



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-THIRD YEAR

2090th MEETING: 10 OCTOBER 1978

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2090)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia: Letter dated 6 October 1978 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12885)..	1

190571

NOTE

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

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

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

2090th MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 10 October 1978, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Jacques LEPRETTE (France).

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/2090)

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

Letter dated 6 October 1978 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12885)

The meeting was called to order at 5 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia:

Letter dated 6 October 1978 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12885)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Members of the Council have before them the text of a draft resolution submitted by India, Kuwait, Mauritius and Nigeria and circulated as document S/12887. The Council also has before it document S/12885, which contains the text of a letter dated 6 October 1978 from the representative of India in his capacity as Chairman of the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia.
2. Certain delegations have indicated to me their desire to submit an amendment to document S/12887. In order to facilitate the preparation of the text, I propose, unless someone wishes to speak now, to suspend the meeting for 10 minutes.

The meeting was suspended at 5.05 p.m. and resumed at 5.15 p.m.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should now like to read out the new text of operative paragraph 4, which will be used to replace the version circulated in document S/12887:

“Expresses the hope that the United States of America will continue to exert its influence in order that genuine majority rule may be achieved without further delay in Southern Rhodesia”.

4. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the members of the Council are ready to proceed to vote on the draft resolution as amended [S/12887/Rev.1].

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Bolivia, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Gabon, India, Kuwait, Mauritius, Nigeria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Canada, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.¹

5. Mr. JAIPAL (India): Mr. President, my delegation extends to you its congratulations and good wishes on your presidency of the Council for this month. There is a good deal of important work to be done and difficult problems will come up this month. It is indeed reassuring that you are at the head of the Council. You have already demonstrated that you possess in large measure the special qualities and skill that are needed to maintain the authority of the Council.

6. The question before us today, namely, the violation of the Council's sanctions resulting from the visit to the United States of Mr. Ian Smith, is not as simple as it might seem. It is a matter for regret that the United States Administration felt obliged by the exceptional circumstances of the request for a visa for Mr. Smith to allow him to enter the United States. My delegation does not agree that the refusal of a visa for Mr. Smith might have been just as bad as, if not worse than, the grant of a visa to him. What is worse is the purpose for which Mr. Smith is using his visit. He is obviously bent on winning support for a possible

¹ See resolution 437 (1978).

withdrawal or suspension of sanctions since the future of his illegal régime is closely linked to that. It is essential, therefore, that the United States should maintain the sanctions and scrupulously observe them. It is, of course, within the power of the United States to do so, and indeed the United States Government in its official statement [S/12885, annex I] has declared its intention to continue to comply with Security Council sanctions. My delegation welcomes that declaration of intention.

7. However, what might be more difficult for the United States to do is to convince Mr. Smith of his mistaken ways and that he should hand over power to a majority Government freely elected on the basis of one man, one vote. However, Mr. Smith may prove to be more susceptible to pressure than to persuasion. At any rate, we hope that the opposition of the United States Government to the Smith régime will stiffen and that the forces in favour of genuine majority rule will gain in strength.

8. In conclusion, I cannot help feeling that the Council should have acted much earlier, and certainly before the arrival of Mr. Smith. After all, it was public knowledge for some weeks that Mr. Smith would be going to Washington on invitation. Therefore, in conformity with its resolution 253 (1968), the Council could have called on the United States in time to prevent Mr. Smith's entry. The Council's failure to do so is a reflection of our own unsatisfactory work methods. The question before us is not an allegation of the violation of sanctions that needed investigation by the Committee on Sanctions established in implementation of that resolution; it is a political question, purely and simply, and should have been taken up directly by the Council. We have another similar case of proved violation of sanctions in the Bingham report [see S/12894] and I trust that the Council will deal with it rather than leave it to the Committee on Sanctions.

9. Mr. CARPIO CASTILLO (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation considers that we are dealing with a serious event which involves the authority of the United Nations and the Security Council. Further, it affects the very prestige of the Organization because one Member State has failed to comply with a Council resolution relating to the treatment of the Southern Rhodesian régime represented by Mr. Ian Smith.

10. Mr. Smith is a rebel against the metropolitan Government responsible for the Territory and his Government has usurped that power in order to impose the domination of a racist minority on the people of Zimbabwe, which should be allowed freely to determine its own future. Mr. Smith and his groups of followers have hampered the process of decolonization begun by the United Kingdom and have obstinately opposed the international community, ignoring the resolutions of the Security Council. On 12 November 1965, the Council adopted resolution 216 (1965) in which the illegality of that spurious Government was declared and its obduracy in rejecting a democratic solution for the Territory of Zimbabwe was condemned.

