

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-THIRD YEAR

# 2064<sup>th</sup>

MEETING: 9 MARCH 1978

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2064) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia: Letter dated 1 March 1978 from the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of the Upper Volta to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12578) .....	1

✓ 191526

## 2064th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 9 March 1978, at 3.30 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Ivor RICHARD

(United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Bolivia, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, India, Kuwait, Mauritius, Nigeria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2064)

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

Letter dated 1 March 1978 from the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of the Upper Volta to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12578)

*The meeting was called to order at 4.10 p.m.*

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia:

Letter dated 1 March 1978 from the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of the Upper Volta to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12578)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken by the Council at its preceding meetings, I invite the representatives of Angola, Benin, Kenya, Mozambique, Sierra Leone, the Sudan, the United Republic of Tanzania, the Upper Volta and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Houngavou (Benin), Mr. Maina (Kenya), Mr. Gbujama (Sierra Leone), Mr. Medani (Sudan), Mr. Lobo (Mozambique), Mr. Salim (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Bamba (Upper Volta) and Miss Konie (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Botswana in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the question. In

accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with Article 31 of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

3. In view of the limited number of places at the Council table, I invite the representative of Botswana to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber on the usual understanding that he will be invited to take a place at the Council table whenever he wishes to speak.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Tlou (Botswana) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.*

4. Mr. N'DONG (Gabon) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should like first to perform a pleasant duty and extend to you the warmest congratulations of my delegation upon your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of March. My pleasure in seeing you preside over the meetings of the Council is particularly great inasmuch as your beautiful country, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and my country, the Republic of Gabon, enjoy excellent relations of co-operation based on friendship and mutual respect. I am convinced that your qualities as a statesman and as an accomplished diplomat, together with your knowledge of the question on our agenda, will ensure that the Council, under your presidency, will find a wise solution acceptable to the community of nations.

5. I should also like to say how much we appreciated the competent leadership of your predecessor, Mr. Troyanovsky, representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

6. Once again Ian Smith has committed a flagrant act of defiance and rebellion against the administering Power, the United Kingdom, by brazenly short-circuiting the negotiations on the plan sponsored by the United Kingdom together with the United States Government. Once again the illegal racist minority régime of Ian Smith, which has been in power in Rhodesia since 11 November 1965, has proved to the international community that it is not prepared in any real sense to modify the particularly dangerous situation which exists in that British colony.

7. In the face of this new act of defiance, why should we continue to tolerate the arrogance of the illegal minority régime of Ian Smith? It is a régime which has been condemned and yet it continues to spurn all manifestations

of goodwill. That is the Rhodesian problem, a complex and distressing problem to which that part of the African continent which lives in freedom cannot remain indifferent. It is because we are an African country and because the President of the Republic of Gabon, El Hadj Omar Bongo, is also the current President of the Organization of African Unity, that the delegation of Gabon will never cease to declare the régime of Ian Smith a rebel, minority and illegal régime and to proclaim that it is high time for us to bend all our efforts to put an end to that situation which is a continual affront to the sacred principles of the United Nations.

8. In the face of this fresh act of rebellion, the reaction of the international community must at least match Ian Smith's conduct, that is to say, it must be firm and effective.

9. Without wishing to open a debate on the entire problem of Zimbabwe—which strictly speaking is not the purpose of our meetings—I should like to recall that the process of decolonization was perforce halted in Southern Rhodesia because of the will of a minority of about 270,000 white diehards who, in order to preserve their selfish interests, decided to usurp the authority of the colonial Power, namely, the United Kingdom, by proclaiming unilateral independence and imposing their rule on the majority of 6 million Africans. The latter cannot take charge of the destiny of their country, because of the political and socio-economic system which prevails and because of the blind stubbornness of the white settlers who are determined to go against the tide of history since they wish to ignore contemporary developments. There has been no lack of efforts in various quarters to end the impasse created by Ian Smith. Among them are the Anglo-American proposals. Without wishing to pass judgement on the Anglo-American plan, I should simply like to say that my delegation feels that it at least makes room for all the interested parties, without any exceptions.

10. The first question that comes to mind is how does Ian Smith intend to deal with those Anglo-American proposals? While the world was setting its hopes on the negotiations being pursued in various places on the Anglo-American plan, the illegal minority régime of Ian Smith, comfortably installed in authority, yet losing power day by day, was doing what it could to deceive the international community. For example, last week it was learnt that a so-called internal agreement had just been signed between Ian Smith and the three moderate black leaders. That agreement is in fact no such thing and no one is deceived by it, except perhaps Smith and his cronies. One does not need to be particularly clever to understand that that so-called agreement gives legal recognition to the domination of the white minority in all areas, although they represent such a small percentage of the entire population of Southern Rhodesia. How, then, could one endorse such an agreement which gives 50 per cent of the land—and very rich land at that—28 per cent of the seats in the National Assembly with power to block legislation, the most important ministerial posts and the maintenance of the outrageous practice of racism to that minority white population? To cite a term used by a journalist: how can one endorse an agreement which recognizes "parliamentary apartheid"?

11. My delegation's position on this problem is clear; it is perfectly in keeping with that of the Organization of African Unity recently reconfirmed at Tripoli by the adoption of a resolution by which OAU rejects the Salisbury internal agreement and reaffirms its exclusive support of the Patriotic Front, the principal liberation movement in Zimbabwe. Thus, like all countries that love peace and justice, my delegation believes that the Salisbury agreement is unacceptable, because it is a devious manoeuvre on the part of international imperialism and a scheme aimed at setting up in Rhodesia not a majority government but a government devoted to the defence of the objectives against which we are all fighting.

12. Our interest in a just and final settlement of the situation in Zimbabwe, in other words, our determination to put an end to this thorny problem, and the efforts being exerted by all to come up with a genuine solution should have a single aim, namely the achievement of a truly independent and prosperous Zimbabwe, in which all its sons—without any exceptions—will live in peace. To denounce the Salisbury agreement and refuse to recognize it will enable all who still believe in those principles to remain consistent. Indeed, it would be difficult to imagine an independent and calm Zimbabwe under the terms of an agreement that flagrantly excluded the Patriotic Front, which is the principal liberation movement and which is, moreover, waging a genuine armed struggle against the illegal minority régime of Ian Smith.

13. On the contrary, the statement made by Mr. Joshua Nkomo on the agreement to the effect that "the war continues, things are now clear, Smith and his puppets are but one enemy", is proof of this, as are the bombs that have exploded in various places at Salisbury since the signing of the agreement. On the other hand, to recognize the agreement or not to take a stand openly—which would in reality be the same—is to practise ambiguous diplomacy; it aggravates the present situation, which remains dangerous and might very well give *carte blanche* to Ian Smith and his clique, enabling them to continue along the same path.

14. When was a rebel ever allowed to define the terms of his own surrender? Everybody here recalls that Ian Smith arranged his own negotiations within a framework which he personally defined and with negotiating partners of his own choice. In the circumstances, he could not fail to secure the results he was seeking. To approve the agreement or refrain from criticizing it is tantamount to recognizing that the rebel Ian Smith has the right to dictate the conditions for his surrender to the international community. That would also retroactively confer legitimacy on all the criminal acts performed by the illegal Smith régime.

15. After so much invective, must we endure this further affront from Ian Smith? We would rather hear that certain States, anxious to intervene militarily, were threatening the Ian Smith régime, which has never failed to threaten peace in sovereign independent neighbouring African States such as Zambia and Mozambique. Does not peace in that part of Africa have the same value as elsewhere?

16. The international community must not be an accomplice in this final desperate effort by Ian Smith. The

delegation of Gabon is convinced that it is a manoeuvre unanimously condemned by all African States; it is a manoeuvre to divert the attention of the entire world from the armed struggle in Southern Rhodesia which, plainly, will overthrow the Smith régime if he does not negotiate within the framework of the Anglo-American plan, which provides a basis for agreement leading to the creation of a genuine majority Government.

17. By virtue of our devotion to equality and human dignity, free and independent Africa categorically rejects the internal agreement, because it does not include an important element in the Zimbabwe equation; I refer to the Patriotic Front, the only arbiter of peace or war.

