
SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 36th 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)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

* 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.

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 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/34/88, 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. Miss VALERE (Trinidad and Tobago) said that ever since Smith's unilateral declaration of independence in 1965, the efforts of the international community to put an end to his illegal régime had met with little success. The "internal settlement" of 1978, which was supposed to result in black majority rule, had merely been a manoeuvre on the part of the illegal régime to conceal its true intentions from the international community. The latter had, however, declared that Southern Rhodesia still needed to be decolonized and that major responsibility for so doing lay with the United Kingdom as the administering Power. The internal settlement had also contributed to an escalation of the armed conflict in Southern Rhodesia and neighbouring countries. For that reason, the initiative taken by the Commonwealth Heads of Government at Lusaka with a view to finding a just and lasting solution to the problem was to be welcomed, since it had led to the negotiations currently taking place in London between the United Kingdom, the Patriotic Front and the Smith-Muzorewa régime.

2. Her delegation was following the talks with keen interest and found the results achieved so far encouraging. It was nevertheless convinced that any solution to the problem had to be in accordance with the legitimate aspirations of the black majority of the Territory and that, if it was to be a genuine solution, the independence of Zimbabwe must be founded on a democratic constitution and a government chosen by the people through free and fair elections.

3. The Lancaster House Conference had reached a critical juncture where everything seemed to hinge on the way the delicate question of a cease-fire would be settled. The administering Power should take into account the proposals on the matter submitted to it by the Patriotic Front, since an enduring settlement of the Rhodesian question had to involve all the parties to the conflict. The sanctions imposed against Southern Rhodesia should be maintained until a comprehensive agreement on the independence of Zimbabwe had been reached.

4. Mr. CARR (Jamaica) said that his Government had consistently supported all international action designed to ensure that the people of Zimbabwe exercised their legitimate political rights; it had repeatedly repudiated the so-called internal settlement of 1978, together with the constitution and the fraudulent elections which had ensued therefrom. Similarly, it had supported the efforts made to resolve the question of Southern Rhodesia, culminating in the negotiations now under way in London. It was his sincere hope that the participants in the Conference would achieve an internationally acceptable settlement and that the United Kingdom

/...

(Mr. Carr, Jamaica)

Government would discharge its responsibilities properly. The constructive, flexible and conciliatory approach of the Patriotic Front to the talks also deserved notice. Notwithstanding the progress achieved towards a peaceful solution to the conflict, his country was concerned over the continuing acts of aggression perpetrated by the illegal Salisbury régime against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of neighbouring countries, most recently against Zambia, in an attempt to destroy that country's economic infrastructure. His delegation supported the recent Security Council action on the matter as it posed a direct threat to the peace and security of southern Africa and the whole world.

5. It behoved members of the international community to oppose any attempt to undermine the efforts being made to find a just and lasting solution to the conflict. It was obvious that any unilateral lifting of sanctions before an agreement had been reached would not only be premature but could also jeopardize the outcome of the current negotiations and would be inimical to both the short-term and the long-term interests of the people of Zimbabwe. It should not be forgotten that Pretoria had offered military and economic assistance to the Smith régime, thereby revealing its sinister designs on Zimbabwe and its hopes of turning it into a satellite State. No effort should be spared to frustrate any such manoeuvres, which might adversely affect the course of events in Zimbabwe.

6. His delegation sincerely hoped that the London negotiations would lead to the establishment of a system of genuine majority rule in Zimbabwe; otherwise, the people of Zimbabwe would have no alternative but to continue and intensify the armed struggle until they were at last able to exercise their right in peace and freedom.

7. Mr. TLOU (Botswana) said that, like the rest of the international community, his country attached great importance to the liberation of Zimbabwe. That was why it supported the Patriotic Front in its struggle and the search for a negotiated peaceful settlement to the problem of Southern Rhodesia. The people of Zimbabwe must be free to decide their own future and it was for them to determine the modalities of their accession to independence.

8. His delegation welcomed the convening of the Constitutional Conference in London following the agreement reached at Lusaka, to which Botswana was a party. His country would like to commend the Patriotic Front for the spirit of accommodation it had shown and the concessions it had made to enable the talks to proceed towards a successful conclusion. His delegation considered that the final document adopted at the Lancaster House Conference should have the agreement of all the parties concerned. Any settlement that failed to take into account the views and proposals of the Patriotic Front could not possibly put an end to the hostilities, which was a prerequisite for the establishment of a genuine system of majority rule in Zimbabwe. It was up to the United Kingdom Government to ensure a fair and equitable transition to majority rule and to carry out its responsibility with regard to the Territory in a manner that would inspire confidence not only among the people of Zimbabwe but in the international community as a whole.

