

United Nations

**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION

*Official Records **

UN LIBRARY



UN/SA COLLECTION

FOURTH COMMITTEE

34th meeting

held on

Monday, 3 December 1979

at 3 p.m.

New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 34th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BOYA (Benin)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 90: QUESTION OF SOUTHERN RHODESIA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL

A/C.4/34/SR.34

18 December 1979

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 90: QUESTION OF SOUTHERN RHODESIA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)
(A/34/23/Add.1, A/34/38, A/34/111, A/34/126, A/34/171, A/34/179, A/34/186, A/34/187, A/34/220, A/34/228, A/34/279, A/34/346, A/34/357, A/34/389 and Corr.1, A/34/439, A/34/499, A/34/542, A/34/599; A/C.4/34/L.26, L.27, L.28)

1. Mr. RASON (Madagascar) said that, in the face of the evasive tactics of the administering Power and the intransigence of the illegal rebel régime in Salisbury, the people of Zimbabwe had opted for armed struggle in order to achieve independence and national liberation, to establish popular rule in Zimbabwe and, lastly, to eliminate colonialism, prevent neo-colonialism and eradicate a system in which the minority enjoyed political, economic and social power at the expense of the majority. The struggle for the liberation of Zimbabwe was thus part of the overall struggle for the liberation of the African continent, and any search for a negotiated solution to the question of Southern Rhodesia must be directed towards that goal.

2. In that context, it was important to bear in mind the responsibility incumbent on the United Kingdom, in accordance with the commitments it had given to bring the negotiations currently under way in London to a successful conclusion. The role of the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, was to ensure the transfer of power to the representatives of the people of Zimbabwe, and to guarantee the implementation of the Declaration contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and the exercise of the right to self-determination and independence.

3. Since the Patriotic Front had been recognized by the international community as the authentic representative of the people of Zimbabwe, it would be natural for the United Kingdom to recognize the legitimacy and representative nature of that movement. However, on the pretext of seeking a solution acceptable to all parties, the United Kingdom was excluding the Patriotic Front from certain parts of the negotiations currently being held in London. It was even going so far as to accord a number of advantages to the illegal régime, while issuing ultimatums to the Patriotic Front and threatening to exclude it from the negotiations and unilaterally to lift the economic sanctions. In so doing, it was revealing its collusion with the illegal régime and obviously seeking to preserve its political, strategic and economic interests in the Territory. Such attempts to favour Smith and Muzorewa and to legalize a régime that had been denounced as illegal by the international community, were tantamount to a betrayal of the people of Zimbabwe and of the United Nations. The biased attitude of the administering Power and its distrust of the Patriotic Front only served to complicate still further the already difficult course of the negotiations.

4. Furthermore, the purpose of the negotiations should be to settle the question of the transfer of power and, in that respect, it was important to remember that it was the people of Zimbabwe themselves who were responsible for determining the future status of their country. The Constitution imposed by the United Kingdom

/...

(Mr. Rason, Madagascar)

was, however, contrary to the genuine aspirations of the majority. It was dictated by racial considerations and was in fact designed to maintain the supremacy of the minority and to perpetuate colonialism in Southern Rhodesia.

5. The Patriotic Front had agreed to negotiate and to seek a comprehensive solution to the problem of Zimbabwe. However, the difficulties arising in the negotiations apparently concerned the transitional period and the questions of the cease-fire and the peace-keeping force. The Patriotic Front had raised serious objections to the United Kingdom proposals whereby the revolutionary armed forces would be grouped together in specially designated bases, the Government would be indirectly responsible for recruiting the forces of law and order from the Southern Rhodesian army, and the size of the peace-keeping force to be provided by the Commonwealth countries would be limited. The position of the Patriotic Front was entirely legitimate, if one considered that the ultimate objective was accession to genuine and lasting independence, which could not be achieved without the participation of the entire population in the electoral process. Moreover, the only guarantee of such participation lay in granting freedom of movement to the revolutionary armed forces, and the only assurance that genuine independence could be maintained lay in establishing an armed force that could neutralize the rebel armed forces allied with South Africa and repel the invasion which that country was planning in the event of a victory by the Patriotic Front.