18. The Security Council is the supreme body in our Organization as concerns international peace and security and it should face the problem squarely and fully assume its responsibilities. We could effectively do this if we were simply to reject the agreement reached in the British colony and if everyone at his own level were to bring pressure to bear on Ian Smith so that genuine negotiations could begin on the Anglo-American plan leading to a real settlement of the Rhodesian problem. Furthermore, the Council must make an urgent appeal to all States Members of the United Nations, and others as well, and to all international organizations not to endorse that agreement which undermines the foundation of the anti-colonialist front in Zimbabwe, wears away the unity of the blacks and seeks to create an armed confrontation between the black nationalists, to the great joy of Ian Smith.

19. The delegation of Gabon hopes that the Council, in its decision, will take into account the very positive contribution of the African States to this debate, in particular those of the front line, whose contribution should be of great objective enlightenment to the Council.

20. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): Sir, it is a cause of great satisfaction to us to take part in this debate while an eminent and experienced diplomat like you is presiding over our deliberations. The delegation of Kuwait would like to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of March. You have already displayed a lot of positive qualities that will contribute enormously to the work of the Council under your captaincy. We wish you good luck and success.

21. I should like also to congratulate the outgoing President, Ambassador Troyanovsky of the USSR, on the manner in which he conducted the proceedings of the Council last month.

22. The Security Council has been seized of the problem of Southern Rhodesia for more than a decade. Its record on this particular issue is, on the whole, satisfactory. It already decided, in 1965, that the unilateral declaration of independence by Ian Smith—and, therefore, his régime—had no legal validity. Consequently, the Council imposed sanctions on the illegal régime as a manifestation of its opposition to the unilateral declaration of independence. It is true that there are some loopholes in the sanctions that have, in fact, enabled the Smith régime to survive, but if universally applied the sanctions can be more effective.

23. As is well known, in Southern Rhodesia all African nationalist parties have been banned for over a decade, and their leaders imprisoned or detained. Throughout that time, the harshest penalties were imposed for any refusal to bow to the authority of the illegal minority administration.

24. The press is rife with reports concerning the security situation in Rhodesia, as nationalists are hitting targets within a few miles of the capital. There are also reports of whites continuing to leave the country and of how the economy is nearing the point of collapse.

25. The fact that Smith has been talking about majority rule is due to the armed struggle carried out by the liberation forces and, to some measure, to the sanctions imposed by the international community. A régime which is totally wedded to racism and the maintenance of privileges for the few cannot overnight believe in equality and democratic rule. Smith is, at the moment, in a rut, and nothing on earth will extricate him from his rutted road of segregation. That is why the deal his régime is trying to sell is not a genuine change of heart but merely a change of tactic.

26. This sudden romance of the illegal régime—and Mr. Smith, in particular—with majority rule gives rise to suspicion. It also does not cut much ice in terms of logic. It is obvious that the illegal régime is desperate. This deal is a desperate attempt to secure legitimacy and, subsequently, the lifting of sanctions. It therefore has masterminded the so-called internal settlement, which is a far cry from a genuine deal that would put an end to the bloody hostilities. Hence it can be seen that the internal settlement is the last card in Mr. Smith's hand for pulling his chestnuts out of the fire.

27. The Council is meeting at a critical moment in the history of the people of Zimbabwe and of Africa in general. The prime responsibility of the Council is not to let Ian Smith go scot-free with the spoils of the deal he has struck with other African leaders. First and foremost for the Council, is the continued maintenance of sanctions without relaxation. After all, the illegal régime has fixed its sights so high as to expect gradual relaxation in the application of sanctions. This expectation should be nipped in the bud.

28. Likewise, the Council cannot abandon the people of Zimbabwe in this time of crisis. An imperative step is the condemnation of the internal settlement and the rejection of its provisions. The Council long ago determined that the situation in Rhodesia constituted a threat to international peace and security. The nature of the Smith régime remains today what it has been for more than a decade, that of an illegal usurper contravening the right to self-determination of the people of Zimbabwe. The passage of time has not altered its nature; neither has the fact that it has inched its way along for the past 13 years in a curious battle for survival.

29. The truth of the matter is that the illegal régime is no more legal today than it was 13 years ago. Consequently, all its actions are illegal and any internal settlement concluded by it is also tainted with illegality. The object of that settlement is to give the illegal régime a breathing spell and

a semblance of legality, while the decisions of the Council called for an immediate end to the régime in Rhodesia.

30. Therefore, the Council is bound to act decisively. Its duty is clearly to reaffirm and strengthen its previous decisions and resolutions. It should uphold the principles enshrined in the Charter. Furthermore, there is an inherent danger in the abdication of responsibility. Apart from being morally untenable, the abdication of responsibility means the escalation of bloodshed, the deepening of animosity among black Africans and a continuation of instability. It is, in short, the encouragement of horror instead of harmony, and of fratricidal war in place of peace. This is not, indeed, in keeping with the Charter; it is contrary to the essence of the United Nations. Nothing encourages the illegal régime in its endeavours to gain credibility more than the Council's inability to act decisively. It is not only a betrayal of the mandate conferred on the Council by the Charter, it is a clear licence for a horrible cycle of blood shedding and blood spilling.

31. Therefore, the delegation of Kuwait urges that there should be no delay in taking a decision commensurate with the gravity of the situation in Rhodesia. No Member State should succumb to the fait accompli as a substitute for the rule of law. A community which is powerless to confront illegality encourages violence instead of curbing it.

32. The question of Southern Rhodesia is a colonial issue and should be dealt with in accordance with the principle of self-determination exercised under the supervision of an impartial body. The deal which Smith is trying to sell to the world is illegal. The white minority—which is no more than 4 per cent of the population—would continue to pull the strings of power for many years to come. A deal which does not ensure the emergence of a genuinely independent Zimbabwe on the basis of universal adult suffrage under the supervision of an impartial body would be no different from the present arrangement.

33. According to press reports, the main pillars of the internal settlement concocted by Smith are power for the whites in Parliament out of proportion to their numbers, their continued tenure of the top echelons of the civil service and the armed forces, and their domination of the economy. If this is not a deal devised to perpetuate privileges under the guise of a settlement, what is it then?

34. It is a deal that will divide the country between a prestigious minority and a deprived majority. It will provide a façade of unity behind which the white elite will enjoy plain sailing while the majority struggle to eke out a mere living. This is to all intents and purposes an attempt to legitimize subjugation. Ian Smith is aware of the fact that a genuine settlement would sweep him and his lieutenants out of power. In the circumstances, the internal settlement is nothing but chains of steel with which to shackle the people of Zimbabwe and make the day of their liberation more remote.

35. The situation in Rhodesia is a threat to world peace and security. In view of the unusual circumstances prevailing in that hapless and unlucky country, the presence of a United Nations force to maintain law and order and to

supervise the holding of a referendum is indispensable. To hold an election under the forces of the illegal régime would be nothing but a travesty of justice and a distortion of the will of the people. The delegation of Kuwait believes that no settlement can be internationally acceptable without a test of the opinion of the indigenous people. No real test of opinion can take place without a cease-fire and a United Nations presence. At the same time, no cease-fire can take place so long as the Patriotic Front is excluded.

36. The leaders of the Patriotic Front have made their position very clear. These leaders not only oppose the internal settlement, which they have described as "the greatest sell-out in the history of Africa"; they have also proclaimed their intention to prevent by force its application. Therefore, the deal will not achieve the very objective it purports to secure, that is, a cease-fire. On the contrary, instead of a decline in hostilities, the world will witness an escalation, and the bloodshed will not be confined to Rhodesia but will spread to the territories of neighbouring States. There have, in fact, been a series of raids into neighbouring countries by Smith's forces, and some of them have been discussed by the Council. But the world will see more of those bloody raids that reflect Smith's problems. In these circumstances, the stability of the neighbouring States is endangered, for who can guarantee that those raids will not be so extensive as to trigger a conflagration between the illegal régime in Rhodesia and the invaded country? And here the Council cannot shun its responsibility. These are but a few examples of the complexity of the situation prevailing in Rhodesia.

37. The United Kingdom remains the *de jure* Power responsible for Southern Rhodesia. The Council cannot accept a cosmetic transfer of power in which the administering Power does not effectively discharge its responsibility in accordance with past decisions of the Council.

38. The United Nations has a vital role in bringing about a real settlement in Rhodesia. The participation of all parties concerned in a conference convened by the administering Power with the assistance of the United Nations is a prerequisite for the achievement of an acceptable settlement. The absence of any party from the negotiations makes it impossible to agree on the essentials for the transitional period. By the same token, the administering Power must do its utmost to ensure the involvement of all the parties in such a conference. We believe that such a conference would allay the suspicion that some of the parties already harbour about the future of Rhodesia. In this respect, the role of the Secretary-General is very important. There is no doubt that the involvement of the United Nations would ensure the co-operation and the goodwill of some of the parties that would otherwise feel alienated and left out in the cold.