11. It is in these circumstances that an invitation has been extended to Mr. Smith to visit the United States at the instigation and on the very strong pressure of reactionary

circles, whose clear intention it is to hamper any attempt to find a just solution to the problem. My delegation feels that internal decisions adopted by States in exercise of their sovereign rights should be respected, but when such decisions affect international commitments and ignore obligations entered into through agreements in which those States have taken part we feel it our duty to draw attention to such counterproductive decisions.

12. We are very well aware of the origin of such moves, decided as they are by the ignoble, petty economic interests, which are heeded by those intransigent circles acting against the progressive trend of history. They are the same circles that until recently opposed the initiatives taken by President Carter to achieve the signing of a treaty in relation to the Panama Canal, which amended long-standing injustices and imperial acts. They are the same circles that persistently advocate a return to the cold war. These are people who are living 100 years behind the times and who have a calcified, hard-headed attitude which prevents them from seeing clearly the advantage of bringing themselves up to date with the demands of the present. Those circles which are now offering protection and support to the illegal Smith régime are the same that offer protection and support to the illegal, cruel and despotic régime of Somoza in Nicaragua and condone the acts of genocide carried out by that dictatorship against the noble and gallant people of Nicaragua.

13. Our delegation considers that by acting in that way they push those people to violence as the only effective form of struggle to free themselves from the repression of tyranny. We believe that, fortunately, such circles represent a very small minority by comparison with the vast majority which does not share their outdated and obscurantist philosophy. It is possible that in acting in that way they may obtain partial victories, but it is equally certain that in the long run they will be beaten, because they are going against the tide of history, against civic sense and the ethics of the international community.

14. My delegation also considers that the presence of Ian Smith in the United States, because of its negative implications, may undermine the negotiating power of the international community in the search for a peaceful solution to the problem of the illegal occupation and the independence of Namibia. The violation of the decisions of the Security Council can only encourage those in South Africa who are convinced that the hard line, the rigid approach, sooner or later pays dividends in the weakening or yielding of those who precisely have within their reach the most effective instruments of pressure to bring to bear against the most obdurate defenders and promoters of illegality and colonialism. In this respect, the precedent set by the Smith visit to the United States could not be more negative.

15. In voting for the resolution we have just adopted, my delegation wished to reaffirm its conviction that we must maintain pressure on the illegal Smith régime to transfer power to a Government representing the real majority of the people of Zimbabwe, which is a prerequisite for its legitimacy and, consequently, its recognition by the international community.

16. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): Let me begin by congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. In the few days since you assumed the captaincy and presidency of the Council, you have already displayed remarkable skill and a dignified composure which command sincere admiration. We wish you good luck and pledge our co-operation.

17. I should like also to express to the outgoing President, Ambassador Hulinský of Czechoslovakia, our appreciation of the able manner in which he conducted the deliberations of last month. We thank him sincerely.

18. My delegation was in favour of holding a formal meeting of the Security Council to discuss Smith's visit to the United States. My delegation believes that there is a great advantage in such a meeting as it underlines the fact that the Council views that visit with the seriousness that it warrants. We were of the view that a secret exchange of views or a closed meeting of the Council in an informal session was not commensurate with the grave implications of Smith's visit. We have no reason to doubt the sincerity of the United States Government, but we are certain that Smith will take advantage of the visit to launch a propaganda offensive to impress on American public opinion the merit of his internal settlement. Yesterday was in fact his field day in New York. We are sceptical about the advantages of such a visit in regard to its utilization to put pressure on him concerning majority rule in Zimbabwe. My delegation drew attention to the danger of granting Mr. Smith a flood of publicity. He is on the crest of the wave of propaganda in his campaign to sell the internal settlement to American public opinion.

19. The convening of the Council in order to reaffirm its resolution 253 (1968), including paragraph 5 b, shows the Council's awareness of the implications of this visit. It could not afford to remain indifferent to such a gross violation of its resolution. No doubt it is the continued violation of that resolution that has so far kept the illegal régime intact. Some may argue that, on the face of it, the visit by Smith to the United States does not seem so tragic. It is the significance and the consequences that have urged the Council to deliberate and to act in order to discourage a repetition of the violation of its resolution. It was in this spirit that my delegation joined in sponsoring the draft resolution just adopted.