6. Accordingly, the United Nations should assume its responsibilities with regard to the settlement of the Southern Rhodesian conflict. In addition to its colonial aspects, the situation in Southern Rhodesia was a source of tension that constituted a threat to peace and security in the region, in view of the constant threat of aggression from South Africa, its collaboration with the illegal Smith régime and the latter's repeated acts of aggression against neighbouring States. The obligations of the United Nations consisted, first and foremost, in ensuring that the administering Power strictly implemented General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), making sure that the electoral process was conducted properly during the transitional period, and guaranteeing the maintenance of peace and security. In that connexion, the United Nations should respond favourably to the appeal made by the Patriotic Front by agreeing to supervise and monitor the electoral process and to provide an international peace-keeping force during the transitional period.

7. Moreover, the United Nations should continue to maintain the mandatory sanctions imposed against Southern Rhodesia in order to oblige Ian Smith and Muzorewa to comply with its decisions until independence had been proclaimed, in accordance with the legitimate aspirations of the majority. The United Nations should, moreover, fully support all the activities of the Patriotic Front, including armed struggle, with a view to liberating Zimbabwe from colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and apartheid.

8. Lastly, his delegation wished to pay tribute to the Patriotic Front for the political maturity, exemplary patience and sense of responsibility it had demonstrated throughout the negotiations. He reiterated his delegation's full support for the armed struggle of the people of Zimbabwe and its belief that it was the most effective way of ensuring that their cause was victorious. His

/...

(Mr. Rason, Madagascar)

delegation was firmly convinced that, by acting in accordance with the decisions and resolutions which it had adopted on the matter, the United Nations would help to hasten a settlement of the question of Southern Rhodesia.

9. Mr. STEPHANIDES (Cyprus) said that remarkable progress had been achieved at the London negotiations and that the United Kingdom Government was to be commended for its painstaking efforts in that respect. His delegation also wished to acknowledge the constructive attitude of the leaders of the Patriotic Front, who had amply demonstrated their desire for a negotiated just settlement, and the substantial contribution made by the Governments of the front-line States in the negotiations.

10. In that context, the Committee must not fail to reiterate the position of principle which it had developed over the years with regard to the question of Southern Rhodesia. It would be a serious mistake to advocate the lifting of the mandatory sanctions against the illegal Salisbury régime before a comprehensive solution had been found and an effective cease-fire proclaimed in the Territory. In fact, the illegal Salisbury régime had given further evidence of its bad faith in the recent attacks it had launched against Zambia for the sole purpose of destroying the civilian and economic infrastructure of that country and undermining the success of the London talks.

11. His delegation fervently hoped that the London talks would lead to genuine majority rule and independence in Zimbabwe, in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions. As the representative of a country which continued to suffer from the occupation and colonization of part of its national territory, he welcomed the prospect of witnessing the triumph of the just struggle waged by the people of Zimbabwe under the leadership of the Patriotic Front.

12. Mr. SASSI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that the problem of Zimbabwe would continue to exist as long as the white minority régime remained in power. Moreover, the problem would not be solved by holding one conference after another; it was necessary to eliminate the white minority régime, which represented only 3 per cent of the population, and to enable the majority of the people of Zimbabwe to exercise their right to self-determination and independence. The international community must realize that the Smith-Ikuzoreva racist régime would never agree to give in, even if it sometimes expressed a readiness to negotiate. The sole result of the 1976 Geneva Conference on Southern Rhodesia, the 1977 Anglo-American proposals and the "internal settlement" of March 1978 had been to enable the racist régime to prevaricate, to maintain its domination and to continue to exploit the population and resources of the Territory.