39. No Member State is interested in a continuation of the war in Rhodesia for its own sake, but the unmistakable determination of the leaders of the Patriotic Front to continue their struggle makes it amply clear that, instead of a decrease in the shedding of blood, we shall witness an escalation, and all will pay dearly because of a deal that was devised to avert the very bloodshed that it is inviting.

40. In view of this, the delegation of Kuwait would like to stress three indisputably dangerous aspects of the deal in Rhodesia. First, it is immoral since it perpetuates the privileges of the minority—economically, socially and politically. It sows the seeds of turmoil; it entrenches racism and legalizes *apartheid*, and it is a stab in the back to the aspirations of the overwhelming majority of the people of Zimbabwe. Secondly, it is in violation of international law, since it was concluded by an illegal régime deprived of internal or international recognition with therefore neither credibility nor legitimacy to conclude an agreement and face the world with a *fait accompli*. Thirdly, this deal is war-mongering since it is an invitation to bloodshed, civil war and fratricidal conflict. It will endanger the stability of the area rather than contribute to progress. It opens the door to rivalry between Powers engaged in power politics and is therefore a destabilizing factor in a region already replete with conflicting interests.

41. The delegation of Kuwait believes that such a deal should be thwarted. It is an ignoble ploy on the part of the illegal régime and nothing but a brazen challenge to the prestige and dignity of the world Organization.

42. Mr. JAIPAL (India): Mr. President, I should like to join the other members of the Council in extending to you my delegation's felicitations on your assuming the presidency of the Council for this month and to offer you our best wishes for your successful handling of the difficult problems that are before us. Your vast political and diplomatic experience and your formidable skill as a negotiator reassure us that you will safely guide us to fruitful solutions in our collective quest for peace and justice.

43. The item before us is entitled "Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia". It is clear from the statements of the preceding speakers that what we are concerned about is the current situation in Southern Rhodesia; a concern that is caused by reports of an internal agreement signed by the illegal Smith régime with certain African parties regarding the future political evolution of that colonial Territory. The details of this so-called internal agreement are available to us only through the courtesy of the American newspapers, and since no one has denied the report we presume that it is true and we must examine it, therefore, in the light of established principles and the position of international law.

44. At this stage, it is useful to recall the main features of the history of Southern Rhodesia since 1965, when the white minority usurped power and unilaterally declared its independence. That act of seizure was condemned by the Security Council as an act of rebellion having no legal validity. Subsequently, mandatory sanctions of an economic nature were imposed after it had been determined that the situation in Southern Rhodesia constituted a threat to international peace and security. The Council continued to recognize the United Kingdom as the legal administering Power and called upon it to quell the rebellion and take all other appropriate and effective measures to terminate the illegal régime. The United Kingdom was also asked to take steps to allow the people of Southern Rhodesia to determine their own future in consistency with the objec-

tives of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). Lastly, the Council called upon the Organization of African Unity to do all in its power to assist the implementation of its resolutions in conformity with Chapter VIII of the Charter, and this underlines the recognized importance of the role of the African Group and the relevance of its decisions for the rest of us.

45. This brief recitation of the law is necessary in order to determine the extent to which it has been complied with. Unfortunately, however, the fact is that the illegal Smith régime has not yet been brought to an end by the United Kingdom, by the armed struggle of the freedom fighters, by the sanctions of the United Nations or by the actions of the Organization of African Unity. On the contrary, the threat to international peace and security has increased. Several attempts made by the United Kingdom to negotiate an agreed process for the free exercise of the right of self-determination by the people have so far failed.

46. The last such effort was the so-called Anglo-American proposals [S/12393], which were taken note of by the Security Council in its resolution 415 (1977). These proposals were drawn up for the purpose of restoring legality "after consulting all the parties concerned". They envisage, *inter alia*, the end of the illegal régime, the introduction of a United Nations force and the establishment by the United Kingdom under its authority of a neutral caretaker transitional administration before elections can be held under United Nations supervision and majority rule and genuine independence established in 1978. They also envisaged a supervised cease-fire and the creation of a Zimbabwe National Army based on the liberation forces. The over-all objective of the Anglo-American proposals is to achieve an internationally accepted negotiated settlement.

47. My Prime Minister informed the British Government that those proposals had much to commend them since they sought to end the illegal régime and establish independence on the basis of the principles of universal adult suffrage and a justiciable Bill of Rights safeguarded by an independent judiciary. The crucial element in the whole process is, of course, the nature of the transitional set-up, with the United Kingdom in the role of guardian, backed by a United Nations force. The Government of India was also of the view that it was necessary to win the confidence of all the parties and that no effort should be spared to end the hostilities. We also felt that it was absolutely vital that the Rhodesian forces should be brought under the discipline and control of the restored legal order and that they should be made to adjust to the inevitability of majority rule and accept the spirit and letter of the Anglo-American proposals.

48. Because the Anglo-American proposals had been drawn up after consultations with all the parties concerned, we had nourished the expectation that all the parties would enter into negotiations on the basis of those proposals. However, it seems that only the Patriotic Front has agreed to do so. Mr. Smith appears to have blown hot and cold and finally withdrawn characteristically to his manoeuvres and attempts to present the world with his revised version of his own vision of the future. In obtaining the support of certain African parties, Mr. Smith has done no more than perpetuate the illegal régime on a somewhat wider basis.

49. When one examines the Salisbury agreement in relation to the Anglo-American proposals, one finds that it is not designed to restore legality. The transitional government would not be under the authority of the United Kingdom and there is no provision whatsoever for any involvement on the part of the United Nations. It simply ignores the United Kingdom and the United Nations, and I fail to understand, therefore, how anyone can appear before the United Nations to defend an arrangement that deliberately defies legality and ignores the Organization. In essence, it is an extension of illegality and no more acceptable than the illegal Smith régime which committed the original sin. Furthermore, under the Salisbury agreement, the white minority would have the veto in the Executive Council, the Council of Ministers and the Legislative Assembly. What could this portend but a transition to prolonged domination by the Smith régime?

50. An important section of the African people represented by the Patriotic Front has denounced this agreement, and for good reason. It is surely unreal to equate legality with illegality. The United Nations will accept as legal only a majority government, freely elected on the basis of universal adult suffrage, in conditions of peace and under United Nations supervision. What we are dealing with is a situation that calls for both decolonization and democratization. Failure to achieve this would surely result in the continuation of hostilities. No settlement can be purely internal in the present situation; it has to take into account the legitimate views and aspirations of all the parties concerned as, otherwise, it cannot be viable or durable.

51. In our view the need of the moment is a new approach, a constructive, creative and positive approach, to seek out the elements that are broadly acceptable to all the parties and that conform to the principles and purposes of the Anglo-American proposals, and thereafter to build on them through resumed negotiations the constitutional edifice of African reconciliation, as well as the restoration of legality.

52. I hope that, for the reasons I have outlined, the Security Council will reject the Salisbury agreement as illegal, and lay down instead the basic principles of procedure and law for a revival of the negotiations along the right lines; in this task the United Kingdom will necessarily have to play the leading role, with the assistance of the Security Council and also of the Organization of African Unity. A peaceful negotiated solution, even though it may involve some adjustment of preconceived notions, would be far better, in our view, than a continuation of the armed conflict with all its uncertainty, bloodshed and bitterness.

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

54. Mr. MEDANI (Sudan): Mr. President, I thank you and, through you, the other members of the Council for making it possible for my delegation to participate in the deliberations on the situation in Southern Rhodesia. It is only fitting that the Council should now be meeting under the

presidency of the United Kingdom, a country whose intricate involvement in Southern Rhodesia predates the advent on the scene 12 years ago of the illegal minority régime. That, coupled with your personal qualities as a seasoned diplomat and your conversance with the Zimbabwe problem, gives us confidence that you will steer the deliberations of the Council to a successful conclusion.

55. The Council is currently meeting to review the situation in Zimbabwe following the claim by the illegal minority racist régime that it has reached an internal settlement and the resultant call for an end to the mandatory United Nations sanctions against the Smith rebel régime. That would be followed by recognition of the régime by the international community.

