being adopted

<sup>1</sup> Document A/AC.109/L.616 of 27 February 1970.

<sup>2</sup> Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

by the monopolies of Western countries and by the countries concerned themselves, in order to circumvent and thus to thwart sanctions. At the same time, the representatives of these countries in the Security Council are doing everything to prevent the adoption of full-scale sanctions and the application of sanctions against the main violators, South Africa and Portugal. This became very clear last year when, for example, the United Kingdom, with the support of the United States and a number of other allies and friends, prevented the adoption in the Security Council of an Afro-Asian draft resolution<sup>3</sup> which would have extended economic sanctions to South Africa and Portugal as well.

23. The present discussion on the question of Southern Rhodesia will show whether these countries members of the Security Council are intending to oppose the adoption by the Council of effective measures against the racist régime of Salisbury and against the racist and colonialist régimes of Pretoria and Lisbon, those loyal friends and allies of the Southern Rhodesian racists and enemies of Africa.

24. In this whole system of protection and support for the Fascist and racist régime in Southern Rhodesia, a special role is being played by the United Kingdom. United Kingdom policy on the question of Southern Rhodesia has two facets, one open and one secret.

25. On the one hand, the United Kingdom Government does not deny its special responsibility for the territory of Southern Rhodesia, which was for a century under British colonial rule. The United Kingdom Government publicly declares its support for the Security Council resolutions calling for sanctions. Its representatives in the United Nations voted for those resolutions. They are providing the Security Council Sanctions Committee with information from United Kingdom sources on cases of suspicious trade transactions which might involve violation of the Security Council resolutions on sanctions. In the Committee, they criticize and even condemn the Southern Rhodesian régime, calling it racist and illegal. Only a few days ago, the United Kingdom representative to the United Nations went so far as to request an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider measures to be taken in connexion with the proclamation of a self-styled "republic" by the Southern Rhodesian racists, and insisted that the Council should be convened even before the arrival of the ministers of the African countries.

26. However, quite frankly, one cannot help having the impression that all this is, as they say, mere "sound and fury, signifying nothing". This situation can only be described as a simulation of seething activity. In fact, this visible—or, rather, ostensible—aspect of United Kingdom policy on the question of Southern Rhodesia is designed to conceal the other hidden and secret aspect, and to distract the attention of the United Nations, the Security Council and world public opinion from it.

<sup>3</sup> *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-fourth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1969, document S/9270/Rev.1.*

27. This secret aspect of the policy is that the United Kingdom is in fact continuing to provide economic and political support to the régime of the Southern Rhodesian racists, and to protect this régime which has in fact been created and fostered by United Kingdom ruling circles. The United Kingdom is continuing to support extensive economic and trade relations with Southern Rhodesia—if not directly, then through South Africa and Portugal. The United Kingdom, together with its NATO allies, is preventing the adoption by the Security Council of more effective measures in regard to the régime of the Southern Rhodesian racists; the United Kingdom is stubbornly refusing to take any substantive measures itself with a view to removing this régime—i.e., measures which would lead to its liquidation—as the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zambia pointed out at some length and so persuasively in his brilliant statement here yesterday [1531st meeting].

28. Here in the Security Council, Lord Caradon, speaking officially on behalf of the United Kingdom Government, calls the Southern Rhodesian racists "rebels", and he calls their régime "illegal". But it is well known that in his country there are strict laws dealing with rebels. Since the beginning of the nineteenth century in Britain there has been one exceptionally severe law—the Treason Act. This law states that any act of treachery—any treason against the British Crown—is punishable by death. The acts of the rebels in Salisbury, and of the ringleader of the illegal rebel régime in Southern Rhodesia, come entirely within the scope of the Treason Act. Then, why has this Act not yet been applied to them by the United Kingdom Government? The answer is obvious—because Mr. Smith and his henchmen are committing treachery and unlawful misdeeds not against the United Kingdom Government, but against Africa and against the Zimbabwe people and all African peoples. This is the crux of the matter. The Rhodesian racists are not acting against United Kingdom capital or against United Kingdom imperialist monopolies. They regard them as their friends, brothers and protectors. This is the crux of the matter. The crux of the matter lies simply in the realities of imperialism and neo-colonialism and no wordy rhetoric can hide these well-known and obvious facts.

29. The United Kingdom's policy in regard to Southern Rhodesia—like that of Western Germany, the United States of America and other Western countries—is based primarily on the selfish economic interests of the imperialist monopolies, and also on the military and strategic objectives of these countries in southern Africa. For the sake of these objectives, the fundamental interests of the Zimbabwe people and the peoples of all Africa are being sacrificed, ignored and trampled upon. The representative of Zambia and the representatives of Algeria, Burundi and Sierra Leone have drawn attention to this here very eloquently and persuasively.

30. The imperialist monopolies and the Southern Rhodesian racists have a complete community of interests, objectives and plans. Both of them have a deadly

hatred of the Africans and are trying to continue the enslavement of the African peoples of southern Africa. But the United Nations and the Security Council—if at last all its members are intending to comply strictly with the Charter—cannot have any community of interests either with the Southern Rhodesian racists or with the imperialist monopolies. The Security Council, as the main United Nations organ for the maintenance of peace and the security of peoples, has other objectives and other purposes—to safeguard peace and watch over the rights of peoples. The Security Council has another compass to plot its course—namely, the Charter of the United Nations. Guided by these noble objectives and by this compass, the Security Council must adopt an effective decision which would at last make it possible to turn the development of events in Southern Rhodesia in another direction—in the direction of liberating the Zimbabwe people and eliminating the threat to peace in Africa and to the security of independent African States.