13. It was an illusion to think that such plans would enable the black majority to accede to unconditional independence. In fact, there could be no real peace without justice, and there could be no justice without equality. Yet the type of peace proposed by the United Kingdom - which some parties were trying to impose on the Patriotic Front, the sole representative of the people of Zimbabwe - was nothing but a surrender, pure and simple. That type of peace had been rejected by all those who were involved in the struggle, who had faith in their cause and

/...

(Mr. Sassi, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

who were not to be deceived by vain promises. Moreover, such promises were made by those who might still be regarded as the enemy, and he wondered what right an enemy had to set himself up as an arbiter. The United Kingdom was still supplying arms to the white minority, which used them against defenceless civilians, and it was essential to realize that, from the merciless standpoint of colonialism, the Western Powers felt themselves obliged to pursue their own interests. For them, the liberation of southern Africa merely represented a blow to their strategic and economic interests in that part of the world.

14. Since the unilateral declaration of independence in 1965 there had been no just solution to the problem in that the people of Zimbabwe were still denied the rights affirmed in the Charter of the United Nations. So far, the international community had merely considered the terrorist acts perpetrated by Smith and Muzorewa against the people of Zimbabwe. It condemned those acts and tried to bring them to an end in order to enable the people of the region to exercise their inalienable right in justice and equality. The fact that efforts to condemn the racist régime were unaccompanied by effective powers of dissuasion was, however, encouraging the régime to intensify its oppression and to redouble its attacks on the front-line States. His delegation deplored the brutal aggression of the racist forces against Zambia and the many losses suffered by that country. In its resolution 455 (1979), the Security Council had condemned the aggression and had called upon Member States and international organizations to assist Zambia in the reconstruction of its economic infrastructure.

15. The conclusion to be drawn from the situation was that the United Kingdom was tacitly supporting the Rhodesian attacks against the front-line States. It was obvious that the principal aims of the Rhodesian attack on Zambia were, firstly, to weaken that country by destroying its economy; secondly, to put pressure on Zambia to internationalize the war; thirdly, to put pressure on the Patriotic Front in order to gain more concessions; fourthly, to sabotage the talks in London; and, fifthly, to prevent or delay the return of exiled Zimbabwean patriots and to hinder the return of refugees to their country. Furthermore, the Pretoria and Salisbury régimes were establishing a joint strategy to prevent the Patriotic Front from being brought to power in the elections proposed by the United Kingdom Government.

16. The peaceful solutions that had been proposed did not conform to the objectives of the Western Powers and the big monopolies, and were therefore liable to lead to a deadlock. The solution was to support the struggle of SWAPO and the Patriotic Front in Namibia and Zimbabwe since that would weaken the effectiveness of the régimes and Western attempts to maintain those régimes in power. The imperialist Powers were contributing to the strengthening of the military arsenals of the racist régimes and were affording them technical support in flagrant violation of the provisions adopted by the United Nations and the international community. The United States, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany, France and the Zionist régime of Israel bore a special and extremely dangerous responsibility in that respect, as was clearly shown by the reports of the Special Committee of 24 on the question. Also, by using their right of veto, certain Western Powers were hindering the application of the sanctions against the racist régime and were encouraging the presence of transnational corporations in southern Africa.

/...

(Mr. Sassi, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

17. His delegation had listened with the keenest interest to the statements made by the representatives of the United Kingdom and the Patriotic Front. The London Conference was indeed continuing, but it must be acknowledged that the results had been extremely disappointing: the aspirations and desires of the Zimbabwean people had not been realized, and his delegation opposed the strategy of applying pressure on the Patriotic Front in order to oblige it to accept provisions which amounted to support for the régimes in power. Any draft settlement must take into account the aspirations of the people of Zimbabwe and all the decisions of the international community, in particular those of the Organization of African Unity.