56. Such a claim leads us to ask whether the conditions which led to the ostracism of the Smith régime by the international community have now been removed. A cursory glance at the provisions of the so-called internal settlement does not support that contention. The so-called internal settlement does not provide for the removal of Smith's instruments of domination embodied in the army, the police and the security forces. Indeed, it is under those very security forces that the so-called free elections leading to majority rule would be conducted. Furthermore, the establishment of separate voting rolls for whites and blacks, and the fact that the whites would have virtual veto power in all parliamentary decisions leaves much to be desired.

57. In our view, the so-called internal settlement does not adequately address itself to three main issues, namely, the legitimization of the new régime by the United Kingdom—the administering Power—the ending of the war with the freedom fighters and the lifting of the mandatory United Nations sanctions.

58. In a genuine settlement it is only the administering Power—the United Kingdom—that could furnish the necessary legal instruments for the independence of Zimbabwe. It is our earnest hope that the United Kingdom will continue to hold that independence can be granted to all citizens of Zimbabwe irrespective of the pigmentation of their skin. With the present "settlement" still weighted in favour of the white minority, we hold that the reasons for which the rebel régime was denounced by the United Kingdom and isolated by the international community still remain valid today. No stretch of the imagination could make the present internal settlement an improvement on the situation that has obtained in Southern Rhodesia for the last 12 years.

59. As mentioned before, the so-called internal settlement does not address itself to the question of fighting in Southern Rhodesia. According to Smith, the ending of the armed conflict would be handled by the so-called new government. This is a prescription for the escalation of the fighting. Indeed, it is an invitation to what Ambassador Andrew Young has rightly called a "black-on-black civil war". It is inconceivable that a government which excludes the Patriotic Front, which controls the freedom fighters, could ever end the fighting. We believe that a meaningful way of stopping the fighting would be to involve the Patriotic Front, the only legitimate representative of the

down-trodden people in Zimbabwe. It is for that reason that the Organization of African Unity has recognized the Patriotic Front.

60. Finally, it is naïve for the authors of the bogus settlement to call for the lifting of the mandatory United Nations sanctions without curing the malady that caused them to be invoked in the first place. By maintaining the *status quo*, under whatever new guises, the rebel Smith régime remains a threat to international peace and security and thus deserves continued international isolation. Besides, the recent attack by the Smith régime on the State of Zambia, in which 38 people lost their lives, is a manifestation of its continued arrogance and defiance of international legal norms.

61. We recommend to all members of this august body in particular, and to the rest of the international community in general, that they should denounce the so-called internal settlement and recognize it for the farce that it is. An equitable and workable settlement involving all the parties concerned should be negotiated. The Anglo-American proposals, in spite of some shortcomings, are still an adequate basis for such a settlement.

62. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Sierra Leone. I invite her to take a place at the Council table and to make her statement.

63. Mrs. GBUJAMA (Sierra Leone): My delegation joins the representative of the Upper Volta and the Chairman of the African Group for the current month in thanking the members of the Council for their quick response to Africa's call for these meetings of the Council at this delicate stage of the situation in Southern Rhodesia, in order to focus the Council's attention once again on the grave threat to peace and security in the southern part of our continent posed by the deteriorating situation in Southern Rhodesia.

64. We expect the Security Council, as the custodian of world peace, to seize this opportunity to take prompt and most appropriate action to prevent further bloodshed in that part of the world through concrete measures aimed at speeding up majority rule, independence and the end of the illegal minority rule in Southern Rhodesia. Indeed, this series of meetings of the Council was requested before the latest attack on Zambian territory by Ian Smith's forces. When such repeated acts of aggression against neighbouring States by Rhodesia's rebel forces are considered in conjunction with the sham internal settlement which has just been reached in that Territory, it cannot be denied that these meetings of the Council are most timely and that its decisions will be vital to international peace and security.

65. Mr. President, with your wealth of experience and your distinguished career, the Council will always be in good hands when under your guidance. It is twice blessed this time in that your leadership of the Council coincides with the debate on the British colony of Southern Rhodesia, a debate which has been prompted by the rebel régime's decision to deceive the world yet again. The significance of such a coincidence is better seen in the light of your own personal involvement in your Government's recent efforts to discharge its responsibility in Southern

Rhodesia. We are therefore convinced that, with you presiding, the Council will conclude its deliberations with singular success for the people of Zimbabwe by disregarding any settlement that does not include all parties and, in particular, the forces fighting for liberation and by pursuing instead the path of genuine majority rule and independence along the lines of the Council's latest resolution on the matter.

66. In the latest discussions on the question of Southern Rhodesia, the Council responded favourably to an invitation to the Secretary-General from you, Sir, as representative of the United Kingdom, and requested him

"to appoint . . . a representative to enter into discussions with the British Resident Commissioner designate and with all the parties concerning the military and associated arrangements that are considered necessary to effect the transition to majority rule in Southern Rhodesia" [resolution 415 (1977)].

The operative phrase here is "with all the parties". The Council also called upon all parties to co-operate with the representative of the Secretary-General in the conduct of these discussions. We therefore presume that, in keeping with its own mandate in resolution 415 (1977), the Council cannot now be prepared to recognize or even consider any discussions on majority rule or any settlement that does not involve all the parties. To take a contrary decision, the Council will agree, would be bound to have serious implications and consequences for peace, and for the Charter of the United Nations. Since the resolution was adopted unanimously, we have no reason to believe that any member of the Council will now retract that position of including all parties in any discussion on transition to majority rule under the leadership of the United Kingdom or with its full participation.

67. With direct reference to the so-called internal settlement which has just been signed at Salisbury, my Government finds it quite unacceptable, for reasons which can be said to have, all at once, a moral, political, psychological, legal and military basis—depending on one's particular disposition.

68. My Government considers that it is first the responsibility of the United Kingdom, and not of the minority rebel régime, to hand over power to the Zimbabwe nationals. The United Kingdom, since 1976—and, it would seem from Mr. Smith's action, until a few weeks ago had assumed full responsibility for Southern Rhodesia and discharged that responsibility with dignity. My Government looked forward to a meaningful conclusion of the United Kingdom's sacred duty of preparing the people for orderly, immediate and genuine steps to independence, with the United Kingdom asserting its sovereign authority in Southern Rhodesia once and for all. Instead, the rebel leader is running the show. My Government supports whole-heartedly the decision of the Organization of African Unity which recognizes the forces of the Patriotic Front, under the political leadership of Mr. Nkomo and Mr. Mugabe, as the fighting force which has lately harassed Mr. Smith's army to such an uncomfortable level that it has resulted in, on the one hand, feverish attacks on Zambia

and Mozambique and, on the other, a desperate attempt by the illegal régime to seek a semblance of a genuine transfer of power. In other words, the part played by the Patriotic Front towards bringing about an end of minority rule in Southern Rhodesia has been very crucial and cannot be ignored by the Security Council.

69. Thus, while we know for a fact that Reverend Ndabaningi Sithole and Bishop Muzorewa are Zimbabwean patriots who once enjoyed the support of large sections among the masses, we cannot accept any settlement proposals that do not include the participation of the Patriotic Front leaders; such a settlement, not having included the leaders of Zimbabwe's fighting force, would not be able to stop the war but would only lead to its escalation, resulting in a situation to which my Government does not believe any member of the Council or the United Nations as a whole would want to contribute.

70. We see, therefore, that, by this move, Smith merely intends to deflect the bullets of the freedom fighters, which at present are aimed at the minority régime.

71. In addition to all that, we take serious note of the fact that the so-called internal settlement in Southern Rhodesia aims at presenting the international community with a fait accompli and seeks to restore a cloak of respectability and legality to the unilateral declaration of independence. A most disquieting factor, also, is that the so-called internal settlement is indeed a test case, bearing in mind that, if Mr. Smith is allowed to get away with this, it could very well constitute a dangerous precedent for South Africa against SWAPO in Namibia.

72. The Council should not allow itself to be used in the vicious circle of oppression against the people of Zimbabwe, but should legitimately continue to be a partner with the Zimbabwean people in their attempt to liberate themselves from the gods' mantle of repression, self-love and parricide, of which this so-called settlement is an additional example.

73. Aspects of this so-called internal settlement are revolting to common sense, to the Zimbabwean people—who crave deliverance from the racist minority régime—and to humanity as a whole, and the settlement should be firmly rejected. We believe that the international community undoubtedly is prepared by now to grapple with the danger of the cynical realism which acceptance of this settlement would mean, seeing that it is only peripheral to the real issue of majority rule and fails to grasp its essence. Yet we look to the Council to take the lead.