31. In the Soviet delegation's view, the draft resolution proposed by the African and Asian States members of the Security Council [S/9696], provides the necessary basis for this. The purpose of this draft resolution is effectively to isolate the racist and Fascist régime in Salisbury politically, economically and in every other way. It provides for measures which would make it impossible for the Southern Rhodesian racists to obtain support from their protectors. This draft resolution also demands that the United Kingdom should at last fully assume entire responsibility for the territory of Southern Rhodesia, and should stop pursuing a dual policy—an open policy and a secret policy—in regard to the question of Southern Rhodesia. Africa and the world demand that the United Kingdom should take the action it has a duty to take in regard to the racist régime of Southern Rhodesia, which it officially recognizes as rebel and illegal. All freedom-loving and peace-loving States and peoples are expecting it to do this.

32. For the foregoing reasons, the Soviet delegation will support the draft resolution of the African and Asian States members of the Security Council, and it appeals to all members of the Council to do likewise.

33. True to its unwavering Leninist foreign policy of support for the national liberation struggle of the peoples, the Soviet Union wholeheartedly supports the Zimbabwe people in its just struggle for freedom and genuine national independence. This is the Soviet Union's policy of principle.

34. It was reaffirmed in the report of the Secretary-General of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, at the twenty-third Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. In this report it was stated that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet State "will continue to provide support of every kind to peoples struggling for their liberation, and will continue to strive for the immediate granting of independence to all colonial countries and peoples".<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: *Records of the Twenty-third Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Moscow, 1966, p. 23.

35. In full knowledge of its responsibility, and with a feeling of pride in this policy pursued by the State it represents, the delegation of the USSR wishes to state in the Security Council that the Soviet Union is, as always, ready to co-operate with other States Members of the United Nations and to back these words with appropriate deeds.

36. Mr. BHATT (Nepal): On behalf of my delegation Sir, may I offer our congratulations on your assumption of the office of President of the Security Council for this month? My delegation has full confidence in your leadership. May I also pledge the full co-operation of my delegation in the discharge of your great responsibility as our President?

37. The decade of the 1960s, and particularly the period since 1965, has seen the continual deterioration of the situation in Southern Rhodesia. Not only has a group of minority settlers seized power illegally in a professed bid to perpetuate the white supremacy régime, but, despite decent public opinion everywhere, despite the efforts of the United Nations, and despite the wishful thinking of the administering Power that the policy of non-recognition and sanctions would suffice to bring an end to the rebellion, that illegal régime has managed not merely to survive but to strengthen its hold.

38. The recent proclamation of a republic is a further manifestation of the policy of defiance pursued by the white supremacy régime. It is, of course, a logical outcome of political developments in recent years, arising, in the first instance, from the failure of the policies advocated by the administering Power, and, secondly, from the general unwillingness of most permanent members of the Security Council to help initiate all appropriate measures to correct a situation which has already been recognized as one representing a threat to international peace and security.

39. My delegation welcomes the decision of a number of countries which have economic and other interests in Southern Rhodesia not to accord any measure of recognition to the new status assumed by the rebel régime. That certainly is a step in the direction of isolating that régime. None the less, we in the Security Council are not primarily concerned with the proclamation of a republic in itself, which is but another illegal act on the part of an illegal régime.

40. Is mere non-recognition and condemnation of the republic all the progress that we seek? Were the Security Council to remain content with that course of action—or inaction, if I may say so—it would serve only as an encouragement to the white supremacy régime and be another disappointment to the people of Southern Rhodesia, because it is a policy which has failed in the past, and there is no likelihood that it will succeed in the future. The recent history of Southern Rhodesia is a history of lost opportunities, of broken promises, of shattered hopes and, above all, of abdication of power. At this stage in the development of the situation in Southern Rhodesia, the Security Council, as a progressive institution primarily

responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, should not lose another opportunity, break another promise, shatter fresh hopes and, above all, abdicate its power by doing nothing in the matter.

41. The Council should rise to the occasion. We urge the administering Power, even at this late stage, to assert its authority by all the means at its disposal, including the use of force, with a view to putting an end to the rebellion and conceding immediate independence to Southern Rhodesia on the basis of well-known democratic principles; and we urge the Security Council—in particular its permanent members—to take all appropriate measures to that end. After all, the problem of Southern Rhodesia has been fully identified; the goal has been set. We also know that our efforts so far have not been successful. What is more important, we know why those efforts have failed. The scope and nature of those efforts have been largely limited and other colonial and race supremacy régimes have actively collaborated with the Smith régime to defeat the purpose of those efforts. In our considered opinion, it is time that the nature and scope of our efforts were extended and the defaulting Governments brought to task. The stakes in the situation are very high. It portends the risk of bitter and prolonged racial warfare in the whole of southern Africa. It is about time that the Security Council understood this.

42. Mr. KUZAGA (Poland) (*interpretation from French*): May I first of all tell you, Mr. President, how pleased my delegation is to see you preside over the Security Council during this month of March, which we, like you, hope will be a month of peace. We are only too well aware of your diplomatic experience and the many qualities that you have already displayed during the Council's deliberations this month, and thus we are convinced that under your guidance the Council will discharge with distinction the tasks entrusted to it.

43. I should also like to avail myself of this opportunity to express our congratulations to Ambassador Terence, who was President of the Council for the month of January.

44. It is only a bit over a month since we debated the question of Namibia, and now a serious colonial problem is again inscribed on our agenda. The illegal proclamation of a so-called republic by the minority Salisbury régime constitutes a new phase in the process through which an implanted minority intends finally to impose on a whole nation, on the world and on the United Nations a system of colonialism, combined with racism into a synthesis of complete oppression. That declaration is designed to strengthen the process of the evolution, expansion and consolidation of a system which defies the fundamental concepts that should govern relations among human beings and nations and that constitute the foundation of the Charter. That declaration increases the tension and thus increases the threat to peace and security, a threat emanating from southern Africa which is spreading throughout Africa and the world.

45. Thus we understand and share fully the feelings expressed in the communication of thirty-nine States Members of the United Nations [S/9682] and expounded in the Council by the accredited representatives of the Organization for African Unity in behalf of all African States.