18. For the electoral process to be successful it must take into account the points recently put forward by the Patriotic Front: firstly, the forces of the Patriotic Front must participate, with those of the Salisbury régime, in maintaining public order during the elections; secondly, a Zimbabwean national army must be established during the period of transition; thirdly, there must be an adequate force to ensure the maintenance of peace and security during the transitional period, and United Nations forces must therefore be deployed for that purpose; fourthly, no precise date should be set for the cease-fire, which must be determined in the light of developments on the spot; finally, all private armies must be dismantled, the white civilian population must be disarmed, and a civilian police force must be formed during the cease-fire. His delegation considered that that was one of the most important conditions in view of the role played by the Pretoria régime in preventing the accession to power of the black majority in Zimbabwe. According to the Western press, there were still many private armies in Southern Rhodesia and military co-operation between South Africa and Southern Rhodesia seemed to be on a large scale.

19. His country fully supported the just demands presented by the Patriotic Front at the London Conference, and also supported the Front in its struggle against the white minority régime of Zimbabwe. The Patriotic Front had the right to every assistance from the international community and his country would extend to it all possible moral and financial support. That was a matter of self-defence in that his country's independence would not be complete until Zambia itself was independent.

20. Support must also be extended to the front-line States, which were daily exposed to the aggressive acts of Salisbury and Pretoria.

21. Finally, his delegation, while hoping that the London Conference would be successful, considered that, should the talks fail, the Zimbabwean people would have no alternative but to continue the struggle until independence was gained.

22. Mr. RAHMTALLA (Sudan) reiterated his country's unreserved support for the people of Zimbabwe in their struggle, under the leadership of the Patriotic Front, to obtain freedom and majority rule by all means possible, including armed struggle. At the same time, however, his country supported all the peaceful efforts being made to achieve that aim, particularly the talks currently under way in London.

/...

(Mr. Rahamtalla, Sudan)

23. Since the 1960s, the United Nations had been endeavouring to ensure the victory of a régime which would guarantee the population of the region the full exercise of its rights to total independence on the basis of majority rule. In 1965, the Security Council had denounced Ian Smith's unilateral declaration of independence and had imposed sanctions against the Rhodesian régime. There was no need to dwell on the isolation of that régime and on the manoeuvres in which it engaged in order to disguise the fact that the "internal settlement" was intended merely to strengthen white domination by means of a puppet régime. The General Assembly, the Security Council and the Special Committee of 24, on behalf of the international community, had rejected that position and had repudiated the sham elections organized by Smith and Muzorewa. The political and military struggle of the Zimbabwean people under the leadership of their sole authentic representative, the Patriotic Front, was an effective contribution to the solution of the question, and it was the duty of the international community to support that struggle.

24. In August 1979, at the meeting of Heads of Government of Commonwealth countries at Lusaka, the international community had reiterated its commitment to black majority rule and had stated that the United Kingdom Government had the constitutional responsibility to bring about the independence of Zimbabwe on the basis of majority rule. All the parties concerned must participate in the search for a lasting solution, and free elections must be organized under the supervision of the United Kingdom Government and representatives of the Commonwealth. It was with the greatest interest that his delegation had followed the negotiations and had listened to the statements made by the representatives of the United Kingdom, on the one hand, and of the Patriotic Front, on the other. He had learned with satisfaction that on certain questions progress had been made towards an agreement which might lead to a peaceful solution. At the same time, it must be acknowledged that the Conference was currently faced with the extremely important question of the cease-fire and that it had reached a most disquieting deadlock. His delegation wished to appeal to all the parties to show patience, understanding and a spirit of co-operation so that an agreement acceptable to all could be achieved.

25. Bearing in mind the complex and delicate nature of the situation, his delegation considered that the closest attention should be given to certain fundamental facts: firstly, the Lancaster House talks were the last opportunity to find a peaceful solution to the problem if the escalation of violence and bloodshed was to be prevented, since the conflict was liable to spread and international peace and security would be jeopardized were the Conference to fail and Pretoria to intervene. Secondly, the liberation of Zimbabwe and the establishment of a truly democratic Government meant that assistance must be given to all the front-line States which were the victims of repeated aggression that inflicted heavy losses upon them and prevented them from developing their economies. Thirdly, black majority rule in Zimbabwe would make a positive contribution to the efforts of the peace-loving countries and would ensure that freedom prevailed in the region and in Namibia; that would lead to the elimination of the apartheid system practised by South Africa in a large part of southern Africa. Fourthly, his delegation hoped that the Lusaka Declaration would continue to serve as a framework for the current talks at Lancaster House, as the representative of the United Kingdom had himself affirmed. The organization of

/...