/...

9. Mr. LUSAKA (Zambia) said that, whatever its outcome, the Lancaster House Conference had ushered in a new era for Zimbabwe, and he welcomed the United Kingdom's acceptance of its constitutional responsibilities with regard to Southern Rhodesia and its willingness to organize free and fair elections in Zimbabwe. He also commended the seriousness, realism and wisdom shown by the Patriotic Front in its approach to the negotiations, the success or failure of which would depend to a large extent on the attitude of the United Kingdom, whose responsibility it was to ensure that the transition to independence in Zimbabwe was irreversible.

10. For many years, South Africa had fought alongside the Smith régime and had provided it with military and economic assistance, in gross violation of the mandatory sanctions imposed against Southern Rhodesia by the Security Council. The threat of South African military intervention in Zimbabwe in the event of a victory by the Patriotic Front in the elections was a real and very grave one; it was yet another affront to all democratic principles and values. South Africa must be warned that any military intervention on its part would automatically invite action by the international community under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. The international community should also reject the Pretoria régime's attempts to establish a constellation of satellite States around South Africa. The assistance provided by South Africa had encouraged the illegal minority Rhodesia régime to commit acts of aggression against the front-line States of Botswana, Mozambique, Angola and Zambia. It had recently embarked on a campaign to destroy Zambia's economic infrastructure and thereby weaken the latter's support for the liberation struggle. His delegation hoped that Member States would respond to the appeal recently made to them by the Security Council and that they would extend to Zambia any assistance which it might need.

11. Zambia would continue to support the people of Zimbabwe in their just struggle for freedom and genuine independence and the cause of peace, freedom and justice, principles which were proclaimed in the United Nations Charter. The very convening of the Lancaster House Conference represented a victory for the forces fighting for independence and majority rule. In that connexion, special mention should be made of the important part played by the international community, and particularly by the non-aligned countries, the socialist countries and other peace-loving States which had rendered generous assistance to the Patriotic Front. However, the war was not over, and if the current Conference in London failed to produce the desired results, fully compatible with the legitimate aspirations of the oppressed people of Zimbabwe, the armed struggle would continue. The oppressed people and their national liberation movement would continue to rely on international support and solidarity until final victory was achieved.

12. Mr. HACHEME (Benin) said that at a time when the Lancaster House negotiations were on the point of concluding, it should be borne in mind that the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the non-aligned movement and the United Nations had recognized the Patriotic Front as the sole authentic representative of the people of Zimbabwe, and that, if the administering Power had been obliged to convene the London Conference, it was essentially because the representative role of the Patriotic Front had been disregarded and because the so-called internal settlement

(Mr. Hacheme, Benin)

which had brought the traitor Muzorewa to power had received a stunning setback. In that connexion, it was disquieting to note that, once again, events at Lancaster House seemed to be developing into an endeavour by the administering Power to obtain international recognition for the Ian Smith-Muzorewa clique: it was as though the main object of the Conference was to finish the work of the rebel, Ian Smith, in order to obtain the official blessing of the States Members of the United Nations. There was no other explanation for the fact that the traitor, Muzorewa and his masters, the white racists and colonialists of South Africa, had been given a privileged position in the negotiations while the Patriotic Front had been subjected to blackmail and pressure, ultimatums being given to its representatives to get them to renounce their claims while bilateral agreements were concluded with the traitor, Muzorewa. For those reasons, his delegation could not help accusing the administering Power of evading its responsibilities. Any just and durable solution to such a thorny problem must be sought in collaboration with the representatives of the Patriotic Front, who alone knew, understood and could translate into action the deep aspirations of the people of Zimbabwe, and not with those who had always put the latter's interests last.

13. The fact that the colonialist, racist minority régime in Pretoria had stationed its troops all along the southern border of Southern Rhodesia, while the London talks were still in progress, and that the Ian Smith-Muzorewa tandem was frantically attacking Zambia and inflicting enormous loss of human life, showed that those Governments were trying by force and intimidation to prevent a peaceful, just and lasting solution of the conflict. His delegation condemned all such acts and threats of aggression and hoped that the international community would insist that the South African régime should immediately withdraw its troops from the Rhodesian borders and cease its acts of aggression against the front-line States. It was also the duty of the United Nations to maintain the sanctions imposed against the illegal Ian Smith régime until the problem had been solved to the satisfaction of the overwhelming majority of the heroic and peaceful people of Zimbabwe.