46. At this stage the situation in Southern Rhodesia requires that the Council—and here I fully share the view expressed yesterday by the representative of Algeria [1531st meeting]—make a thorough study of all of the facts of the problem. First of all, there should be a clear and precise reaffirmation of the objectives of the United Nations; then, an analysis of the reasons why, far from achieving those objectives, we are today compelled to note a further act of defiance by the Salisbury régime; and finally, a recommendation encompassing all the measures necessary to put an end to this situation.

47. With respect to the objective of the United Nations, it was, and continues to be, to allow the people of the Territory to exercise their inalienable right to decide their own destiny in accordance with their own wishes. That is the essence, the basic factor, as well as the final goal. All of the measures that we take should be subordinated to that objective, of which they are part and parcel.

48. It was from that point of view that I listened carefully, as I always do, to the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom, Lord Caradon [ibid.]. I noted in particular his appeal for unity of action in the Council, focused on an appeal for non-recognition of the unlawful proclamation by Salisbury. As for my delegation's view on this point, we agree that unity in the Council—and particularly in the Council—is necessary. But upon what should we build that unity? Should we build it on the basis suggested by Lord Caradon—in other words, on the least common denominator, the appeal for non-recognition of the unlawful republic—or rather on the basis of the only denominator which is common to the United Nations and the Zimbabwe people, namely, the right of that people to freedom and independence in equality?

49. As far as my delegation is concerned, we have no difficulty in supporting those who consider that the only means of settling this problem is to adopt a solution which would of course include condemnation of the régime and certainly an appeal for non-recognition of that régime as well, but in addition it should include all measures likely to deliver the people of the Territory from colonialist and racist oppression, to enable them to enjoy the rights that we all enjoy here as natural rights, to eliminate the existence of a growing threat to peace and security, which this Council has already recognized in its resolution 217 (1965).

50. It is no pleasure for my delegation to recall the long and sorry history of the problem of Rhodesia—the road which has brought a handful of racist settlers to the point of establishing a so-called independent republic.



lic and where they have acquired the *de facto* status of *gauleiters* of *apartheid* in Southern Rhodesia.

51. We need only glance at the resolutions submitted, and so often rejected or ignored, to see how just and far-sighted was the attitude of the very large majority of the Members of the United Nations, and how well-founded were the energetic measures proposed by this Organization to crush a *putsch* which threatened to become transformed into a revolt. It suffices to glance over the records of the declarations and acts of the administering Power to realize how open to criticism was the dilatory attitude, the application of the formula "too little and too late" that it adopted on the problem of Rhodesia. It suffices to look at the record of votes in the United Nations on this problem to realize how vast is the joint responsibility of the States that have supported that attitude of the administering Power.

52. When in 1962 thirteen then independent countries of Africa drew the General Assembly's attention to the fact that the promulgation of the new Constitution threatened to increase the complexity and seriousness of the situation in Southern Rhodesia, the United Kingdom representative answered that a debate on that question would only "raise passions",<sup>5</sup> and that "the essence of the position in the territory is the need to compromise and conciliate".<sup>6</sup> The result of that policy of compromise and conciliation proved to be the entry into force of the racist Constitution of 1961.

53. When in 1963 three Afro-Asian countries called upon the Security Council to adopt a draft resolution<sup>7</sup> which would request "the Government of the United Kingdom not to transfer to its colonies of Southern Rhodesia armed forces and aircraft as was proposed at the Conference of Central Africa in 1963", the United Kingdom representative, maintaining that the situation in Southern Rhodesia was "neither explosive nor critical", brought about the rejection of that draft resolution. In that case the result was to provide the racist régime with the military means for imposing its doctrine.

54. When there was every indication that the Smith régime was preparing to declare its independence, the United Kingdom informed that régime that in no case would it have recourse to force to oppose that usurpation of power. The Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of Zambia recalled that fact to us in eloquent terms in his statements yesterday [*ibid.*].

55. It was only a little more than a year after the proclamation of independence by the Smith régime that the Security Council in resolution 232 (1966) voted for the first selective sanctions, and only after two and a half years that it called for the application of broader economic sanctions in its resolution 253 (1968).

<sup>5</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixteenth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1109th meeting, para. 23.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 1120th meeting, para. 52.

<sup>7</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Eighteenth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1963*, document S/5425/Rev.1.

56. I recall these few striking facts about the Rhodesian question, not to call into question the past and present intentions of the administering Power but rather to bring out in objective terms the facts that have led to what is perhaps one of the greatest anachronisms in recent history, namely, the establishment of a racist minority régime in the decade marked by the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. I have done so, in order once again to remind the Council that it is the administering Power and its allies that bear full responsibility for the failure of the United Nations action, for they, despite the attitude of the majority, determined the limited scope and thus the ineffectiveness of that action.

57. Economic sanctions were the remedy recommended by the administering Power to bring about the immediate downfall of the Smith régime. The facts submitted to the Council by the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs for Zambia have shown the complete failure of that course. Indeed, could it have turned out otherwise? Prior notice of at least two and a half years was given to the Smith régime to foresee the consequences, and that régime did not fail to take advantage of the warning by developing the production of goods to replace imports. Whereas in 1966 we still noted a net capital deficit in Southern Rhodesia, by 1967 we were already obliged to note a net surplus amounting to £12.7 million Rhodesian, and in 1968 the figure was £25.2 million. How could it be otherwise when the doors to South Africa and to the Portuguese colonies were left wide open, through which aid flowed into the country, from sources which are so closely linked to and dependent on the economic and military interests of a certain number of Western NATO countries?

58. Therefore, it is not surprising to hear Ian Smith state, as he did at the press conference held with United States journalists at Salisbury on 2 March 1970, that Rhodesia had benefited from the sanctions by developing and diversifying its industry. Thus it is not surprising to see the Smith régime, after the vote on expanded sanctions adopted by the Security Council in 1968, proclaim a racist Constitution, have it approved by a referendum and then proclaim the republic and schedule elections for April. The Smith régime does not consider itself threatened by the United Nations action in its present form and scope; it has confidence in its impunity. It is strengthening its domination over the Zimbabwe people by force and terror and is taking a hostile attitude towards the African countries and a defiant attitude towards the United Nations.