20. The delicacy of the issue of sanctions is such that the whole edifice falls apart if one component is ripped off. Violations must be nipped in the bud, otherwise reluctant applicants of sanctions will follow suit. In other words, the United States action should not be allowed to blaze the trail for others. In this connexion, my delegation is gratified to note that the United States did not oppose the decision of the Council calling on it to observe scrupulously the provisions of Council resolutions concerning sanctions. That shows that the visit goes against the grain of the collective will of the Council, including the United States.

21. My delegation also wishes to express its deep sense of resentment at the fanfare that has greeted Mr. Smith's visit to the United States. It is obvious that he is making the most of the sophisticated American mass media to reach

out for converts. This brings home to us the danger involved in preaching and defending the illegal. There has undoubtedly been a collapse of the internationally maintained blackout on the views of the racist minority led by Smith. An exit from the political and propagandist isolation was offered and Smith wasted no time in maximizing the advantage, presenting his views and blasting his foes, whom he portrays as insatiably blood-thirsty.

22. The opposition to the decision of the United States Government becomes more legitimate in the light of the fact that an internationally boycotted illegal régime is allowed to beam out its offensive views in a city that houses the Headquarters of the United Nations, the very Organization that has declared that régime illegal and imposed sanctions on it with a view to bringing about its downfall. That act is untenable and becomes more so in view of the highly publicized concern for human rights. We are here to take steps against an act which is contrary to human rights, in breach of fundamental human freedoms and in violation of Security Council resolutions and the Charter of the United Nations. It in no way promotes the rights of the majority in Zimbabwe to give the embodiment of illegality a propagandist red-carpet and VIP treatment that is usually reserved for the privileged few.

23. In this regard, my delegation expresses its disappointment that four Western Powers failed to support the resolution.

24. My delegation is happy with the speed with which the Council acted on this grave development, which is unacceptable even in terms of human rights, quite apart from its political implications as defiance of the Council's authority. The sense of urgency, coupled with regret, that prompted the Council to adopt this resolution should not be lost on those who masterminded the abominable propaganda crusade which Ian Smith is conducting.

25. My delegation hopes that the reaction of the Council to the decision of the United States Government will be given its place in the American mass media and not be lost in the midst of the media stampede triggered by Smith's visit. It is true that the mass media never courts the banal, but it is equally true that it is immoral to court the illegal. Furthermore, it is obvious that the illegal régime in Zimbabwe wants to inveigle the United States into defending the internal settlement inasmuch as it wants the United States to accept its assessment of what the United States can do to bolster the internal deal. In sum, the whole affair boils down to salesmanship regarding a deal which the Security Council declared as unacceptable. My delegation is pleased with the speedy action of the Council and hopes that the sales talk which Mr. Smith beams out will fall on deaf ears.

26. Mr. CHEN Chu (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): Recently, in disregard of the strong opposition of world opinion, the United States Government has flagrantly decided to grant entry visas to Ian Smith, chieftain of the racist régime in Southern Rhodesia, and others. This is in direct contravention and violation of the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the resolutions of the Security Council on mandatory sanctions against the

racist régime in Southern Rhodesia. The fact that it is the United States, a permanent member of the Security Council that voted in favour of resolution 253 (1968), that has seen fit to resort to the above course has added to the gravity of the issue. The Chinese delegation cannot but express very deep regret at it.

27. In recent years, with the continued development of the Zimbabwe national liberation movement and the powerful pressure of world opinion, the Smith racist régime is beset with difficulties both at home and abroad and finds itself in increasing isolation. While intensifying its repression of the Zimbabwe people at home, it has been committing ceaseless aggression against the neighbouring countries and obstinately pressing forward with its political trick of a so-called internal settlement in an attempt to legalize the white racist régime and thereby to perpetuate its reactionary rule. In these circumstances, the action taken by the United States Government cannot but arouse concern.

28. It should also be pointed out here that, since the adoption of resolution 253 (1968) on the sanctions against the racist régime in Southern Rhodesia, this relevant resolution is far from being effectively implemented. The Security Council must not remain indifferent to this. The Chinese delegation holds that the Council should deal seriously with the aforementioned violation committed by the United States Government and that, pending the attainment of genuine independence by the Zimbabwe people, the sanctions against the Smith racist régime must only be strengthened and not weakened in any way.