74. If we yield to the temptation of looking closely at the settlement, we observe that it allows for the creation of certain fallacious mythologies. What "maintaining the defence forces, the public service, the police force and the prison service free from political interference" actually means is that the structures of the so-called security forces and the aggressive army, which over the years has carried out aggression in neighbouring territories and inflicted enormous suffering on the poor, innocent, harmless population, including women and children, would be preserved in their *status quo*, in spite of the number of black faces in

Parliament. The Council will recall that the question of the Rhodesian armed forces was the point of departure with the rebel régime in the Anglo-American proposals. This is therefore significant, because Mr. Smith can now at last have it his own way—or so he thinks. The judiciary and the civil service, 99 per cent of whose top echelon is white, are also to remain intact. To add to all this, 28 per cent of the parliamentary seats are reserved for the 3 per cent making up the white population, and 14 per cent of those seats will be elected by an all-white electorate. So that in a so-called general election the people will have no way of changing the situation even if they desire to do so. What is the relevance of retaining 28 per cent of the seats as non-multiracial seats? That is Mr. Smith's interpretation of majority rule! My Government cannot endorse that special protection of the rights of a minority which has continuously violated the rights of the majority for decades.

75. My Government and the international community have enough evidence on which to reject even what may seem like a genuine proposal by the Smith régime towards majority rule; it must be rejected on the grounds of his record of recalcitrance and insincerity. The Security Council's experience of Mr. Smith's utter disregard of its own decisions is very wide.

76. For more than a decade now, Mr. Smith and his racist régime have continued their acts of open rebellion and high treason against the British Crown, and have nurtured such acts in recent years with several betrayals of Britain's trust. You yourself, Mr. President, fell victim to such insincerity when, as Chairman of the Geneva conference, you had enough faith in Mr. Smith to put forward fresh proposals for the transfer of power and your Government's participation in an interim government, following the collapse of the Geneva conference. Members of the Council will recall that these new proposals were rejected outright, with Mr. Smith saying that he would seek an internal settlement with the Africans in Rhodesia. That was, of course, long after the first attempt at internal settlement, when, thank God, Mr. Nkomo was able to see right through the rebel régime's manoeuvres to stay in power indefinitely and at all costs. Do we want to repeat these experiences?

77. Today the plot thickens, and Mr. Smith's latest move to confirm to the world that majority rule and independence in Zimbabwe are completely subject to his whims and caprices has been to give the boot to the joint Anglo-American proposals and to go about his own business. The Anglo-American proposals were accepted by my Government—despite their faults—as a basis for negotiations towards majority rule and independence.

78. How can one take this move seriously, especially when one knows that Mr. Smith's whole political life has been based on a stubborn policy of white supremacy—to the point where he has often said that majority rule would not come to Rhodesia in his lifetime? It is against this backdrop that the Smith-Muzorewa-Sithole-Chirau agreement should be viewed in order to see that it has no meaning for the struggling masses and for the freedom fighters of Zimbabwe and must on no account be recognized by the Council.

But, having done that, we cannot but ask ourselves the question "Where do we go from here?" It is important that the Council should note from most of the contributions so made in the debate that there is a state of war in Rhodesia. A certain Geoffrey Taylor's account of the situation, as reported in *The Guardian* of London on 24 February of this year, states that parts of Rhodesia are heavily infiltrated by the forces of the Patriotic Front to a point where travel is severely restricted. Further, in that account it is stated that the African population in Rhodesia is sceptical about the settlement, which does not include their "external leaders", whose inclusion they consider to be essential. The account also says that youths have shown their scepticism by joining the Patriotic Front forces in their thousands. Thus the armed struggle has been accelerated.

80. The rebel leader, on the other hand, while talking of majority rule, is strengthening his military machinery to suppress guerrilla activities with the recruitment of civilians into the rebel army. That army continues to cross into neighbouring territories in so-called "hot pursuit", the régime's euphemism for aggression against neighbouring States, thereby inflicting immense damage on defenceless villages on the pretext that they harbour guerrillas.

81. In spite of the so-called settlement, laws similar to the apartheid system, like the identity-pass legislation adopted by Parliament in late 1972, still remain in effect.

82. The situation thus remains one that threatens international peace and security, notwithstanding the latest agreements and settlements, just as it was more than 10 years ago. We therefore call upon the Security Council to take action to contain the situation by further effectively isolating the illegal régime from the international community through the application of all the provisions under Chapter VII of the Charter.

83. For our part, Sierra Leone will, in conformity with the resolutions of the Organization of African Unity, continue to support the armed struggle of the people of Zimbabwe led by the forces of the Patriotic Front as an effective way of forcing Mr. Smith to abandon his racist policies for genuine negotiations aimed at the transfer of power to the Zimbabwe nationalists. We call upon all freedom-loving States to do the same.

84. Having said that, my delegation feels obliged therefore to look ahead, beyond the present debate. Of course, a lot will necessarily depend on the decisions of the Council and the contacts made in the past few days, those still being made and those which may be made in the future. While my delegation does not pretend to have any specific blueprint, we dare, in our commitment to the promotion of a genuine negotiated settlement, suggest some ideas that may be further explored.

85. First, we firmly believe that concrete incentives should be found as a demonstration to those who have co-operated with the illegal régime in a so-called internal settlement that there are yet possibilities for them to play more productive and constructive roles in a future independent Zimbabwe.

86. Secondly, we consider it essential that maximum efforts should be exerted to create a proper framework within which all parties concerned can fully participate in bringing to an end the illegal régime and thus expediting the accession of Zimbabwe to independence.

87. Lastly, being fully conscious that the task ahead requires leadership, tact and exceptional diplomatic skills, we wonder whether the Secretary-General, who in the past has been most generous with his time and energy in the cause of the liberation struggle in Africa, might now be called upon once again to make available his good offices in helping to move things forward from where we left off before Smith's latest gimmick.

88. I thank all the members of the Council profoundly for granting my request to be allowed to participate in the debate on a matter of utmost importance to my Government.

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

90. Mr. TLOU (Botswana): Mr. President, allow me to congratulate you upon your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. It is pleasing to see you, a representative of a country with which Botswana enjoys very cordial relations, presiding over this very crucial debate. We are confident that your undoubted diplomatic skill and experience will ensure the successful conclusion of this debate. In a real sense, you have special responsibility as representative of the colonial Power in Southern Rhodesia, special responsibility so to pilot the debate that the outcome will be applauded by Africa, by the international community and, above all, by the people of Zimbabwe.

91. This debate is being held in the face of a rapidly deteriorating situation in our region. I am not referring to the atrocities perpetrated against the people of Zimbabwe day in and day out, for with those we are all familiar; nor am I referring to the already well-known attacks against the independent African States of the region. Rather, I am concerned with the latest acts of brutal aggression perpetrated by the illegal minority régime on the eve of the convening of the Security Council and again while the Council was in session.

92. On 27 February, the rebel régime's forces ambushed and killed 15 young Botswana soldiers while they were doing normal patrol duty along our border with the rebel colony. Eight others were critically wounded, and three vehicles in which they travelled were totally wrecked. Two civilians in a neighbouring village were killed also, bringing the total of those killed to 17.

93. Once again, like all previous attacks, this one was perpetrated well inside the country being attacked and without the slightest provocation—a clear violation of our territorial integrity and sovereignty. The relevant details of this attack were circulated in document S/12580 of 1 March 1978.

94. Then, as the Council was meeting, the rebels launched a barbarous unprovoked attack against our neighbour the sister Republic of Zambia. Here again the rebels struck well inside Zambian territory. Preliminary reports reaching us indicate losses of life and property. As always, Botswana will stand shoulder to shoulder with her sister States who suffer acts of aggression at the hands of the rebel régime. In this particular instance, Botswana wishes unequivocally to condemn the dastardly acts of aggression perpetrated against the Republic of Zambia. The international community must rally behind Zambia in its hour of greatest need. We congratulate the armed forces of Zambia for repulsing the reckless invaders.