59. We can no longer tolerate the impunity of the racist régime of Southern Rhodesia, the provocative attitude of countries which support it openly, or the atmosphere of tacit agreement on the part of other countries which try to cloak their presence in Southern Rhodesia in the most inoffensive garments. Nor can we pass over in silence the actions of influential circles in certain Western countries which are linked to specific interests in Southern Rhodesia and are designed to consecrate the minority régime. But, above

all, we cannot fail to note the administering Power's dilatory attitude and its policy of half measures and we cannot fail to demand of that Power that it fully discharge by all necessary means the obligations incumbent upon it, obligations which it has always claimed towards the people of the Territory.

60. From the outset the Peoples Republic of Poland has adopted a firm and consistent attitude towards the racist régime in Southern Rhodesia. We have refused any form of recognition to that régime; we have not maintained and do not maintain any relations with it; we engage in no trade either direct or indirect with it. After the unilateral declaration of independence we broke off all postal and telegraphic communications between Poland and Southern Rhodesia on 17 February 1966. In the United Nations our delegation has offered active support for the proposals designed to eliminate the racist régime and to restore the freedom of the oppressed people of Zimbabwe. We support and shall continue to support that people in its struggle for independence. In this connexion permit me to quote from a statement made by the Polish Committee of Solidarity with the Peoples of Asia and Africa, condemning the illegal proclamation by Salisbury:

"We have always offered and shall continue to offer our full support for the peoples struggling for their freedom and independence and we shall continue to support the national liberation struggle being carried on by the Zimbabwe patriots."

61. Accordingly, we shall support any draft resolution which is in line with the opinions that I have just expressed, and I would add that we look favourably on the draft resolution submitted by five Afro-Asian countries [S/9696].

62. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank Ambassador Kulaga, the representative of Poland, for the words of welcome which he extended to me as President. I should like also to offer my personal thanks to Mr. Bhatt of Nepal for his offer of co-operation and for his words of welcome.

63. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): First of all, may I join those representatives who have preceded me in congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the Presidency of the Security Council? We have in you a distinguished statesman of Colombia, a man of high learning and great achievements. In addition to this, I, as representative of Syria, have special reason to congratulate you: for my own people, from the dawn of history, caught with that eternal wanderlust, have always looked for horizons outside their own shores, and they migrated to various parts of the world, including your own, and other Latin American countries where they found friendship, generosity and understanding. So we are in the peculiar position that, whereas I represent the people and country of Syria, you, Sir, have among your constituents citizens of Colombia who are of Syrian, Lebanese and Arab origin.

64. I wish also to reiterate our congratulations to the representative of Burundi on his Presidency of the

Security Council during the month of January, in the course of which another African question was discussed, the question of Namibia.

65. I think that we all owe a debt of gratitude and thanks to the Organization of African Unity for having sent to this meeting Foreign Ministers or Ministers of State, and we already have among us the Foreign Minister of Zambia. If this illustrates anything, it is the importance that the Organization of African Unity attaches to the strengthening of international peace and security by bringing its problems in all their aspects to open debate in the Council. My delegation wishes particularly again to thank the Foreign Minister of Zambia for the illuminating and factual statements which he made yesterday [1531st meeting]. Because they came spontaneously from a heart which feels deeply the problems of Africa, we were all indeed touched and moved by the sincerity and genuineness of his words.

66. No description of the nefarious impact of the Southern Rhodesian question on the United Nations as an international Organization, on its principles as the fundamental rules supposed to govern international relations and on its objectives—the reign of peace and the saving of mankind from the scourge of war—can be exaggerated.

67. In fact, it was the Security Council itself, in its resolution 232 (1966), which came to the conclusion that the situation in Southern Rhodesia constituted a threat to international peace and security. Besides, the oppression by a fanatic minority not exceeding a quarter of a million of an African majority of four million, and the suppression of the right to self-determination run counter to every norm of international law and justice, counter to the concept of human rights, and counter to the interests of humanity at large. Indeed, it is a phenomenon that is declared inadmissible by the very administering Power which originally was instrumental in bringing about this minority control and, once this had been done, abstained from any radical action that could put down the rebellion.

68. Together with this, the sanctions determined by the Security Council have failed to produce their effects because both the Government of South Africa and the colonial régime of Lisbon, through its hold on Mozambique, have thwarted these sanctions outright. South Africa has gone even further in supplying the rebels with equipment and armed forces. The success of the sanctions requires their application by all States, but South Africa and Portugal have virtually been given the assurance that no drastic measure will be taken against them if they choose not to comply with the sanctions.

69. This is indeed the purport of the stand of those Powers—the first and foremost of which is the administering Power itself—which opposed the application of the relevant Chapters of the Charter against South Africa and Portugal.

70. In these circumstances the latest move by the illegal racist régime of Salisbury to sever its symbolic relationship with the British Crown by declaring itself a republic was to be expected; but in the context of the whole tragedy it has minor significance. What matters is not what form of régime the rebels attribute to themselves; what matters indeed is the usurpation of the government of Zimbabwe, the oppressive control and suppression of the rights of four million innocent African people entitled, like everybody else, to enjoy freedom and independence.

71. That is why the delegations of Burundi, Nepal, Sierra Leone, Zambia, and my own country, Syria, sought to re-establish the question in its real, proper context. Of course, we all realize that no one should grant recognition to the illegal racist régime and—among other things—to its latest so-called status of a republic. A decision by the Security Council to bar such recognition is quite pertinent, but we maintain that it deals with but one aspect of the question. The decision we have to take in the Security Council is one that ensures the end of the illegal racist régime itself and the granting to the whole people of Zimbabwe, black and white, its right to an independent Government based on majority rule and equal citizenship among its people. Accordingly, the five delegations developed a draft resolution that reflects the tenor of the decisions of the Organization of African Unity. In this connexion we respectfully request that the resolution adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African States in Addis Ababa on 3 March 1970 be considered as an official document of the Security Council. The draft resolution well represents the large consensus among the Afro-Asian nations which are deeply perturbed by the daily deterioration of the situation in Southern Rhodesia and concerned about the fate of their 4 million brothers under the tyranny of ruthless oppressors.