29. Mr. PETREE (United States of America): I will be brief in my remarks because I believe that a fair examination of the record would amply demonstrate that the United States has been foremost in seeking to bring about a peaceful resolution of the deeply troubling problem of Rhodesia.

30. The decision by the United States to issue a visa to Ian Smith, on an exceptional basis, was made only after the most careful consideration. In reaching this decision, my Government was deeply conscious of its commitment under the Charter of the United Nations to imposing and maintaining sanctions against the illegal régime in Rhodesia. We were also profoundly aware of the ultimate purpose of those sanctions: to bring the illegal régime to an end and to bring about an independent Zimbabwe under the rule of a majority of its population. Thus, the visa was finally issued because it would permit a continuation of the discussions which the United States and others have pursued in a variety of locations with the many parties involved in the tragedy of Rhodesia. What the issuance of this visa means is that there is an additional chance to advance the cause of majority rule and peaceful settlement. It does not mean that the United States has decided to violate its responsibilities, recognize the Smith régime or lift embargoes on trade with Rhodesia.

31. As for the draft resolution which was considered today, the United States will not take a position on its merits or the fairness or the impartiality with which it presents the issue. Since we are a party to this particular

matter, and acting in the spirit of Article 27, paragraph 3, of the Charter, the United States has abstained.

32. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, first of all, I should like to congratulate you on your assumption of the lofty and responsible functions of President of the Council for this month. We are pleased to see in that post the representative of France, a country with which we are successfully developing relations of comprehensive co-operation, in the interests of peace and détente in international relations. I would express our confidence that your uncommon diplomatic experience and personal qualities will serve as a pledge of your successful fulfilment of the functions of the office of President.

33. We should also like to express our sincere thanks to the representative of the fraternal Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Comrade Hulinský, who conducted the work of the Council during the past month with so much mastery and skill. We wish to associate ourselves with the high praise for his activities as President of the Council that has already been expressed here.

34. The delegation of the Soviet Union considers very timely the convening of the Security Council for the consideration of the question of Southern Rhodesia in connexion with the unlawful actions of the Government of the United States of America, which has permitted the entry into the country to the head of the illegal racist régime, Ian Smith, and other members of the so-called Executive Council who are among the collaborating Africans.

35. We share the profound concern over the action of the United States that has been expressed in a joint statement issued by the Group of African States [*S/12885, annex II*]. We also concur in the assessment contained in that statement according to which the decision of the United States will undermine the efforts of the international community to isolate the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia and encourage it to continue its policy of repression and callous brutality against the people of Zimbabwe.

36. Whatever arguments might be adduced by the representative of the United States in seeking to justify that action, the fact remains a fact. We are faced with a gross violation of numerous Security Council resolutions that prohibit giving any moral or political support to the Southern Rhodesia régime and impose extensive and specific sanctions against that régime. In particular, the United States is acting contrary to resolution 253 (1968), which provided that all Member States should take all possible measures to prevent the entry into their territories of persons whom they have reason to believe to have furthered or encouraged the unlawful actions of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia. It is also clear that the actions of the United States constitute one further step towards imparting the appearance of legality to the manoeuvres of Smith, who is striving to bring about the so-called internal settlement with the purpose of retaining the colonial racist régime in Rhodesia. The United States is thereby grossly violating the provisions of resolution

423 (1978) of 14 March last, which declared illegal and unacceptable any internal settlement in Zimbabwe concluded under the auspices of the illegal régime and calls upon all States not to accord any recognition to such settlement.

37. In spite of the affirmations to the effect that the actions of the United States Administration are allegedly designed to induce the Smith régime to make concessions, what we see in fact is a magnificent reception being accorded to Smith in the United States and extensive facilities being granted to him for the propagation of his views. All this leads him to defy the United Nations further and to reject its demands for the speedy establishment in Zimbabwe of genuine majority rule.

38. It is impossible not to see a connexion between Smith's arrival in the United States and the campaign that has been conducted here for the total repeal of sanctions against the Smith régime, a campaign that has been reflected in a resolution adopted by the United States Congress in favour of such repeal. As is well known, Southern Rhodesia is an important bastion of racism and colonialism in southern Africa, where the economic interests of major Western monopolies are concentrated. It is clear that highly influential circles in the United States, including American legislators, are striving insistently to prevent genuine self-determination for the people of Zimbabwe. They are striving by every possible means to retain control over the situation in Rhodesia and maintain the positions of Western monopolies in that country.