14. Mr. FERGUSON (Guyana) said that the question of Southern Rhodesia had engaged the attention of the General Assembly and the Security Council for more than a decade. If the many General Assembly decisions reaffirming the right of the people of Zimbabwe to self-determination and independence, and the sanctions imposed by the Security Council in 1968 against the illegal minority régime in Southern Rhodesia had been strictly applied, the peoples of Zimbabwe, Botswana, Mozambique and Zambia, victims of the intransigence of Ian Smith supported by Western economic interests, would have been spared much suffering. However, those decisions, together with the decisions adopted by the Organization of African Unity and the non-aligned countries, had given the Patriotic Front the necessary moral support. A combination of international pressure and the armed struggle waged by the Patriotic Front had finally moved the racist régime in Southern Rhodesia to enter into negotiations with the Patriotic Front.

15. It was against that background that the States members of the Commonwealth had met at Lusaka in August and had been able to agree on a framework for seeking a final settlement of the problem of Southern Rhodesia, which provided, among other

/...

(Mr. Ferguson, Guyana)

things, for black majority rule for the people of Zimbabwe, and recognized the need to achieve a lasting settlement involving all the parties to the conflict. That was the origin of the London talks. His delegation had been following those talks very closely and was pleased to note the progress which had been made, particularly in relation to the constitution and the transitional arrangements, thanks to the good will, flexibility and willingness to negotiate of the Patriotic Front. It could be hoped therefore, that it would be possible to arrive at a comprehensive and just agreement for a peaceful transition to independence and that the proposals presented by the Patriotic Front, in particular those relating to the cease-fire arrangements would be accepted. It was essential not to jeopardize the results achieved after so many weeks of effort, and to seek a lasting settlement involving all the parties to the dispute, with the support of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

16. His delegation deeply regretted to learn of the presence in the southern part of Zimbabwe of South African troops which, according to South Africa, had volunteered for service with the Rhodesian army. Guyana vigorously condemned the presence of those troops and called on the United Kingdom Government, as the administering Power, to demand that South Africa withdraw the troops immediately and cease to interfere in the internal affairs of a Territory which was the responsibility of the United Kingdom alone. The international community had not supported Zimbabwean independence and the Patriotic Front had not waged its armed struggle to liberate Zimbabwe merely in order to deliver the Territory into the hands of the racists of Pretoria. The agreement to be concluded in London must be implemented in the manner agreed upon by the parties concerned without any external interference. Guyana would continue to support the Patriotic Front in its struggle for the independence of Zimbabwe and for black majority rule. He also took the opportunity to assure the Zambian people, who were victims of aggression by the racist Salisbury régime, of Guyana's solidarity with them.

17. Mr. HERMIDA (Nicaragua) said that the Committee was taking up the question of Southern Rhodesia at a particularly critical time, when the future of Zimbabwe was being decided in London. The Lancaster House talks were the result of the sacrifices of the people of Zimbabwe, whose struggle against the forces of colonialism had obliged the administering Power and the Rhodesian leaders to start negotiations. Some attempts, however, were still being made to perpetuate the present régime in Southern Rhodesia, but just as in Nicaragua the Sandinista forces had been able to prevent the installation of a Somoza régime without Somoza, there was hope that things might go the same way in Zimbabwe.

18. The administering Power could obviously not bring lasting peace to Zimbabwe if it maintained links with the racist South African régime. Since the "internal settlement", 15,000 people had been imprisoned in Zimbabwe where the Muzorewa régime, with South African assistance, was maintaining intact the structures of the minority racist régime. The apartheid system was thus at the heart of the Southern Rhodesian problem. In so far as the right to self-determination, independence and a truly representative government were universal rights, the rights of the people of Zimbabwe could not be infringed upon by decisions taken in London. His delegation hoped that the Committee would give its clear support to the position taken by the Patriotic Front.

/...