72. The draft resolution is now before the members of the Security Council [S/9696]. On behalf of the sponsors—Burundi, Nepal, Sierra Leone, Zambia and my own country, Syria—I have the honour to submit this draft resolution. However, in doing so, may I draw attention to the following? Paragraph 3, as it appears in the document that has been circulated, reads: “*Calls upon* all States to take appropriate action. . .”, and so on. It should in fact read:

“*Requests* that all States shall undertake national measures as appropriate to ensure that any act performed by officials and institutions of the illegal régime in Rhodesia shall not be accorded official or judicial notice by the competent organs of their State”.

Also, paragraph 7 should begin “*Requests* the Government of the United Kingdom . . .” instead of “*Calls upon* the Government of the United Kingdom . . .”.

73. It will be noted that this draft resolution in its preambular paragraphs contrasts the various resolutions adopted previously by the Security Council since 1965 with the steady deterioration of the situation and the non-compliance of some States with those deci-

sions, especially the Governments of South Africa and Portugal. The preambular paragraphs allude to the key elements of the question. On the one hand, the primary responsibility of the Government of the United Kingdom, as administering Power, to enable the people of Zimbabwe to exercise their right of self-determination and independence is affirmed; and, on the other hand, the inalienable right of the people of Zimbabwe to self-determination, freedom and independence—and hence the legitimacy of their struggle—is stressed. The preamble, of course, places the measures suggested in the operative paragraphs within their natural frame of reference: Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

74. The operative part of the draft resolution deals with the main aspects of the question, one after the other. The first three paragraphs embody the idea of the United Kingdom draft resolution on non-recognition, thus heeding the emphasis put by the delegation of the United Kingdom on the significance of this problem.

75. Paragraphs 4 and 5 deal with the responsibility and role of the administering Power. If Paragraph 4 emphasizes its responsibility with regard to the situation prevailing today in Southern Rhodesia, it is because of the compelling evidence abundantly manifested in the past conduct of the United Kingdom. It facilitated that classic brand of colonialism, “settler colonialism”, in the area, and in other areas of the world, and did little to check its nefarious effects on the rightful, legitimate people who constitute the immense, overwhelming majority of the inhabitants. It encouraged European immigration. It was its laws and acts that introduced racial discrimination and gave the immigrants undue privileges which they still enjoy. The “Labour Conciliation Act” and the “Land Apportionment Act”—the former blocking progress by Africans with respect to acquiring skill and know-how, the latter dispossessing the African masses of their land and pushing them back and back into the arid regions—stand as monuments conveying, louder than any other expression, the message of racial superiority, privileges of the few over the unfortunate masses and the degree to which lust for power and expansion can blind one to moral and human values. The responsibility of the administering Power is there, and it is undeniable. This being the case, it should have fulfilled its task in a manner commensurate with such a heavy responsibility. It should have used force, the only language that the racist and the Fascist understand and obey—yesterday and today. The use of force would have been legitimate. It would have been in defence of the inalienable rights of the subjugated people. It would have been in defence of the Charter. It would have been in defence of the United Nations. It still is.

76. The Security Council, in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, is therefore compelled to condemn the refusal by the administering Power to use force, the more so as on various occasions it has demonstrated its readiness to use force, if public law and order would otherwise be perturbed. Was not that assertion tan-

tamount to saying that as long as the European minority held power order was considered safe, but that when the African masses try to reconquer their rights, concern arises immediately and force is envisaged by the administering Power?

77. I wish here to quote from the concluding words of a chapter in the book *A Start in Freedom*, by Sir Hugh Foot, the representative of the United Kingdom himself, now Lord Caradon. It is a chapter on the United Nations. Speaking of the great danger of a situation in which the United Nations would be too weak to meet its obligations, and specifically with reference to the problem we are discussing at this moment, namely the problem of Southern Rhodesia, the permanent representative of the United Kingdom said that strong measures had to be adopted by the United Nations to give it significance; he stated the following:

"If that time comes, the greatest responsibility will rest on those whose policy towards the United Nations has been negative, those who have sought to limit its powers and diminish its authority. It will be too late then to blame the South African Government or the Afro-Asians. The burden of blame will rest on those who have neglected over many years to support and strengthen the United Nations, who have formulated no positive policies, who have been content to watch the drift to disaster."<sup>8</sup>

Since those words were written, the representative of the United Kingdom and we ourselves have indeed watched the drift to disaster.

78. We maintain that the United Kingdom, backed by the material and moral support of the United Nations, is still in a position to fulfil its obligations and to redress the injustice that, to a large extent, it was responsible for inflicting upon the 4 million Africans and, actually, upon the whole continent of Africa.

79. In paragraphs 6 and 7 of the draft resolution the severance by all States of all relations with the racist minority régime is stipulated and, in order to give that prescription its full scope, the Government of the United Kingdom is called upon to abrogate any existing agreement on the basis of which commercial or other foreign consular missions can be maintained in Southern Rhodesia.

80. Paragraphs 8 and 9 deal with another, no less radical, obstruction of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), brought about by the assistance given by the Governments of Portugal and South Africa and by other imperialist Powers, to the illegal racist minority régime. That assistance is condemned and the authors of the draft resolution, realizing that what defeated the sanctions against the Smith régime was precisely the violation by South Africa and Portugal of the measures set out in resolution 253 (1968), have introduced paragraph 9 in order to apply the same measures against both.

81. It is facts, not speculation, which prove that unless those two régimes are deprived of the means

<sup>8</sup> Sir Hugh Foot, *A Start in Freedom* (London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1964), p. 230.

to strengthen the illegal racist régime in Southern Rhodesia, all kinds of sanctions remain indeed futile. If any effect is to be expected from United Nations resolutions and, above all, from Security Council resolutions, all Member States and specialized agencies must carry them out.