39. The question with which the Security Council is dealing today also has broader significance: it is a matter of principle. The decision of the United States Government to issue a visa to permit the entry into the country of Ian Smith and his henchmen causes the most serious concern, in that it is a direct violation of a mandatory Security Council decision by one of its permanent members and a founder of the Organization. It is contrary to the obligation assumed by the United States pursuant to Article 25 of the Charter, which provides that "the Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council".

40. These actions of the United States lead to the undermining of the Security Council's authority. They do damage to the effectiveness of its measures for the implementation of the purposes and principles of the Charter. They contradict the numerous assurances by the United States that it is striving to strengthen the United Nations.

41. As the matter essentially involves a violation of the Charter, the Security Council ought to condemn these unlawful actions of the United States and call for the immediate cessation of the flagrant violations of the sanctions régime instituted against Southern Rhodesia. Nevertheless, the Soviet delegation has found it possible to support the draft resolution submitted to the Council, bearing in mind that it expresses regret and concern in connexion with the United States Government's actions that are under consideration, actions that are contrary to resolution 253 (1968) and the obligations of the United

States under Article 25 of the Charter, and inasmuch as that resolution also contains an appeal to the United States strictly to comply with the sanctions imposed by the Council against Southern Rhodesia.

42. The Soviet delegation has stated on a number of occasions in the Security Council and in other organs of the United Nations that only by total liquidation of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia in all its forms is it possible to ensure genuine self-determination for the people of Zimbabwe. If that régime still exists today and continues to challenge the world community, it is because certain Member States are not complying with the relevant decisions of the Council and are not applying the sanctions that it has decreed.

43. In order to put an end to the reign of the racists in Southern Rhodesia, it is necessary to achieve a comprehensive strengthening of the sanctions régime established under Chapter VII of the Charter. It is clear that any statements about a "dialogue" with the racists and the need to prevail upon them by means of "arguments" merely lead us away from effective measures genuinely aimed at the solution of the Southern Rhodesia problem.

44. Guided by its policy of principle regarding the total liquidation of all remnants of the colonial system of oppression and all hotbeds of colonialism and racism, the Soviet Union will continue to support efforts aimed at the speedy transfer of authority in Zimbabwe to the genuine representatives of the people of that country, that is, the Patriotic Front.

45. Mr. BARTON (Canada): First, Mr. President, I should like to join others in paying a tribute to you and to your country on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. It will be a busy month. I know that you will bring distinction to our work. At the same time, I should like to acknowledge with gratitude the excellent work of your predecessor, Ambassador Hulinský.

46. In approaching the question before us, the Canadian Government has taken account of the difficult and complex factors at play in the Rhodesian situation. We recognize that the decision of the United States Government to allow Ian Smith to visit its country was a violation of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), which established sanctions against Rhodesia. Canada has always considered the effective enforcement of such measures to be a key element in bringing the full weight of international pressure to bear upon the illegal régime at Salisbury.

47. However, we are mindful of the necessity of not leaving any stone unturned in seeking to enhance the possibility of making real progress in negotiations involving all parties to the conflict. We note that the United States Government has indicated that the visit was agreed to on an exceptional basis in the hope that it would indeed have that result. It is clear that, with the continuing bloodshed and suffering, the need to find a solution is more urgent than ever.

48. In Canada's view, it is not evident that the results of this visit will necessarily be harmful to the objectives we all support, and accordingly Canada decided to abstain on this

resolution. We hope that the United States Government will be successful in its efforts during the visit to impress upon Smith and his colleagues the vital necessity of moving forward to a genuine transfer of power to the majority. Let there be no mistake about it, majority rule is inevitable. The only question is whether it can be attained only at the cost of more bloodshed or by peaceful means. My country has every confidence that the United States will continue to do its utmost, in co-operation with the United Kingdom and with the support of all Members of the United Nations, to attain a peaceful Rhodesian settlement at the earliest possible date.

49. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): Sir, I should like to start by echoing the sentiments that have been expressed around this table this afternoon and extend my congratulations to you on assuming the presidency of the Security Council for this month. I think it will be a difficult month. Speaking for the United Kingdom, I would say that we are very pleased indeed to see you, with your skill, presiding over us.

50. I should also like to express our thanks to Ambassador Hulinský for the able way in which he led the Council through last month, which was also a very difficult one, but from which we emerged, I think, relatively unscathed.