19. Mr. CARTER (Barbados) said that, although significant progress had been made towards the return of Southern Rhodesia to legitimacy and the attainment of self-determination and independence for the Territory, there were still obstacles to a speedy settlement of the question particularly so far as the cease-fire arrangements were concerned. Barbados would maintain its opposition to the illegal racist régime in Southern Rhodesia until Zimbabwe was fully independent. At the Lusaka Conference, therefore, it had welcomed the United Kingdom Government's proposals regarding negotiations to decide on the future of the Territory and it was heartened by the progress achieved at the Lancaster House talks. Now that a final settlement was near at hand, all the participants should endeavour to resolve the remaining differences, particularly in regard to the cease-fire arrangements, in the spirit which had characterized the negotiations thus far. It was particularly important not to create the impression that some participants were at an advantage as compared with others otherwise the negotiations would break down. The Patriotic Front was regarded by the vast majority of people of the world as the legitimate spokesman for the majority of the inhabitants of Zimbabwe; in the eyes of the world, the sinners were Ian Smith, his illegal régime and the puppet régime currently established in Southern Rhodesia, and the sinned against were the oppressed majority of the people of Southern Rhodesia.

20. The United Kingdom, as the administering Power, should ensure that the cease-fire arrangements took account of the concerns of the Patriotic Front. The timing of the elections was also important and the Patriotic Front should have an opportunity to reach the people. Those guarantees were of the utmost importance. In addition, the monitoring forces should be as neutral as possible and should under no circumstances involve the participation of South African forces. The fact that the Salisbury régime had recently resumed its dangerous attacks on Zambia was to be deplored, and the United Kingdom should ensure that such attacks did not recur. Lastly, Barbados would continue to oppose the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia until the Territory had achieved independence, and it trusted that, until then, the sanctions imposed against Southern Rhodesia would not be lifted, either by the United Kingdom or by any other country that might be thinking of doing so.

21. Mr. LOBO (Mozambique) said that the Constitutional Conference on Southern Rhodesia which was still under way in London, was a direct result of the armed struggle waged by the people of Zimbabwe under the leadership of the Patriotic Front. The first objective of the Lancaster House talks should therefore be to eliminate the causes of the armed conflict and to create conditions conducive to the complete independence of that British Territory. The United Kingdom, however, appeared reluctant to discharge its responsibilities as a colonizing Power and to keep the promises it had made to the other Commonwealth countries. On many occasions, the United Kingdom Government had resorted to pressure and threats and, had it not been for the political maturity, wisdom and spirit of compromise of the Patriotic Front, the negotiations would have broken down. As the negotiations entered their final phase, the Patriotic Front was asking that the elections should be free and should be conducted smoothly. That implied that the Patriotic Front forces should participate in the maintenance of law and order on an equal footing with the forces of the Salisbury régime and that, during the transitional period, a Zimbabwean

(Mr. Lobo, Mozambique)

national army should be created by combining the two forces to ensure that the cease-fire was observed. The Patriotic Front should therefore be given sufficient time to arrange for Zimbabwean refugees and other displaced persons to participate in the electoral process and to take the necessary measures to maintain peace during the transitional period prior to independence. The United Kingdom could hardly refuse to accede to those elementary and legitimate demands of the Patriotic Front, from which it had obtained so many concessions.

22. Mozambique called upon the United Kingdom Government to take advantage of the prospects for a settlement of the Southern Rhodesian problem created at the Lusaka Conference and the London talks and to grant the Patriotic Front the conditions necessary for a solution to the problem. Although Mozambique remained in frequent contact with the United Kingdom Government on the matter, that did not affect its solidarity with the Zimbabwean people. It would continue to apply the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia until the Security Council decided to lift them and, as stated by the President of Mozambique at the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, it would continue to support the armed struggle of the Patriotic Front until the latter had achieved its objective. Like the whole international community, Mozambique wanted to see a stable, peaceful, united, democratic, anti-racist and independent Zimbabwe. Without the Patriotic Front, that objective could not be achieved.