82. That is the tenor of paragraph 10. But paragraph 11 emphasizes in particular the value of assistance in the implementation of those measures by Member States having a primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. If they oppose those measures or merely refrain from assisting in their implementation, while they, more than anybody else, have at their disposal the means to implement them, the rule of law will be relegated to the realm of platitudes.

83. In this episode of struggle between right and wrong, it is the merit of the freedom-fighters that they advocate the very cause of the United Nations: the cause of freedom, self-determination, equality, justice, and peace in justice and brotherhood. It is no less incumbent on the United Nations and on all States to assist them materially and morally, so that the very principles of the Charter may be vindicated. That is the sense of paragraph 12 of the draft resolution, with its great and urgent expectation of a concrete attitude on the part of Member States, and particularly those which have ready access to power and resources.

84. The Secretary-General's concern over this tragic question and, indeed, over the fate of the United Nations in these critical times is well known and highly appreciated by every fair-minded Member, and it gives my delegation great pleasure to pay a tribute to him. The draft resolution calls on all States to report to the Secretary-General on the implementation of these measures and requests him to report to the Security Council on the progress achieved.

85. The delegations which have honoured me by their request to speak on their behalf place their confident hope in the members of this Council. They think that time is running out. International peace is exposed, and might, not right, is increasingly prevalent. They expect the Council unanimously to halt this downward course, which will engulf not one State nor one continent but the whole of mankind.

86. As the representative of Algeria stated yesterday: "The time for disquisitions is past. The time for action has come, and we invite the Council to take such action now" [*1531st meeting, para. 77*]. That view was also voiced by the representative of Zambia and other African speakers. To my delegation, there could be no better formulation of the need for the adoption of more radical measures.

87. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am grateful to the representative of Syria, Ambassador Tomeh, for his kind words of welcome to me, and particularly his eloquent recognition of my country's broad attitude towards immigrants—who in turn have done so much for Colombia.

88. Mr. TERENCE (Burundi) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, my delegation is grateful to you for calling upon us at this stage of the debate. Nevertheless, we should like to state that our remarks will be confined to the draft resolution, since our formal statement will be made at a subsequent meeting.

89. I should like now to speak to the draft resolution sponsored by Burundi, Nepal, Sierra Leone, Syria and Zambia [S/9696]. In both form and substance, the draft resolution shows the spirit of understanding and compromise of our delegations—so much so that it should command the Council's unanimous support. It goes without saying that we are determined to co-operate with all members, including the administering Power whose task we should like to make easier, so that it would itself be unable to resist such a spirit of understanding. The draft resolution is of course based on the position adopted last week at Addis Ababa by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity.

90. The draft resolution does, of course, attempt to present a formula which is not confined to a mere marginal declaration. It tries to go to the heart of the problem, that is to say, it proposes that the Security Council discharge its responsibilities, that it play its role and that it find an adequate solution to the problem of Rhodesia.

91. We should like to address an appeal to all members of the Security Council and, in particular, to the States that are friends of the United Kingdom, to lend their support to this draft resolution. For this is a test of what I might call genuine friendship on the part of those States which, because of their solidarity with the United Kingdom, may find themselves in some difficulty. But, as we have stated from the outset, we are not trying to embarrass the United Kingdom; rather we are trying to assist that country to carry out its responsibilities and to play the role which any administering Power is called upon to play, with the assistance of the United Nations Security Council and, of course, of the Zimbabwe people themselves, who are reaching out to the Security Council. It would be a matter for regret if the Security Council should disappoint those hopes.

92. The objective of the draft resolution is clearly to help the London Government to go forward, to prepare for a democratic process, and by that same process to advance the people of Zimbabwe towards independence and sovereignty so that, in the final analysis, there will be a climate of co-operation and understanding with the United Kingdom itself and, of course, with all other countries of the world. For so long as this question remains unresolved, so long as the United Kingdom persists in avoiding the most appropriate solution, unfortunately this will always be an obstacle to what I shall have occasion later to call the final reconciliation between Africa and the former metropolitan Powers.

93. It goes without saying that so far as the people of Zimbabwe are concerned, as my delegation had an opportunity to state a few days ago, the draft resolution

submitted to us by the United Kingdom delegation [S/9676/Rev.1] confines itself to one aspect. But that aspect—and this is one further demonstration of our frank co-operation—is also to be found in our own draft resolution, in operative paragraph 4 and in paragraphs 1 and 2, which repeat almost word for word the language of the United Kingdom representative.

94. These are the major reasons which should make it possible for our draft resolution to receive the unanimous support of the Council. We do not say that this draft is ideal, but we regard it as the only satisfactory formula in the present situation. We have taken into account the real situation in the Security Council. If those realities had not been taken into account, a far better draft might have been prepared, a draft better in keeping with the situation of Rhodesia.

95. As the representative of Syria indicated, the sponsors of the draft resolution, whose names I have already read out, are accordingly seeking a compromise which, we hope, will be supported by all members of the Council.

96. Some members may see certain drawbacks in this draft resolution. We have attempted to avoid such drawbacks precisely by taking into account what might be the reactions of certain delegations. Consequently, we would appeal to everyone and say that if it should be found necessary or useful to hold a dialogue, our delegations would always be prepared to enter into negotiations with a view to finding an adequate solution, a vigorous solution, a solution which can lead to what we all want, namely, an end to the situation created by Ian Smith and his henchmen. But we still believe that it is for the United Kingdom to assume the main responsibility, that it should co-operate to the utmost, and in the final analysis face up to the situation which, all in all, is its responsibility because it did not fail to promote it—indeed, to create it.

97. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The last speaker on my list is the representative of Senegal, on whom I now call.

98. Mr. BOYE (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): As you know, Mr. President, it is customary in the Security Council for the representative of a Member State not a member of the Council to refrain from paying tribute to the President and his predecessors. Out of respect for that tradition, I shall therefore refrain from doing so. And, as a matter of fact, does it not constitute a tribute to the Council and to you, Sir, that I observe that tradition?