51. In instructing me to abstain from voting on this resolution, my Government has asked me to make it plain that it does so in no spirit of disagreement with the positive elements in the text. The British Government remains whole-heartedly committed to a solution of the Rhodesia problem in the spirit of the Anglo-American proposals of 1 September 1977 [S/12393] and committed also to observance of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council. In co-operation with the United States Government, we shall continue to do everything in our power to promote a settlement in Rhodesia which will bring the Territory to legal independence in peaceful conditions and in accordance with the wishes of the people. It is in the context of that close co-operation that my Government has concluded that the United Kingdom should abstain.

52. The British Government has, from the time when this visit was first mooted, expressed its view that the decision whether or not to admit Mr. Smith and his colleagues to the United States was a decision for the United States Government. Its decision stems from a different political and legal system from that which operates in the United Kingdom. I should like to inform members of the Council that my Secretary of State has today turned down a request from British parliamentarians to grant immunity from prosecution for Mr. Smith to visit the United Kingdom on his way back from the United States, though Mr. Owen has pointed out that if there appeared to be overriding reasons for granting immunity in the interests of a negotiated settlement the Government would consider this.

53. But the fundamental question which I know this visit has raised in many people's minds in fact is far wider than the narrow issue of whether or not Mr. Smith should have been granted entry into the United States. It is—and Mr. Smith's own propaganda has of course made its contribution here—whether or not the United States Gov-

ernment remains genuinely committed to the principles and ideals embodied in the proposals which we and they worked out together over a year ago and have since been working strenuously to put into practice. My Government is totally convinced that it does.

54. We welcome the commitment expressed once again in the joint United States-United Kingdom statement issued following Mr. Smith's call on Secretary of State Vance on 9 October, and we welcome also the fact that the United States Government was able to use Mr. Smith's visit to urge him once again to consider seriously the framework of a settlement which was put to him and to agree to an all-party meeting.

55. Mr. VON WECHMAR (Federal Republic of Germany): I am delighted to see you, Sir, presiding over today's deliberations as President of the Security Council for the current month. Our co-operation with you will be marked by the close and friendly ties that exist between our two delegations in the Security Council and between our two countries.

56. My expression of appreciation and gratitude goes also to Ambassador Hulinský, who presided over the sometimes extremely difficult deliberations of last month in so skilful and efficient a manner.

57. Let me now briefly state my delegation's position on the question under consideration.

58. In accordance with resolution 423 (1978), my Government has refrained from extending any kind of recognition to the so-called internal settlement. We continue to believe that only a process of negotiations in which all interested parties, and in particular all political groups of the country, participate can pave the way to a just and lasting settlement of the Rhodesian conflict and to internationally accepted independence for Zimbabwe.

59. In the meantime, the Federal Republic of Germany adheres to the decision of the Council concerning sanctions against Rhodesia. My authorities have taken all appropriate steps within their jurisdiction to prevent any violation of this decision, and they will continue to do so. Mr. Smith would therefore not be able to enter the Federal Republic of Germany.

60. In view of the existing sanctions, the visit of the leading representatives of the illegal régime at Salisbury to the United States has aroused concern and apprehensions within the international community and within the United States itself. My delegation appreciates the explanation given by the United States Government. We are convinced that all relevant aspects of the problem have been duly taken into account in its decision. We have noted in particular that no recognition is in any way intended and that the United States Government is willing to use every opportunity to impress upon the parties the need for negotiation and compromise as the only alternative to war and violence.

61. In view of the particular role which the United States, together with the United Kingdom, has assumed in the

negotiation process over Rhodesia, it seems to my delegation that the explanation given by the United States delegation is sufficient and that there was no need for the kind of resolution that has just been adopted. My delegation therefore abstained on the resolution.

62. Mr. HARRIMAN (Nigeria): This being the first formal meeting of the Council I have attended under your presidency, Sir, I join other speakers in congratulating you on being President of the Council during the month of October. You represent a country in which I had the honour to serve for about six years as Ambassador, when I tried to develop a very cordial relationship between our two countries. However, on certain aspects, when it came to the question of South Africa and your country's arms deals with the South African régime, I was very vocal, as Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, in condemning France, and I believe that was fully in conformity with the policies of my country.

63. Today you do not hear me condemn France. I have seen a change of policy, and today I have seen the quintessence of this new policy in the fact that you and your delegation have extricated yourselves from the cabal and the clique—the “gang of five” they call them in certain quarters—by voting for a simple straightforward resolution which reflects the spirit of all the decisions we have been taking in the Council, much of the action we have been taking and many of the objectives we have been trying to achieve.