23. Mr. de FIGUEIREDO (Angola) said that African States should not only assume their responsibilities with regard to the attainment of independence by Zimbabwe and support the struggle waged by the Patriotic Front - the movement recognized by the Organization of African Unity as the sole legitimate representative of the people of Zimbabwe - but should be even more vigilant in ensuring that the settlement being negotiated in London would enable the national liberation movement to play its rightful role during the transitional period. The Patriotic Front had displayed as much courage, wisdom and adaptability at the negotiating table as it had on the battlefield, thereby demonstrating its will to achieve genuine independence for Zimbabwe and to establish peace and stability in Southern Africa. Consequently, it was the duty of the administering Power and of the other members of the international community to guarantee that the London negotiations resulted in a total and fair solution, and that the agreements reached within the framework of those negotiations were faithfully implemented so that the enormous sacrifices made by the people of Zimbabwe would not have been in vain. The five Western Powers would have to be vigilant, for the thought of genuine majority rule and the dismantling of the white-privilege structure was unlikely to please the racist minority in Southern Rhodesia and its puppets, who were ready to strike again when the opportunity presented itself.

24. The South African racist régime had declared that the situation in Zimbabwe was of vital concern to it and that it would not hesitate to intervene militarily if the situation so required. There was already much incontrovertible proof of the South African military presence in Zimbabwe. It had been acknowledged, for example, that South African troops had their own command headquarters at Fort Victoria and carried out military operations in the southern part of the country, that South African officers had been allowed to serve with the Salisbury forces

/...

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

for extended periods, and that South African helicopter pilots had been assigned to the Southern Rhodesian Government. Moreover, according to the testimony of an American mercenary, South Africa had sent two combat battalions of paratroopers and one squadron of fighter-bombers to Zimbabwe, and South African troops and warplanes had taken part in the recent fighting there. According to the same source, Israeli officers from the Zionist State were assisting the Salisbury junta in an advisory capacity by providing Southern Rhodesian troops with combat training inside South Africa. Moreover, helicopters purchased by Israel had been sold to South Africa, which had then transferred them to Salisbury. That military assistance by one racist minority régime to another was part of a deep and dangerous conspiracy, not only because it sought to deny the people of Zimbabwe their right to freedom, to destroy the forces of the Patriotic Front and to maintain the Smith minority régime, but also because it was part of Pretoria's "grand design" to establish in southern Africa a constellation of subservient States whose economies would be strictly controlled by South Africa, which would thus necessarily be responsible for the defense and foreign affairs of those satellites.

25. In the face of the resistance of the front-line States to the racist, imperialist and colonialist régimes of Pretoria and Salisbury, South Africa had stepped up its efforts to create a white laager inside black Africa not only to keep in check the aspirations of the majority of its own inhabitants but also to exercise military control over all the States in the region which might stand in the way of its plans. South Africa's intransigence on the issue of Namibian independence, its attacks against Angola and its military role in Zimbabwe only served to confirm the nature of its intentions. It was therefore the duty of the five Western Powers to take action to end South Africa's military adventurism and to ensure that its troops withdrew from Zimbabwe; they should give guarantees that, if the outcome of the new elections in Zimbabwe were not to the liking of the forces of racism and imperialism, South Africa would not collude with the racist Smith troops to sabotage international efforts to grant independence to Zimbabwe. It was also necessary to ensure that the Patriotic Front participated fully in any settlement that might be reached on the matter. The People's Republic of Angola would continue to support the Patriotic Front and to render whatever assistance it might need. Angola's progressive role in southern Africa no longer had to be demonstrated; the constant attacks to which it was subjected by the racist junta in Pretoria were proof not only of its devotion to the cause of liberation but also of the danger it represented to racism, imperialism and colonialism in southern Africa and throughout the continent of Africa as a whole.

26. Mr. CLARK (Nigeria) said that his country had participated from the start in all efforts to solve the problem of Southern Rhodesia. After the unilateral declaration of independence in 1965, Nigeria had hosted a Commonwealth conference at which it had been stated that the rebellion would be ended in a few weeks. Thirteen years later, the struggle still went on. The unilateral declaration of independence had been condemned not only by the United Kingdom but also by the General Assembly and the Security Council. The administering Power had requested the assistance of the international community and, in 1968, the Security Council had imposed mandatory sanctions against the rebel régime of Southern Rhodesia.

/...

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

The General Assembly, the Security Council and the Special Committee of 24 had always affirmed the right of the people of Zimbabwe to liberty, self-determination and independence and had requested the United Kingdom, as administering Power, to ensure the exercise of that right and to permit the establishment of majority rule. The United Kingdom was also to undertake measures to keep the illegal Salisbury régime outlawed.