(Mr. Rahamtalla, Sudan)

free elections under the supervision of the United Kingdom and the Commonwealth countries seemed to be a satisfactory solution, and he hoped that those elections would be organized as had been envisaged at Lusaka, with the support of the international community. Fifthly, it must be emphasized that, until the international community was assured of the success of the negotiations, any attempt by any country to lift the sanctions imposed by the Security Council would be tantamount to approving an unacceptable and unjust presence in the territory of Southern Rhodesia. Furthermore, the question of lifting the sanctions must be considered in the first instance by the Security Council, which was the only body competent to do so.

26. Mr. GELAGA-KING (Sierra Leone) recalled that, during the special series of meetings of the Special Committee of 24 held at Belgrade in April 1979, his delegation had stressed the blatantly discriminatory nature of the so-called internal settlement, the illegality of the constitution resulting therefrom and the responsibility of the United Kingdom Government which, as the administering Power, should take all appropriate steps to restore legality in the Territory. His delegation once again emphasized the need to reach a properly negotiated settlement, with the participation of the Patriotic Front, and to draw up a new constitution to replace the one which had been formulated under the so-called internal settlement. He was therefore pleased to note that a negotiated peace was on the point of being concluded as a result of the action taken by Commonwealth leaders at Lusaka.

27. He also expressed his delegation's unreserved support for the appeal made by the representative of the administering Power that all those concerned should do their utmost to bring about a peaceful transition to majority rule and to put an end to the war and bloodshed in Zimbabwe. In that respect, he wished to congratulate all those who had worked so tirelessly to organize the London talks and, in particular, the Patriotic Front, which had demonstrated its goodwill by agreeing to make concessions with a view to a lasting solution to the problem. It was therefore to be hoped that the proposals of the Patriotic Front regarding a cease-fire and the establishment of a Commonwealth observer force would be given serious consideration and that the results of the negotiations would be not merely a tactical compromise but a genuine agreement concluded under the auspices of the administering Power between all the parties to the conflict which would lead to genuine majority rule through free and fair elections.

28. His delegation was also gravely concerned over the continuing acts of aggression by the Rhodesian forces against Zambia, a country which had consistently supported the people of Zimbabwe in their struggle against domination and exploitation by the white racists and their allies. The international community should not only condemn such acts, but should also take steps to put an end to them and to ensure that the aggressors bore the full responsibility for their actions. In that respect, the veiled threat of the South African Prime Minister to intervene if a government not to his liking came to power in Zimbabwe, and the actions of the South African armed forces which had infiltrated into the southern part of Zimbabwe were especially disturbing.

/...

(Mr. Gelaga-King, Sierra Leone)

29. Since the talks were entering their final stage, early consideration must be given to the difficulties that Zimbabwe would have to face after independence. The country would urgently need to reconstruct its war-ravaged economy in order to meet the challenges of a modern society, and it was to be hoped that plans to meet that contingency would form part of the over-all London agreement.

30. In conclusion, the Government and the people of Sierra Leone looked forward at the next meeting of the Organization of African Unity to welcoming Zimbabwe as a free and independent State which would have contributed to the elimination of the last bastion of colonialism and racism in Africa.

31. Mr. OUATTARA (Mali) said that the Constitutional Conference currently under way in London represented a crucial phase in the settlement of the question of Southern Rhodesia. The events that had led to the convening of that Conference had undoubtedly been brought about by the nationalists of Zimbabwe who, merged in the Patriotic Front and with the support of the international community, were endeavouring to ensure the triumph of right and justice in Southern Rhodesia so that the people of Zimbabwe could exercise their right to self-determination and achieve independence.