64. I wish also to congratulate the last president of the Council, Ambassador Hulinský, a good friend and neighbour of mine, for his excellent work during the month of September.

65. My delegation was as surprised at the abstention of Canada and the Federal Republic of Germany on the resolution I have described as at the invitation of the United States Government to Ian Smith to visit this country—perhaps even more surprised. I have listened with surprise, with regret and concern to the explanations and, if I might use the word, the explications of some of the Western delegations regarding their reasons for abstention.

66. I believe that, as the representative of the United Kingdom has said, pressure is already now mounting in Europe, beginning in the United Kingdom as we would all expect, where several Conservative politicians are asking that Ian Smith should be allowed to go to London. Pandora's box is open and we shall continue to hear a lot of this.

67. What I want members to appreciate is that, if we go into the history of Rhodesia, it is clear that, as one representative of a world Power has said, the British have tried to turn their backs on the matter. And on every occasion they have done so. They have not only done so, they have gone beyond doing so and have taken direct action in sustaining the Ian Smith régime. I would not be surprised if, in spite of their declarations to the effect that they will not allow Ian Smith into the United Kingdom, they did so at some point. It is the excuse, probably, they are looking for.

68. In 1965 I was personally involved—I have said this again and again—in a situation in which the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom made a declaration to the effect that, even if Smith seceded, the British Government would not use force. Obviously, a unilateral declaration of independence becomes automatic if you make such a declaration beforehand.

69. I have decided to refrain from recalling the Bingham report, but we all know about it. This is the most recent example of something I will not describe in order not to use superlatives that will injure the very cordial relations which I have with the representative of the United Kingdom, and which I believe continue to exist between his country and mine.

70. I believe that in 1965, when Ian Smith's minority racist régime declared what is called UDI—the unilateral declaration of independence—which the British Government rightly described as treason against the Crown, they should have taken some action. As I said recently in another forum, the British have been able to fight wars—probably in Belize they are going to fight—when it is suggested that independence and freedom should be granted to people. They have never been able to fight in order to give freedom and independence to people. This is a tragedy for a country which has such a great reputation as one of the greatest democracies on earth. The Security Council declared that the unilateral declaration of independence was treason against the Crown. The Council called on the British Government in a unanimous resolution in 1966, supported by the United Kingdom itself, to quell that rebellion. As I have said, we know what action the United Kingdom has taken.

71. The United Kingdom talks about differences between the Zimbabweans which, presumably, it should resolve as a moderator together with the United States. Ian Smith, a criminal who represents nobody but a handful of very self-centred criminal modern settlers, has now become a party. And the United Kingdom, which is a colonial Power, as I said, has become a moderator.

72. We have seen these antics before. We saw them in India, Kenya and Nigeria. But in Rhodesia, after all these years of discussion, it is worse than a cruel joke. Ian Smith has no right to be anywhere except in the Queen's custody. It is the responsibility of the United Kingdom to transfer power to the people in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

73. Nobody has ever prevented Rhodesian leaders from going to any part of the world. As a matter of fact, I have on my desk a pile of requests from Sithole to see me, from some others from Namibia to see me and I have had meetings with Muzorewa. They have all been in and out of this country. We have not raised objections; they are in that Government. They have committed actions in conformity with their own judgement. But when a great country like the United States goes against its own word and when it substitutes for legality the pressure of what might be described as democracy by the vocal, then we begin to wonder what the credibility of the Security Council is all about. I would go further to say that, while we in this

delegation do appreciate that the issues are clear and that the United States has not acted in bad faith in acceding to these pressures, and that the Carter Administration is consistent in its policies towards Rhodesia, it is most unfortunate that we read that what has happened is "in the interest of making every effort to conclude a Rhodesian settlement" and that it is intended "to use this unique opportunity to continue the discussions" [S/12885, *annex I*]. But for this, I would not have taken any interest in Smith's being here. But when a *raison d'être* is being provided for a case that contravenes commitments in accordance with the Charter it is a very serious matter. I shall read from resolution 253 (1968) because some people may not know why we are so serious about so futile a matter. In this passage, the Council decided that all Member States should:

"Take all possible measures to prevent the entry into their territories of persons whom they have reason to believe to be ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia and whom they have reason to believe to have furthered or encouraged, or to be likely to further or encourage, the unlawful actions of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia or any activities which are calculated to evade any measure decided upon in this resolution or resolution 232 (1966) of 16 December 1966".