27. All those efforts, however, had failed and the "internal settlement", in which the Patriotic Front, the sole authentic representative of the people of Zimbabwe, had not participated, had been made in March 1979. In April 1979, after the sham elections, Abel Muzorewa had been named "Prime Minister". The General Assembly, the Security Council and the Special Committee had declared that the internal settlement was illegal and that the results of the elections were null and void. The Organization of African Unity and the non-aligned countries had continued to support the people of Zimbabwe in their struggle and had provided financial and material assistance. They had also decided to recognize the Patriotic Front as the sole legitimate representative of the people of Zimbabwe. Meanwhile, the conflict had continued to increase in intensity. In August 1979, the Heads of Government of Commonwealth countries had proclaimed their full support for the principle of black majority rule in Zimbabwe, and had requested the United Kingdom to grant independence to Zimbabwe on that basis. They had also decided to seek a lasting solution to the problem, with the participation of all the interested parties. The accession of Zimbabwe to independence would involve the adoption of a constitution and the future Government of Zimbabwe must be chosen through free elections supervised by the administering Power and in the presence of observers from the Commonwealth. It was against that background that the Lancaster House talks had begun on 10 September 1979.

28. Now that the negotiations had reached the final stage, the spirit of accommodation and the goodwill shown by the Patriotic Front were to be commended. On the other hand, the question arose whether the administering Power was as impartial an arbiter as it claimed, since it had given ultimatums and threatened to lift the mandatory sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. There was no doubt, however, that the United Kingdom had shown patience and realism. The recent attacks against some countries bordering upon Southern Rhodesia, in particular Zambia, showed that the Ian Smith régime stayed in power thanks to the assistance of South Africa and the administering Power. The Security Council had recently adopted a resolution requesting those two countries to pay financial compensation to Zambia for the damages caused by those attacks. His country nevertheless hoped that a lasting solution to the problem of Southern Rhodesia would be found, taking into consideration the proposals of the Patriotic Front.

29. Sir Anthony PARSONS (United Kingdom) said that the Lancaster House talks had not proceeded as well as could have been hoped because the Patriotic Front had still not agreed to the cease-fire proposals. On 28 November, Lord Carrington had responded to various points raised by the Patriotic Front: he had emphasized the role of the cease-fire commission, on which both the Rhodesian forces and the Patriotic Front would be equally represented, described more fully the nature of the monitoring arrangements, and agreed that the monitoring force would have to be larger than had originally been contemplated. He had stated, moreover, that the assembly of the Patriotic Front's armed forces would be essential if there was to be a genuine cease-fire and that there would be a reciprocal disengagement of Rhodesian forces.

/...

(Sir Anthony Parsons, United Kingdom)

30. Since the impasse had continued, the Privy Council had made an Order in Council establishing a temporary Government in Rhodesia, by appointing a Governor in whom full executive and legislative authority would be vested. One of his main tasks, as soon as his authority was accepted there, would be to normalize relations between Southern Rhodesia and the neighbouring States. Under the provisions of the Order in Council, which would not come into operation until the Governor had been appointed and had arrived in Southern Rhodesia, all authorities in Southern Rhodesia would be required to comply with his directions, and the United Kingdom Government would take immediate action to restore lawful government in the Territory and would make arrangements for a cease-fire and for an election. Nevertheless, it must be stressed that the conclusion of a comprehensive agreement in which all the parties could participate was the ultimate objective.

31. It was not, of course, in the power of the United Kingdom Government to oblige the parties to accept its proposals for the cease-fire, but it hoped that the Patriotic Front would agree to them, so that the Conference could consider their practical implementation. The matter was one of urgency because if an agreement was not reached, the achievements at Lancaster House would be prejudiced.

32. He categorically rejected the allegations made by the Soviet, Cuban and Vietnamese delegations and those of Eastern European countries. The representative of the German Democratic Republic, for example, had made the malevolent and dishonest suggestion that the motives of the United Kingdom Government at the London Conference had been to place obstacles in the way of the struggle of the people of Zimbabwe for self-determination. It was absurd to suggest, moreover, as the representative of the Ukrainian SSR had done, that the Conference was an attempt, through pressure, to bind the Patriotic Front to accept a neo-colonialist settlement that would deprive the people of Zimbabwe of the fruits of their decades of struggle. It was just as unjustified for delegations such as that of the Byelorussian SSR to accuse the United Kingdom Government of colluding with the Salisbury delegation to impose a solution against the wishes of the Patriotic Front. In fact, the Soviet Union and its friends did not wish the Conference to succeed in achieving a peaceful settlement of the conflict in Southern Rhodesia, nor did they wish to support what was the most genuine effort ever made to eradicate, once and for all, all the causes of misery and bloodshed in that country.