32. It was the Patriotic Front which, through its remarkable political acumen, total devotion to the cause of its homeland and single-minded attachment to the noble ideals of the Charter of the United Nations, had foiled all the dubious attempts to settle the Rhodesian problem, thwarted all endeavours to gain recognition for the racist minority régime, and prevailed upon the United Nations to recognize the legitimacy of its struggle. The Patriotic Front was currently commanding the attention of the world conscience to the extent that no solution to the Rhodesian problem was conceivable without the effective participation of the Front in the negotiations and any settlement which did not meet with its approval was unacceptable. It was therefore inadmissible that the Patriotic Front, which embodied the conscience of the people of Zimbabwe, should, at the London Conference, be subjected to pressure, blackmail and ultimatums by the administering Power and the Iluzoreva-Smith clique, which were attempting to induce the Patriotic Front to renounce the sacred objectives which it had set for itself and to accept proposals which were contrary to its interests.

33. His country noted with regret that the United Kingdom intended to proceed with a sham decolonization of Southern Rhodesia under which power would remain in the hands of a group of puppets in the pay of the white minority. It also deplored the methods used by the administering Power and the partiality which the latter had shown throughout the current talks at Lancaster House. If tangible progress had been achieved at the Constitutional Conference, it was solely due to the efforts of the Patriotic Front which, through its patience and courage, had induced the United Kingdom to make certain concessions. It was regrettable that the administering Power was insisting that the role of the representatives of the Commonwealth and the United Nations, which was still considering the problem, should be restricted to that of mere bystanders and that the administering Power had unilaterally determined that the duration of the period needed to prepare for elections would be only two months. Such haste was totally unrealistic and did not offer equal opportunities to all the parties involved.

/...

(Mr. Ouattara, Mali)

34. His delegation therefore entertained grave doubts regarding the impartiality of the administering Power during the constitutional talks and reaffirmed the need to acknowledge the legitimate misgivings of the Patriotic Front. A settlement of the Rhodesian problem could not be reached by making threats and exerting pressure on the Patriotic Front with a view to inducing the latter to renounce fundamental principles. The Front's cause was a just one, its attitude responsible, and its objectives were in conformity with those of OAU and the United Nations; the international community should therefore continue to assist it. The Republic of Mali, which had expressed its full support for, and its active solidarity with, the Patriotic Front since the latter's establishment, wished to reaffirm its confidence in, and support for, the Front.

35. Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania) said that his delegation had noted with great interest the working papers which the Special Committee of 24 and the Secretariat had prepared for the Fourth Committee. Since the Committee was thus in possession of all the requisite information and facts, it should lose no time in determining how best it could use that information in order to give effective assistance to the people of Zimbabwe in their struggle against colonial domination and oppression.

36. Since 1965, when Smith had made his unilateral declaration of independence, the United Republic of Tanzania had consistently affirmed that it regarded Southern Rhodesia as a British colony and that, consequently, the responsibility for the decolonization of the Territory lay with the United Kingdom. The Tanzanian Government had systematically supported every move and every initiative aimed at accelerating the decolonization of Southern Rhodesia whenever it had seemed apparent that they might promote the accession of Zimbabwe to independence on the basis of genuine majority rule. His country had supported the armed struggle only when it had become evident that it was the only way to achieve the desired objective.

37. In September 1979, the Patriotic Front had agreed to attend a constitutional conference convened in London for the purpose of negotiating with the United Kingdom Government the modalities for the Territory's accession to independence. The United Republic of Tanzania had encouraged those negotiations for three reasons: because the people of Zimbabwe, through the Patriotic Front as their sole authentic representative, had agreed to take part; because at the Commonwealth conference held at Lusaka in August 1979, the United Kingdom Government, as the administering Power, had undertaken to decolonize Southern Rhodesia by means of negotiation; and, finally, because the United Republic of Tanzania, as a matter of policy, supported every attempt to reach a peaceful settlement of the question.