99. I should like, once again Mr. President, to thank you and, through you, to thank all the members of the Council for having allowed the delegation of Senegal to participate in your debates without the right to vote. Through its participation, Senegal will thus be able to discharge the task entrusted to it by the Organization of African Unity.

100. Now, what is the issue before us? It is again the problem of Southern Rhodesia. I have already had

an opportunity to deal with this question, last year, in this very hall of the Security Council. At that time I had occasion to say that the sanctions that had been decreed against the rebel government of Southern Rhodesia would not prevent Ian Smith and his clique from pursuing their course towards a complete rupture of their ties with the Crown. And that is what has now happened.

101. In order to understand the attitudes of both sides, it is well for us to make a careful review of the whole history of the Rhodesian case. We shall then better understand what has just taken place and why the African countries are disturbed about the fate of the Zimbabwe people. I shall rely on facts that I have reported to another United Nations body.

102. Why are we being urged to adopt a policy of compromise and conciliation? Before the arrival of the European settlers in Rhodesia, the lands were occupied by Africans in accordance with their customs and traditions, and their traditional chiefs were the guardians of that heritage.

103. In 1889, Rhodesia was annexed by Great Britain and became a colony of that country. The Royal Charter that authorized the British South Africa Company to administer Rhodesia guaranteed Africans the right to "acquire, hold and mortgage lands and to dispose of them under the same conditions as apply to persons who are not natives". However, in 1895, with the creation of the first two "native reserves", the settlers began to infringe the land rights of the Africans.

104. Those first two reserves were intended to receive Africans removed from their traditional homes. That was one of the causes of the 1896 rebellion. Peace negotiations were begun, and Cecil Rhodes assured the Africans that they would all be returned to their homes. But that promise was not kept, and at the end of 1902 the system of native reserves was extended to include Mashonaland.

105. In 1921 the delegation of settlers that went to London to ask for the installation of a responsible government in Rhodesia called for the designation of certain areas where only "natives" could acquire land and where Europeans would not be authorized to do so. The British Government then requested the settlers to prove by means of a referendum that the Rhodesian population supported the proposed changes. The referendum, in which the Africans, since they did not have the right to vote, did not participate, was favourable to the changes that formed part of the whole series of proposals affecting the establishment of a "responsible government". Those proposals were accepted in 1923.

106. On 10 November 1925, the Royal Commission designated by the Governor of the colony for the purpose of examining the whole system of land tenure, concluded that the act that granted Africans and Europeans rights concerning the purchase of land was "unsound", and it recommended that the two races should not be allowed to purchase land in areas border-

ing on each other. The Commission expressed the fear that the interests of the European landholders might be compromised by the proximity of African-landowners. The Commission pointed out that the white landholder "questions the honesty of the natives and fears that his crops and his equipment may be stolen. For social reasons the white landholder is also opposed to having the native as his neighbour". In conclusion, the Commission praised what it called the "prudence" displayed by the Union of South Africa in adopting its Land Act of 1913.

107. The Legislative Assembly accepted the Commission's report and proceeded to apply its recommendations by adopting the Land Apportionment Act of 1930. That Act constitutes the legal foundation for racial discrimination in Rhodesia. Since that time, other laws have been enacted to strengthen the 1930 law. Legislation concerning land distribution divided the land into European regions and African regions. The law empowers the Governor to order anyone to leave his traditional village and settle in another specified area.

108. In 1964, the term "native reserves" was eliminated and replaced by the new expression "tribal zones". The land-ownership system was not changed. The tribal zones bring together the former special native regions and the "native reserves", and the situation at present is as follows: European zones, 36 million acres; total for African zones, 44.64 million acres.

109. During the census of the African population taken in April and May of 1962, the African population totalled 3,618,150, 82 per cent of whom were living in rural areas. According to the census carried out in September 1961, the European population amounted to 221,504 persons of whom 70 per cent lived in urban areas.

110. It is clear from certain official data that rainfall is less than twenty inches in a great many of the African zones. Certain other zones are located in areas of heavy rainfall that is harmful to crops. The soil and geologic structure of the African zones are generally second-rate and subject in great measure to erosion. The land in the tribal zones does not suffice to provide a living for more than 940,000 people. Since 1961, an increasing number of Africans have been dislodged from their traditional lands and sent to regions reserved for "natives". In 1963, the Rhodesian Secretary for Internal Affairs stated that 2,891 families had been removed in the course of that one year.

111. On 11 November 1965 the rebel régime of Southern Rhodesia unilaterally proclaimed the independence of that territory and adopted a so-called constitution which was approved on 20 June 1969 by a referendum which affected almost only the white minority. Under the provisions of that constitution the President exercises the legislative power jointly with the Senate and the Assembly. The Senate is to be composed of twenty-three senators, ten of whom are to be Europeans elected by the European members of the Assembly. Ten of the senators are to be African chiefs elected



by an electoral college composed of chiefs who are members of the Council of Chiefs, and three are to be appointed by the President. The Assembly is to consist of sixty-six members: fifty Europeans elected by the Europeans inscribed on the rolls of fifty European electoral districts, and sixteen Africans, eight of whom will be elected by the Africans listed on the electoral rolls; the eight others in the Tribal Trust Lands will be selected by electoral colleges made up of chiefs of Headmen and advisers elected by the African councils.

112. The second annex to the 1969 "constitution" contains a so-called Declaration of Rights, the provisions of which are similar to those which appeared in the "1965 constitution". By not according to the courts the power to decide on the validity of an act which they consider to be in violation of the "Declaration of Rights", and by arrogating to itself the powers spelt out in article 11 of that "declaration", the illegal régime places the legislation in clear contradiction with itself and exposes to the broad light of day the dishonesty of its intentions.

113. In any event, it appears that the majority of Africans living in the tribal zones are not permitted to vote. They do not satisfy the requirements as to education and income necessary to obtain the right to vote. They have no control over the administration of the country as a whole. In respect of local affairs, they are placed under the control of the white district commissioners who impose their will through puppet chiefs.