33. In answer to all those criticisms, he wished to stress once again that when the British Governor went to Salisbury and his authority was accepted there, the rebellion in Southern Rhodesia would be over. Moreover, since the Governor would be British, there could be no question of external intervention. Finally, a major purpose of the Conference was to agree on arrangements for the holding of free and fair elections in Southern Rhodesia, for it was only through such elections that the people of Zimbabwe could truly choose their representatives. It would therefore be wrong at the present stage for the Committee to prejudge the choice that the people of Zimbabwe would make.

34. Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania) said he feared that the United Kingdom would prejudice the negotiations going on in London regarding the problem of Southern Rhodesia by trying to hasten their conclusion. The Patriotic Front, which

/...

(Mr. Foun, United Republic of Tanzania)

embodied the true aspirations of the people of Zimbabwe, had gone to London to work out a comprehensive and acceptable settlement that would lead to a just and lasting solution of the Rhodesian problem. What it asked was simply sufficient time to resolve some essential points and establish the necessary machinery for that purpose.

35. The representative of the United Kingdom had just stated that, once the Governor had arrived in Salisbury, the rebellion would be over. Did that mean that the United Kingdom Government was more concerned with ending the rebellion than with bringing justice to Southern Rhodesia?

36. The Fourth Committee should entreat the United Kingdom to show patience and moderation so as not to prejudice the results achieved so far and so that all parties could thoroughly examine ways to overcome the final obstacles to a just and lasting settlement of the Rhodesian problem.

37. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, categorically denied the accusations made by the United Kingdom delegation against the Soviet Union. The United Kingdom delegation had clearly not listened carefully to the various statements made by members of the Fourth Committee, and had not answered any of the important questions that had been raised, including those raised by the representatives of the African countries, regarding the recruitment of mercenaries and the duration of the transitional period. To contend, as the United Kingdom representative had done, that the socialist countries were opposed to a peaceful settlement of the Rhodesian problem at the Lancaster House Conference was absurd; no one wished more ardently for the success of the London negotiations. But it was true that the socialist States did not want success to be achieved at any price; what they wanted was an outcome that would allow the people of Zimbabwe to establish an independent and sovereign State, rather than a neo-colonialist triumph that would favour the interests of the Muzorewa-Smith clique. If that objective was achieved through the negotiations going on in London, the Soviet Union would be the first to welcome it. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had also been accused of intervening in the London negotiations. But one had only to read the statements of the Soviet delegation on the question of Southern Rhodesia to be convinced that the opposite was true.

38. The majority of States Members of the United Nations hoped that the military operations and bloodshed would cease as soon as possible and that racism and colonialism would disappear from Zimbabwe. Unfortunately, the United Kingdom delegation had not convinced the Committee that that was truly the objective which the United Kingdom was pursuing at the London Conference.

39. Mr. ERAN (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said he felt obliged to make clear Israel's firm and unequivocal position concerning Southern Rhodesia and Israel's strict compliance with Security Council resolution 253 (1968). His delegation therefore categorically rejected all allegations of assistance of any kind by Israel to the current régime in Southern Rhodesia, and in particular, certain allegations in the press implicating Israel in the sale of helicopters made in the United States to Southern Rhodesia. His Government had conducted a thorough investigation, which had shown clearly that those reports were unfounded.

/...