38. While, in his opinion, that combination of circumstances provided a sufficient basis for a successful outcome to the Lancaster House conference, he fully understood the apprehension in some quarters with regard to the negotiations. It was not the first time that the Patriotic Front had taken part in negotiations with the United Kingdom Government regarding independence for Zimbabwe; the Front had gone to Geneva in 1977 and to Malta and Dar es Salaam in 1978 for that same purpose. The failure of the various conferences was due to the fact that the United Kingdom had betrayed the Front, had lacked the necessary firmness, and had consistently sought to appease Smith instead of devoting all its efforts to the actual process of decolonization.

/...

(Mr. Fom, United Republic of Tanzania)

39. Despite the unhappy experiences of the past, the Patriotic Front had agreed in good faith to sit once again at a conference table to negotiate the independence of Zimbabwe with the United Kingdom Government. Its continuing perseverance, patience and statesmanship were commendable. However, in order to achieve the genuine decolonization of Southern Rhodesia and thus bring independence to the Territory on the basis of majority rule it was essential to respect the wishes of the people of Zimbabwe. The Patriotic Front had expressed its aspirations in the most unequivocal terms at Lancaster House, and the United Kingdom Government would be making a fatal mistake if it chose to ignore them.

40. In that context, it was fair and reasonable that the Patriotic Front should be asking for sufficient time to create an atmosphere conducive to free and fair elections. Any undue haste would be damaging to the interests of the people of Zimbabwe themselves.

41. He wished to state that if free elections were organized in Zimbabwe, his country would respect their results. If such elections were not held, it would intensify its support for the Patriotic Front's armed struggle.

42. It was important to maintain all the sanctions imposed against Southern Rhodesia by the United Nations Security Council until the negotiations on the independence of Zimbabwe had been completed and agreement had been reached. Various rumours were, however, circulating in London to the effect that certain aspects of those sanctions would be lifted in the very near future. The United Kingdom Government must realize that, if it did take such action, it would be violating a Security Council resolution and encouraging the Salisbury régime, while betraying the confidence which the international community had placed in it. It was therefore of the highest importance that the United Kingdom should not take any measure which could be construed as giving support to the racist minority régime or conferring on it a semblance of legitimacy and which might jeopardize the process set in motion by the Commonwealth countries at Lusaka.

43. The Patriotic Front had shown remarkable flexibility and goodwill in the negotiations at Lancaster House. On behalf of the majority of the people of Zimbabwe, it had put forward proposals which would ensure that the independence of the Territory was both peaceful and durable. It was up to the Government of the United Kingdom to take advantage of that goodwill to solve the problem of Southern Rhodesia without further delay, since it was the last chance to achieve a peaceful settlement.

44. During the final phase of the liberation of Zimbabwe, his delegation urged the international community to intensify its support for the people of Zimbabwe in their armed struggle, through the Patriotic Front, against the illegal minority régime of Southern Rhodesia. It was essential that the United Kingdom should be aware that the United Nations unanimously and unreservedly supported the liberation of Zimbabwe, in accordance with the wishes of the people.

/...

45. Mrs. UNAYDIN (Turkey) said that her delegation had on many occasions condemned the illegal minority régime of Ian Smith and had called for the prompt conclusion of a negotiated settlement based on genuine majority rule in accordance with the true aspirations of the Patriotic Front and the people of Zimbabwe, just as it had always condemned the persistent acts of aggression and atrocities perpetrated by that régime against the front-line States.

46. Although the situation in Southern Rhodesia had not changed essentially since the previous session of the General Assembly, certain encouraging signs could none the less be detected. Various initiatives had been taken which should make it possible to break the deadlock. Her delegation was particularly pleased to note the agreement reached by the Heads of Government of Commonwealth countries at Lusaka in August 1979, and the convening of the Constitutional Conference in London in September 1979, which brought together all the parties to the dispute for the first time within a realistic framework for the purpose of arriving at a negotiated settlement. It was encouraging to note that perceptible progress had already been made in the London talks on the adoption of a new Constitution and on the arrangements for the transitional period.