95. Those attacks have tremendous significance and bear serious implications for our region. Timed to come when they did, they are in fact a challenge to the Security Council and to the international community. True to fashion, Smith has demonstrated once again that he can ignore the overwhelming wishes of the international community with impunity and arrogance. It is important for the Council to note that this evil man who is masquerading now as a harbinger of peace is in fact what he has always been, a man of war, an architect of destruction. The international community must take him seriously for what he is and act resolutely to stay his blood-stained hand of destruction. Thus, in this current debate, the Council must aspire to take a unanimous decision which will give no comfort to the rebels at Salisbury. It should vehemently condemn those latest acts of aggression against neighbouring African States.

96. Those attacks should also serve as a warning to those who seek a lasting solution to the Rhodesian problem. It should be abundantly clear that, so long as Smith stays in power and possesses physical force, that is, the rebel army, not only will he continue to oppress the people of Zimbabwe, but he will also continue his acts of aggression against the neighbouring African States, with grave implications for international peace and security.

97. We appeal once again to the United Kingdom to move with speed to decolonize its colony of Southern Rhodesia, because only a genuine transfer of power from the minority to the majority and the dismantling of the Smith army of repression can end those acts of aggression and the suffering of the people of Zimbabwe.

98. I have dwelt for some time on the latest acts of aggression in the context of this debate because essentially these issues are intertwined, linked as they are by the continued existence of the belligerent illegal régime at Salisbury.

99. If those attacks are aimed at forcing Botswana to abandon its sacred duty to support the legitimate struggle of the people of Zimbabwe, then Smith is deluding himself. Botswana will continue, along with other African States and all those who cherish peace and justice, to rally behind the people of Zimbabwe and their liberation movement, the Patriotic Front, in their hour of greatest need.

100. Let me now turn to the immediate question before the Council. I shall avoid the temptation of going into the

history of the conflict in Zimbabwe. Nevertheless, I think certain aspects of that tragic history need to be borne in mind as we seek solutions to the problem. We are not about to claim that knowledge of historical facts necessarily makes men decide wisely at all times. But certainly a judicious interpretation of historical facts ought to illuminate our path to the future and ought to enable us to avoid mistakes of the past, for those who ignore the lessons of history do so at their own peril.

101. My colleague, the Ambassador of the United Republic of Tanzania, in opening this debate [2061st meeting], pointed to the tragedy of errors committed by the United Kingdom as the colonial Power in Southern Rhodesia, and cited as a case in point a statement made in 1965 by the then Prime Minister, to the effect that Britain would not use force to quell the rebellion even if Smith declared independence unilaterally. As we know, Smith went ahead and nothing was done to him.

102. In fact, those tragic errors are the most persistent and dominant theme of British colonial history in southern Africa. The record of British administration in southern Africa, in the white settler colonies to be precise, is full of such errors whose ultimate result was the emergence and entrenchment of white minority régimes in the area, with all the attendant minority privileges.

103. In South Africa, Britain abandoned the black majority to the mercies of the Boers by signing the South Africa Act in 1910, which transferred power from the British Government to the white minority, and expressed the misplaced hope that, in the fullness of time, that minority would voluntarily share power with the black majority. We all know the tragedy that decision brought upon the people of South Africa. The problem of *apartheid* is a direct outcome of that tragic error.

104. Taking the example of the South African minority, the Rhodesian white minority also demanded and got from Britain, in 1923, a constitution which gave it all power in the colony, again at the expense of the black majority. All that was left of British influence were certain residual powers which, throughout the long tragic history of Southern Rhodesia, it never effectively used to curb the excesses of the white minority.

105. Thus, since 1923, the persistent theme in the history of Southern Rhodesia has been the recession of British influence there and the rise of a series of attempts on the part of the settlers to sever the umbilical cord with Britain and rule Rhodesia in perpetuity, thus ensuring a racially based society of unequals with the whites controlling all the commanding heights of power.

106. The method of achieving this has varied from time to time in response to various pressures, both internal and external, but the main objective of the minority to dominate all the institutions of power in Southern Rhodesia has remained virtually unchanged. Nothing which has happened so far has changed this fact. We cite these historical facts not to open up the wounds best left to time's healing hand, but because they have relevance for this discussion.

107. Now, Ian Smith has not deviated from that. At least in this case, Ian Smith has been most consistent and only those who ignore the realities and true intentions of Southern Rhodesian white politics can be deceived by Smith's manoeuvres.

108. Those who deal with this slippery character are well advised to be aware of his treacherous manoeuvres. At one time, he tried, in vain, to use the traditional chiefs to thwart the legitimate aspirations of the people of Zimbabwe; now he has resorted to yet another trick—that of using the so-called internal group against the so-called external group. To this end, he is marshalling his propaganda machinery to paint what he calls the external group as bloodthirsty messengers of doom and the internal group as reasonable men who love peace and harmony. Unfortunately, certain sections of the international press and news media are falling for this bait and are joining in the propaganda chorus emanating from Salisbury. This can only be damaging to the cause of the Zimbabwe people.

109. Smith is trying to drive an irreversible wedge between the people of Zimbabwe. The administering Power, the international community and the people of Zimbabwe must resist those dangerous manoeuvres, which can only lead to strife and the prolongation of suffering.

110. The Security Council, and in particular the United Kingdom, the administering Power, should not be tempted to repeat the tragic errors of 1910 in South Africa and 1923 in Southern Rhodesia. The United Kingdom has the opportunity now to reverse the unfortunate chain of events set in motion by the tragic decision of 1923. The United Kingdom should not entertain any settlement which aims at entrenching the white minority.

111. I turn now to the question of finding an acceptable negotiated settlement to the problem of Southern Rhodesia. Botswana will always be guided by two broad principles, namely, the principle of the unquestionable acceptability of any solution chosen by the people of Zimbabwe as a whole and the principle of democratic majority rule on the basis of one-man, one-vote in free and fair elections. We would find unacceptable any settlement which did not meet those two broad principles.

112. Indeed, we believe very strongly that in this whole Zimbabwean problem the final arbiter is the people of Zimbabwe itself. Botswana will go by the freely expressed, undoubted collective will of the people of Zimbabwe as a whole, when it is expressed in an atmosphere free from intimidation of any sort and inspiring confidence in a people so long oppressed by a régime with no respect whatsoever for human life and dignity. That is what, under similar circumstances, we would wish for ourselves, and we wish the people of Zimbabwe no less.

113. Botswana, along with the other front-line States, accepted the Anglo-American proposals, despite certain negative aspects in them, as a reasonable basis for further negotiations between the administering Power and the parties concerned. Botswana supported those proposals because, judiciously handled and refined further, they might meet the requirements of the two principles that I have just outlined.

114. In general outline, then, the proposals recognize the fact that conditions of peace should be created in order that Zimbabwe may move smoothly towards majority rule. Furthermore, after years of neglect, the United Kingdom has now pledged to resume its proper role as the colonial Power with the sacred duty of decolonizing the Territory. Botswana still holds the view that, to date, those proposals present the basis for further negotiations towards a settlement. Botswana's support still stands.

115. The so-called settlement recently agreed upon between rebel Smith and certain internal elements in Zimbabwe conveniently, as we can see, excludes the Patriotic Front of Zimbabwe. There are great dangers in such an arrangement, dangers which are such as to ensure that the people of Zimbabwe will be unlikely to enjoy the peace and tranquillity they so much deserve after so many years of white minority domination and brutal oppression.

116. Can the Patriotic Front be expected to accept that fait accompli in which it played no part? After all, those are the people who have fought for over 10 years now against the rebels at Salisbury. They are the people whose struggle finally forced Smith to go to Geneva to attempt to negotiate with the other parties involved—for what that was worth. It is they, as it were, who have pushed him into a tight corner out of which he is now trying to wriggle. It is they who have demoralized the racist rebels at Salisbury, as evidenced by the large exodus of white racists from the country.

117. It is likely that the Patriotic Front will continue the war—and they have just told us so—so long as they are not party to any settlement. Under the circumstances, Zimbabwe is likely to be plunged into civil strife, a strife which one shrewd observer aptly referred to as “black-on-black civil war” a strife whose consequences can only be ghastly. In that event, the suffering of the people of Zimbabwe would be prolonged and our region as a whole would be plunged into a tragic era of yet more bloodshed.

118. We urge Her Majesty's Government—the only one which can end the illegal situation in Rhodesia—and its allies in this exercise to redouble their efforts to find a durable solution to the problem of Zimbabwe. To that end, the British Government should enter into immediate negotiations with those concerned, for Smith cannot be expected to end the state of illegality because he is himself illegal. Only the British can do that, with the concurrence of the United Nations.