40. Mr. NIKULIN (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, rejected the accusation made by the United Kingdom delegation against the socialist countries, and in particular against the Byelorussian SSR. It was not for the representative of the United Kingdom to tell Committee members what they should think of the Lancaster House talks.
41. The United Kingdom must understand that the course of history was irreversible and that the people of Zimbabwe, led by the Patriotic Front, would emerge victorious from its struggle against the ruling minority.
42. Mr. SEMICHI (Algeria) recalled that, when the representative of the United Kingdom had made his statement on 26 November 1979, his delegation had been the first to remark on its importance and to draw attention to the fact that that representative had asked all Committee members to do nothing that might compromise the negotiations under way at London. In his delegation's view, the Southern Rhodesian problem was at once a decolonization problem to be considered by the General Assembly and a purely African problem whose settlement was of the greatest significance to the countries of Africa. He therefore welcomed the fact that a great many speakers had taken the floor on the question.
43. Mr. NEYTCHEV (Bulgaria), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, deplored the fact that the representative of the United Kingdom had seen fit to lecture Committee members on how they should interpret the London talks. Those talks, far from being a dialogue between equals, were in fact a diktat imposed by the United Kingdom Government. The Bulgarian Government had a very clear position on the question of Southern Rhodesia: it wanted a peaceful solution that would respect the will of the majority of the Zimbabwean people.
44. Mr. SCHLEGEL (German Democratic Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, pointed out that it was not the first time that the United Kingdom delegation had sought to lecture the Committee on issues concerning southern Africa. He categorically repudiated the accusations made by the United Kingdom delegation against the socialist countries, and in particular against the German Democratic Republic. In an earlier statement, his delegation had analysed the situation in Southern Rhodesia, underscoring the close collaboration which existed between the imperialist countries and the racist régime. Its position on the question coincided with the views of the overwhelming majority of the members of the Committee.
45. Moreover, everyone was aware of the manoeuvres used by the imperialist countries to maintain puppet régimes in power and thwart the efforts of peoples struggling for freedom and independence. Totally rejecting the imperialist allegations, the German Democratic Republic, for its part, would continue to give its support to the Zimbabwean people, through the Patriotic Front, and to the front-line States in their just struggle.
46. Mr. YUSUF (Somalia) endorsed the appeal made earlier in the meeting by the Tanzanian delegation, which had asked the United Kingdom Government not to rush matters at the London Conference. The Lancaster House talks were, in fact, the outcome of the efforts made by the Commonwealth countries when they had met at

/...

(Mr. Yusuf, Somalia)

Lusaka in August 1979. It would therefore be useful if the United Kingdom Government called a special meeting of the Heads of State or Government of Commonwealth countries to report back to them. The Commonwealth countries might perhaps find a way out of the impasse.

47. Mr. PEREZ NOVOA (Cuba), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of the United Kingdom had used terms which were insulting to a number of delegations, including the Cuban delegation. It was clear from the statement that the representative had made earlier in the meeting that he had not listened attentively to the various statements in which the delegations in question had outlined their views on the Southern Rhodesian problem and their concern over the progress of the Lancaster House talks. He had, moreover, tried to give a double meaning to the declarations of the delegations expressing their unswerving support for the genuine and legitimate independence of the people of Zimbabwe and for the logical positions of the Patriotic Front. The United Kingdom delegation should in fact answer not to the Committee but precisely to the Patriotic Front and the people of Zimbabwe, which were engaged in a bitter struggle against racism and had displayed admirable patience during the Lancaster House talks with a view to finding the way to genuine independence.

48. Sir Anthony PARSONS (United Kingdom), referring to the points raised by the representatives of the United Republic of Tanzania and Somalia, said that his Government had no intention of rushing matters at Lancaster House; in fact, the Conference had been in session without interruption for almost three months, and the negotiations were continuing. While the United Kingdom wished to achieve a comprehensive settlement of the Southern Rhodesian problem, with the agreement of all parties, it was at the same time aware of the precariousness of the general situation in southern Africa and, for that reason, thought it advisable to reach a conclusion as soon as possible. His Government continued to hope that the parties concerned would reach a comprehensive agreement on the question.

49. With regard to the Somali delegation's suggestion concerning the Commonwealth, he informed the Committee that throughout the Lancaster House talks, his Government had been in constant contact with the diplomatic representatives of the Commonwealth countries at London, as well as with the Governments of the front-line States.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

50. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the observer for the Patriotic Front wished to make a statement at a later meeting to clarify its position on the question before the Committee.

51. He also pointed out that the Committee had not yet received any draft texts concerning the item under consideration and that several delegations had asked for a postponement that would enable them to assess before the discussion any results reached at the London Conference. Since the General Assembly was to examine the question of Namibia on 6, 7 and 10 December, he suggested that the Committee should suspend consideration of the question of Southern Rhodesia until the General

/...

Assembly had finished its consideration of the question of Namibia and should meet subsequently to consider any proposal submitted to it on the question of Southern Rhodesia.

52. He would inform the President of the General Assembly that for reasons beyond its control, the Committee would not be able to meet the deadline set by the General Assembly for the closure of the work of the Main Committees and that it planned to complete its work on 11 December 1979.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.