114. Since 1965 the policy of the removal of populations has been rigorously applied. Thus in 1967, 5,000 Africans were removed to Gokvo, a region infested with the tse-tse fly. According to *The New York Times* of 19 September 1969, the Tangwena people, under the leadership of Chief Rekayi, were forcibly removed from their ancestral lands in the eastern part of the country on 18 September 1969. That population had been resisting eviction for some time. In July 1968 the High Court of Southern Rhodesia unanimously supported the argument of Chief Rekayi to the effect that the Tangwena people were entitled to remain on their lands. The Government immediately reacted by enacting a special eviction ordinance which nullified the finding of the High Court. In answering the Government order, the Chief stated:

"This is our land. Five chiefs are buried there. For as long as we can remember we have always lived here. If we are compelled to leave, we will come back. If they burn my house, I will build it again."

115. On 18 September 1969 the Government mobilized troops and armoured divisions; soldiers were sent out to the region and houses were destroyed. Many traditional chiefs were removed from office and replaced by others who were appointed by the Government and who are under the control of the district commissioners and who have no respect for the local population.

116. Under the security laws African political organizations are prohibited. In the reserves, schools in most instances had been set up by missions. Parents were required to pay a minimal enrolment fee and provide the labour needed to maintain the schools.

117. In 1966 the Government examined what was henceforth called the "New Plan" of education for Africans. The plan contained certain rigid elements of "Bantu education" which is offered in South Africa. Churches would no longer be authorized to open new schools for Africans. This applied to primary schools as of 1968 and secondary schools as of 1970. Existing schools would be subjected to pressure to bring them under the control of African councils set up on the tribal lands under the aegis of the Government which announced that for reasons of economy, the duration of the primary school cycle would be reduced from eight to seven years. Moreover, many parents, according to an inquiry carried out in 1968 by the Society of Jesus in Southern Rhodesia, cannot pay for the teaching of their children, and thus a considerable number of African children leave school before having completed their studies.

118. With respect to economic conditions for Africans, I would say that an average family of about thirty persons living in the reserves may succeed in producing ten to fifteen sacks of wheat per annum, and it is with the money obtained from the sale of that wheat that they are supposed to live for the whole year and provide themselves with food, clothing and pay school fees. The Council will easily understand that the African population in that part of the world is struggling for its very survival and it is a miracle that it has been able even to survive in those conditions.

119. According to the last report of the Special Committee of Twenty-Four,<sup>9</sup> the figures communicated by the illegal régime show that, as of 1 January 1969, 142 persons had been held under emergency legislation and 237 had been sentenced to restriction—that is to say, a total of 379 persons were deprived of their freedom under the emergency legislation as against 435 in October 1968.<sup>10</sup>

120. Need it be said that the security police of Southern Rhodesia work closely hand in hand with the South African authorities? In the course of an inquiry that we carried out in 1968, we learned that a large number of prisoners condemned to death—approximately 118 at that time—had been awaiting a final decision on their case for a very long time. The Council will easily understand the state of extreme anxiety in which those prisoners found themselves. Such a situation constituted a violation not only of the elementary rules of humanity and dignity, but also of the fundamental principle *non bis in idem*, that is to say, double jeopardy, which is reaffirmed in particular in article 14,

<sup>9</sup> Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

<sup>10</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 23*, chapter VI, para. 52.

paragraph 7, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.<sup>11</sup>

121. I have taken the liberty of going over the whole history of the case of Rhodesia to enable the Council unequivocally to pass judgement on the illegal régime of Salisbury. In my delegation's opinion, economic or other sanctions are not the tools that will cause Ian Smith and his clique to back down. It is necessary for the administering Power to use more energetic means to bring down the Salisbury rebellion which constitutes a permanent defiance of the international community. But is it going to do that? I doubt it, for long before the unilateral declaration of independence, the sovereign Government of Southern Rhodesia had always proved to be passive in the face of the demands of the settlers. Today those settlers have just ignominiously repudiated their link with the Crown. It is now up to the Council, and particularly the great Powers, to restore the dignity of the Zimbabwe people who, anxious about their fate, are awaiting there the decision that you, gentlemen, are about to take.

122. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): There being no more speakers on my list, I propose to adjourn this meeting. However, before doing so, I should like to inform members that I have just received a communication [S/9699] from the representative of India, Mr. Samar Sen, in which he asks to be invited to participate, without the right to vote, in this debate. If I hear no objections, and with the consent of the Council, I propose to invite that representative to participate in our deliberations at the next meeting of the Council.

123. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I apologize for not realizing that the list of

speakers for today had been exhausted; otherwise I would have notified you earlier that I wished to say merely this word. Of course, a number of points have been raised this afternoon which might well call for some reply on my part. I think it may be better, however, with your permission, if I delay until a later stage commenting on what has been said today and what will be said subsequently, and if I also postpone commenting on the draft resolution that has now been submitted to us. I did intend at one stage this afternoon to make one exception: to reply to what had been said by Ambassador Malik of the Soviet Union; but since what I had in mind to say might be regarded as somewhat harsh, I think it would perhaps be better for me to postpone my comments until I have the pleasure of his personal presence. So, with your permission, I shall say no more now, except, of course, that I trust I shall have an opportunity later of commenting on some of the points that have been made in the debate this afternoon.

124. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, Ambassador Malik has had to leave this meeting of the Security Council on account of the opening in New York today of the photographic exhibition entitled "USSR—'Photo 1970'", which illustrates the many-sided life of the Soviet people. As he left the meeting, Ambassador Malik told me to expect a statement by the United Kingdom representative. I must say that Ambassador Malik proved to be quite right in his prediction and the Soviet delegation would have been prepared to answer any remarks made by the United Kingdom representative. However, as Lord Caradon prefers to make his comments when Ambassador Malik is here, it will not be possible to do this until the next meeting when Ambassador Malik will be present.

*The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.*

<sup>11</sup> See General Assembly resolution 2200 A (XXI), annex.