119. Until a lasting solution is found, the international community must rally behind the people of Zimbabwe and their liberation movement, the Patriotic Front. The sanctions against the rebel colony must be intensified and scrupulously observed.

120. Botswana in its humble way and for its part will continue, to the best of its ability, to rally behind the people of Zimbabwe in their struggle for freedom and justice.

121. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. Robert Mugabe, to whom the Council extended an invitation at its

2062nd meeting under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

122. Mr. MUGABE: Mr. President, on behalf of the struggling people of Zimbabwe and the Patriotic Front, the spearhead of our people's revolution, we wish to express our appreciation to you and the other members of the Security Council for permitting us to address you on this occasion in the history of our country.

123. Today we appear before this august body to discuss the deteriorating situation in our country. The coincidence of your presidency over this august body and your country's colonial responsibilities over our country makes this series of meetings of the Security Council a special one, particularly considering the fact that you have had the opportunity to direct efforts to find a negotiated settlement to the problem of our country. We hope that your own experience with the Smith régime and its agents will help the Council to find means of averting the catastrophe that hangs ominously over the heads of our people.

124. Despite the violence, terror and brutality that we daily experience from the terroristic despotism that is "Rhodesia", we appear before the Council in a constructive spirit and frame of mind. Yes, wanton mass killings of our people and of the people of the neighbouring peace-loving countries of Zambia, Botswana and Mozambique by the racist Rhodesian régime have reached genocidal proportions. Yes, men and women, the young and the aged, in fact whole families within the country are daily being uprooted from their homes and taken to concentration camps, which have neither sufficient food nor sanitation facilities. That barbarous treatment of our people by the racist white minority régime threatens to destroy completely any chance for racial harmony in our country. Despite the racist recklessness of the Smith régime against our poor people, we continue to maintain the progressive position that in Zimbabwe we are not fighting white people but a racist system whose continued existence poses a serious threat to the security of Africa as a whole. On our part, as leaders of the Patriotic Front of Zimbabwe, we have been involved in this tough struggle against the evil that is "Rhodesia" for too long now to respond emotionally to Rhodesian acts of barbarism. After so many years of hard struggle, we have come to appreciate the fact that any struggle whose principles are based on emotional responses to the evils that it seeks to correct cannot succeed. Hence our position that armed struggle is the only effective means of bringing about meaningful changes is a well-considered position. This is a position that we hold firmly and consistently.

125. Since we first brought the colonial problem of Zimbabwe to the attention of the United Nations two decades ago, this problem has continued to exercise the minds of the international community. At the beginning of our international campaign, particularly before 1965, our efforts to make the international community appreciate the gravity of the problem posed by minority rule in Zimbabwe were sabotaged by the British, who then argued that Southern Rhodesia was a self-governing colony whose decolonization fell outside the normal United Nations trusteeship frame of reference. Encouraged by this attitude,

Rhodesian settlers, under the leadership of Ian Douglas Smith, seized power in 1965 and declared themselves unilaterally independent of the United Kingdom. Since then, the efforts of the United Kingdom in connexion with the United Nations attempts to end minority rule in our country have taken the form of seeking to return the Rhodesian régime to legality—an aim that is not the same as the liberation movement's objective of liberating the country from minority rule.

126. We wish to stress the fact that the liberation movement of Zimbabwe has never questioned the United Kingdom's constitutional authority over the colony of Southern Rhodesia. However, it is also true that the British objective of returning the régime to legality—particularly when the administering Power begins to act as if it wanted to bring this about through the efforts of the liberation movement—has flown in the face of the main objective of the liberation movement: total liberation from minority rule.

127. It is against this background that today the Patriotic Front's interpretation of the results of the so-called internal settlement differs fundamentally from that of the British Government, which seems more interested in returning Smith to legality than in removing him. Hence, in 1966, the United Kingdom and the illegal régime held what are known as the *Tiger* talks near Gibraltar. The British had two objectives in those talks, namely, to get Smith to promise not to declare Rhodesia a republic, and to ask Smith not to impede progress towards majority rule. The following year, in 1967, the United Kingdom and the régime again met in what are called the *Fearless* talks. In both those encounters with the régime, the British Government was more interested in returning the régime to some form of legality. Therein lies the difference in principle between us and those who have been telling the world that the results of the so-called internal settlement represent "a step in the right direction".

128. As all the members of the Council know, even those British half-measures to deal with the problem and other subsequent attempts to transfer power to the majority of the people of Zimbabwe have failed because the Smith régime would not contemplate any arrangement that sought to alter its institutions of power. All these pointless attempts foundered on the same rock: the foxy and racist Smith.

129. Although the Patriotic Front and the British Government may disagree on exactly why the Geneva conference failed, there is no blinking the fact that in Geneva Smith's contempt for Africans was unmistakably clear. After the Geneva fiasco, the British and the Americans put together what some people call the Anglo-American plan for Zimbabwe. While the Patriotic Front agreed to consider the proposals as a basis for negotiations, the Smith régime rejected those proposals outright and opted for negotiations with African elements opposed to the liberation movement. We give this brief resumé of Smith's prevarications and deceitful tactics not because we want to express any preference for the Anglo-American plan over the so-called internal settlement, but to underline the fact that the Smith régime has never conceded the possibility of handing over power to the Zimbabwean majority.

130. Understandably, the fraud that the Smith régime has been able to perpetrate with the active assistance of African hangers and traitors has received a great deal of attention in certain world circles. This support for the so-called internal settlement from Western reactionary elements does not surprise us, because those are the same forces that have kept the Smith régime afloat, in flagrant violation of United Nations sanctions against that régime. At no stage in the history of our struggle have those forces given us encouragement, let alone support.

131. What is the nature of the "settlement" conspiracy of the Smith régime? As can be expected from professional racists, the "settlement" conspirators have predicated any settlement of the country's problems upon the principle that blacks and whites in Zimbabwe shall remain separate communities. Hence the whole scheme seeks to devolve power upon the Zimbabwean community through racial channels. This can be seen from the text of the eight-point agreement signed by Ian Smith and the three black puppets, namely:

First, on the subject of a bill of rights, there must be a justiciable declaration of rights to protect the rights and freedom of the individual. This must provide, in particular, protection from deprivation of property unless adequate compensation is promptly paid. This, in truth, as it appears, is a bill not of rights but of race.

Secondly, as regards the judicature, to make the bill of rights effective there must be an independent judiciary free from political influence. To ensure a competent bench there must be high qualifications for the appointment of judges.

Thirdly, in connexion with a public services board, to maintain the confidence of the public service and also to maintain the confidence of the people in the professional neutrality of the public service, the public services board or commission must be established as an independent body whose composition and functions should be entrenched.

Fourthly, as to the retention of the administration, in order to provide a smooth transition and to ensure the continued efficient administration of the country, the civil service, the police, the defence forces and prison service should be retained in a high state of efficiency and free from political interference.

Fifthly, pensions represent a most important aspect for the retention of white confidence. Pensions payable from the consolidated revenue fund must be guaranteed and be freely remittable outside the country. With regard to private pension funds, the rights of employees and other persons who are members of private pension funds must be guaranteed.

Sixthly, in so far as citizenship is concerned, in order to encourage whites to remain, provision for dual citizenship must be retained.

Seventhly, the aforementioned constitutional provisions must be entrenched, a majority of two-thirds-plus-one of the membership of the Parliament being required for their amendment.

Eighthly, with reference to white representation in Parliament, in order to retain the confidence of the whites in regard to the entrenched safeguards in the Constitution, one third of the seats in Parliament would be reserved for direct election by white voters.

132. In short, the eight-point agreement speaks for itself with respect to how Smith and his puppets have sought to entrench white privilege in our country. If we consider the fact that the present war in Zimbabwe is the culmination of a crisis built upon institutionalized racial separation, then we can see that the creation of an *apartheid* franchise cannot solve the problems of our country. It is for that reason that the Patriotic Front of Zimbabwe has maintained the position that it is fighting for a non-racial society, because we believe that any solution based on racial lines is no solution.

133. We believe that those who have found South Africa's *apartheid* policies morally indefensible and intellectually grotesque cannot characterize Smith's creation of a constitutional homeland as "a step in the right direction", because there is no qualitative difference between South Africa's constitutional homelands and Smith's constitutional homeland solution to our problem.