47. In that connexion, a special tribute should be paid to the United Kingdom Government, which had shown patience and determination in carrying out the delicate task and heavy responsibility which devolved upon it as the administering Power, and also to the front-line States and the Patriotic Front for the sense of responsibility, the flexibility and the spirit of compromise they had shown throughout the negotiations. It was to be hoped that the same spirit of realism, co-operation and restraint would enable the parties involved in the London Conference to overcome the final obstacles and to ensure the practical implementation of their decision so that a free, independent and democratic Zimbabwe could soon take its rightful place in the United Nations.

48. Her delegation deplored the highly destructive effects of the recent attacks on Zambia by the Salisbury régime in collaboration with South Africa. It categorically condemned those atrocities and hoped that the parties involved would in future refrain from such irresponsible acts, which jeopardized a peaceful solution to the question of Zimbabwe.

49. It was also essential that the international community should continue to observe scrupulously the economic sanctions imposed against the Salisbury régime by the United Nations. Her Government was fully implementing the relevant United Nations resolutions; it maintained no relations with the Salisbury and Pretoria régimes. It reiterated its belief that a peaceful solution to the question of Zimbabwe, based on genuine majority rule resulting from free and fair elections, would not only be in the interests of the indigenous population but would also contribute to the establishment of peace and stability in southern Africa as a whole.

50. Mr. AMPAT (Congo) said that 14 years had elapsed since Ian Smith had defied the world by his unilateral declaration of independence in Southern Rhodesia. Faced with the conniving and reprehensible vacillations of the administering Power, the people of Zimbabwe had taken the irrevocable decision to wage an armed struggle, under the leadership of their sole legitimate representative, the Patriotic Front, in order to free themselves from the yoke of the white racists.

/...

(Mr. Ampat, Congo)

51. In a desperate effort to maintain its domination over the Territory, the illegal Smith régime had resorted to inhuman measures of repression, terror and intimidation, both against the people of Zimbabwe and against neighbouring independent States. Far from discouraging the forces of the Patriotic Front, such barbarous acts had led them to intensify their struggle against the illegal Smith régime and to extend their military activity to the entire Territory, including Salisbury.

52. The Patriotic Front had thus given material proof of its existence and its representative nature; by associating themselves with that struggle, the people themselves had taken up arms. That was what had led Ian Smith to state on 11 January 1979 that it had to be recognized that majority rule was inevitable, and that his Government had no possibility of overcoming the guerrillas. That did not imply that the illegal régime was ready to give in. However, its efforts to deceive world public opinion by imposing the so-called internal settlement of 3 March 1978, followed by elections which had been declared null and void by all international bodies, had been favourably received only in certain Western circles which had always publicly maintained that the elections were an important step towards a lasting solution to the Southern Rhodesian problem.

53. Furthermore, the administering Power had recently engaged in Machiavellian manoeuvres with a view to lifting the sanctions imposed by the United Nations against the illegal Smith-Muzorewa régime - a fact which would indicate that the United Kingdom Government was tacitly supporting the illegal Government of Abel Muzorewa, the man of straw of the white racist minority. It was, however, to be hoped that the initiative, which had been condemned by the international community, would not come to fruition before the establishment of majority rule in Zimbabwe.

54. The hopes engendered by the London Conference seemed to have been misplaced in that, although the Patriotic Front had made significant concessions during the negotiations, it found itself in great difficulties in trying to secure agreement regarding the nature and composition of the neutral Commonwealth force which would be responsible for observing the implementation of the cease-fire during the transitional period. It was essential that the administering Power should show compassion for the sufferings of the Zimbabwean people by accepting the constructive proposals of the Patriotic Front without further delay. Once the final agreement was signed, it would be the duty of the United Nations to urge all Governments scrupulously to respect its implementation.

55. Finally, his delegation hoped in the very near future to see a truly independent Zimbabwe occupying its proper place in the United Nations and making its contribution to the realization of the noble aims which the Organization had set itself.

The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.