134. According to the eight-point agreement signed at Salisbury, the so-called internal settlement does not address itself to the transfer of power to the majority with respect to the institutions of power that are the linchpin of the racist colonial system of the Rhodesian minority régime. For a Fascist and colonialist régime, those strategic institutions of power, namely, the civil service, the judiciary and the security forces, are central to the effectiveness of the régime. In the so-called "internal" settlement, those institutions will remain as they stand at present. If one accepts the centrality of those institutions for any government to function effectively and if one considers the fact that 100 per cent of the Rhodesian judiciary is white, 99.9 per cent of its civil service is white, and the whole leadership of the security forces is completely white, then one understands the fact that, in terms of real power, this agreement does not settle anything. The agreement does not constitute a settlement because it cannot end the war raging in the country. The situation in Zimbabwe is a war situation. No agreement that does not take into account the realities of that war situation can produce a settlement. The reality is that only those locked in combat are capable of bringing about the desired settlement. Similarly, the composition of the future army of Zimbabwe is a matter for those who are in control of the fighting. It is only the liberation forces of the Patriotic Front that can guarantee the irreversibility of the achievement of majority rule and independence. To the masses of Zimbabweans who actively support the armed struggle and form its rock base, the agreement is a betrayal of that struggle. Those masses continue to pay heavily at the hands of Smith's terroristic assassins who shoot them as "curfew breakers" or summarily execute them for collaborating with freedom fighters.

135. We know that the Security Council, as the guardian of international peace and security, must needs take a serious view of attempts by the Smith régime to concoct a "settlement" that is bound to deepen the conflict. The

Patriotic Front totally rejects the so-called "internal" settlement by the illegal racist régime and its African puppets. This means that, as far as we are concerned, the armed struggle will continue until our people's demands for a complete transfer of power are met, and we shall work for the complete overthrow of the existing colonial régime now joined by a small clique of black puppets. In this regard, the Council should follow the example of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity which met recently at Tripoli and repudiated the Salisbury agreement as a fraud designed to protect guarantees of privilege for the white minority.

136. As we have already noted, the so-called settlement is conceived within the framework of South Africa's definition of African self-determination, as exemplified in the obscene creation of the homelands of the Transkei and Bophuthatswana. In this connexion, members of the Council should take note of the fact that Mr. Smith and Mr. Vorster have designed a common strategy aimed at concocting a similar "settlement" in Zimbabwe and in Namibia. This is to say that the agreement between Smith and his black puppets at Salisbury will immediately encourage South Africa to move in the same direction with regard to Namibia. Will members of the Council permit the creation of a belt of puppet régimes across southern Africa, whose chief purpose would be to make the world safe for apartheid?

137. We earnestly call upon the Security Council in the name of peace and justice to repudiate the so-called Salisbury agreement and to reaffirm its condemnation and isolation of the illegal régime of Rhodesia. In the meantime, we want to reaffirm our position, namely, that any attempt to find a negotiated settlement to the problem of our country by by-passing the liberation forces of the Patriotic Front, which now controls more than two thirds of the country, will not solve anything. The masses of Zimbabwe are solidly behind us; hence, our capability of sustaining the war despite the Salisbury fraud.

138. I thank you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Security Council for affording me this opportunity to present our case.

139. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. Joshua Nkomo, to whom the Council has likewise extended an invitation under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

140. Mr. NKOMO: The case that has been laid before the Security Council by my colleague, Mr. Mugabe, is the case for the Patriotic Front. What remains for me is to underline what was mentioned in his statement.

141. It is important to note that Mr. Smith, in his attempt to thwart the forward movement of the people of Zimbabwe to genuine independence and self-determination, has sought to use the name of our people by using the three puppets. Here I should like to underline our statement by recalling the nature of the so-called agreement.

142. In this so-called agreement of Salisbury, the Smith régime's Parliament remains the authority. It is only after

the Smith régime has ratified this so-called agreement that it can be regarded as an agreement. The puppet black friends are but instruments; all power remains with Mr. Ian Douglas Smith. He remains Prime Minister. It is said that the four leaders will alternate in the presidency of the so-called Council of State, but it was made clear by Mr. Smith that, although it appears that the four leaders are equal, Mr. Smith retains his title. What Smith has done is to use these men to perpetuate his criminal acts against our people and to try to hoodwink the international community.

143. It is pleasing to us that the members of the Council and the representatives of other States Members of the United Nations who have spoken here have made it perfectly clear that they see the so-called agreement in the same light as we see it, and therefore we hope that the administering Power, in this case the United Kingdom, will realize that this fraudulent attempt by Smith to make a second unilateral declaration of independence can no longer be called by the British Government a step in the right direction.

144. If the British Government believed that their proposals were a step in the right direction, then the Smith proposal cannot be a step in the right direction. They cannot both be steps in the right direction. Therefore I should like to emphasize that we hope that the British will realize that there can be only one step, and that from now on, after what has been said in the Council, the British will make active moves to bring about a settlement that will be internationally recognized.

145. What we see in this so-called settlement is an attempt by Smith to legalize his unilateral declaration of independence. And, after legalizing it and getting the Security Council to lift sanctions, Smith will move fast towards Mr. Vorster. What we see in it is that, by retaining the four important elements of State—that is, the army, which remains pure white and white-controlled, the police, which remains white and white-controlled, the civil service and the judiciary—Smith is preparing for a second unilateral declaration of independence. Once he has been given independence legally, Smith will remain with that independence for four to six months while preparing and working out a confederation with South Africa, and will then conduct a second straightforward coup.

146. What will the international community do? The United Kingdom will say that this is an internal affair of Zimbabwe, and the world will witness yet another move towards consolidating the racists and Fascists in southern Africa in preparation for their assault on African States. It is a known fact that Mr. Smith and his friend, the Fascist Vorster, are not happy about the independence of African countries, especially those surrounding South Africa. It is a fact that, if Smith is allowed to go on with this so-called independence, we shall see danger emanating from southern Africa after South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, assisted by the United Kingdom, have set up puppet régimes in Rhodesia and Namibia and joined with South Africa in order to attack Mozambique, Botswana, Angola, and indeed Zambia, and other States not on the Zambezi. This is the design that Vorster and Smith are creating by trying to establish puppet régimes in that part of the world.

We should like to stress the importance of our having  
to negotiate with the British. As a matter of fact, it  
the British Government that came to the Council and  
requested it to give the Secretary-General power to appoint  
representative who, together with the British, would  
negotiate with the parties concerned in Southern Rhodesia.  
in the Patriotic Front were engaged in those nego-  
tations when Ian Smith defied the world community by  
pulling off from what was regarded as an attempt to solve a  
problem that has bedevilled the United Nations and other  
world organizations.

We therefore call upon the Council not to regard  
what Ian Smith is doing by attacking Mozambique,  
Botswana and Zambia just as an attack on those three  
countries. It is a preparation for wider aggression against  
independent Africa. Therefore the situation in Southern  
Rhodesia is not just a problem of that colony but a  
problem that may bring a conflagration not only in Africa  
but in the whole world.

My colleague and I are satisfied by what has been  
said here and we believe that after the Council has taken a  
decision, which we believe will be aimed at condemning the  
moves at Salisbury—because, as I have said, those moves are  
a danger not only to Southern Rhodesia but to the entire  
continent—the United Kingdom will take heed of that  
advice and move towards what we agreed in Malta. In  
Malta we agreed that we would meet and continue our  
discussions for the solution of this problem; but, to our  
surprise, the British Foreign Secretary, after Smith had

announced his so-called agreement, welcomed that so-called  
agreement. We hope that the United Kingdom realizes that  
the so-called welcome agreement is not welcome in African  
circles, or indeed in the world community as a whole. Can  
we therefore hope that from now on we shall move  
together towards solving this problem, without wasting any  
more time?

150. As I have said, these are just my remarks on the  
statement issued jointly with my friend Comrade Mugabe,  
and we thank the Council for having listened to us.

151. The PRESIDENT: Mr. Nkomo, I know, would not  
expect me, in my capacity as representative of the United  
Kingdom, to agree with everything he said. I can only say  
that in that capacity I will study with very great care  
everything that has been said in this chamber this after-  
noon.

152. I should like to announce to the Council that during  
the course of this afternoon's meeting I received a letter  
dated 9 March from the representative of Zambia, which  
will be circulated tomorrow morning as document S/12589.  
In her letter, the representative of Zambia, upon the  
instructions of her Government, requests an urgent meeting  
of the Security Council. I would therefore propose to hold  
consultations with the Council on this matter tomorrow at  
11 a.m.

*The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.*