74. As the African Group quite rightly states in the document from which I have been quoting [*ibid.*, *annex III*], Article 25 of the Charter enjoins every Member of the United Nations to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council.

75. The commission of such acts as the one before the Council today becomes even more serious when a delegation has itself supported a resolution by which it is not abiding.

76. The 49 African countries are beginning to wonder whether they are the fools. We decided at meetings of the Organization of African Unity at Lusaka and Libreville to form the Patriotic Front. That was a well-considered decision. Sithole and Muzorewa were there, angling for recognition as part of this Front. At one stage we described it as a front of patriotic forces. They could not show us where their forces were.

77. As I said earlier, 49 African States have decided to support the genuine leaders of the country of Rhodesia, and we believe it is nothing but arrogance for people to play up to Ian Smith, who has been declared an international rebel and who, I repeat, should be in custody for treason.

78. I shall conclude my statement by repeating what I said midway through it. My delegation does not consider that the Carter Administration has acted in bad faith. We are rather worried that certain somewhat facile arguments have been adduced to engender the *raison d'être* for the presence of Smith here.

79. Mr. FUENTES IBÁÑEZ (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Bolivia, as it has already made clear in the Security Council Committee established in

pursuance of resolution 253 (1968), fully shares the concern at the granting by the United States Government of entry visas to Mr. Ian Smith and members of his illegal régime, in contravention of express provisions of Council decisions.

80. The United States like any other State, may, in the exercise of its sovereignty, take the measures dictated by its interests. But in this instance, the exercise of that power has acquired a discouraging and, therefore, regrettable significance since, both legally and politically, it results in a weakening of the authority of the supreme body of the Organization. It also—and this must be recognized, painful as it may be—creates an unfortunate precedent, which is all the more significant because it constitutes open disregard for the obligations assumed by this State in its capacity as a permanent member of the Security Council.

81. Thus, a disturbing situation has been created. We are back in the sphere of odious exceptions. For, while the rest of the international community must carry out its duties, even at the cost of sustained and harsh sacrifices—and this is certainly true for Rhodesia's immediate neighbours in regard to the sanctions against Rhodesia—it would seem that some privileged countries are to be allowed not to fulfil their obligations when they decide that their interests or internal pressures require that.

82. And that is exactly what is so serious about this matter. Influential circles that exercise internal pressure exist everywhere. Indeed, it is against such circles that Governments have to defend themselves when principles and standards of conduct are involved—principles and standards of conduct which are reflected in decisions that have been freely and willingly adopted and that, as in the present instance, represent a commitment and a responsibility within the historical process of decolonization and the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination which we are all committed to carry out.

83. A painful question must now be asked by the Security Council and the Committee established in pursuance of its resolution 253 (1968): To what extent has the force of their mandate been weakened? Has this given new strength to the opportunists and the adventurers, allowing them to attain their objectives without redressing the illegal situation or desisting from their rebellion? Do we have to accept as valid the periodic contradictions in the behaviour of a great Power? Do such contradictions go hand in hand with the traditional feelings of a high-minded people, a people that loves freedom and human dignity—such as the people of the United States? We refuse to believe that, although frequently we are confronted by paradoxical events in which influential American circles and opinions are involved.

84. We also have government leaders and legislators who have poor memories and who treat with the Pharisee and forget the friend. In this connexion, I would note that the people of Bolivia contributed, at great sacrifice, to the victory of a great cause—a cause supported by the United States during the Second World War. Today, however, that same people, a staunch friend in difficult times, finds itself with its back to the wall of poverty each time the General

Services Administration announces that it is going to place part of its strategic reserves on the mineral market. By lowering the price of tin through the creation of an artificial surplus of that mineral, they show their disregard for the serious disturbances caused by the mere announcement of the sale of these reserves.

85. In that way, the weak economy of the Bolivian people—which in good faith contributed to the accumulation of those reserves through its high-minded and idealistic acceptance of burdensome frozen prices, in the name of an alliance of solidarity for the defence of freedom and democracy—has been weakened even further, and that people is reduced to a level of overwhelming poverty that is conducive to deep-rooted social disquiet, a cause of unforeseeable evils.

86. As Mr. Ricardo Anaya, in his capacity as Minister for External Relations of Bolivia, said on 27 September last in the General Assembly, because of the simple announcement that the General Services Administration would put on the market part of 35,000 tons of tin from its strategic reserves,

“the price of tin has been radically affected because of the fear of a drop in the price such that Bolivia’s economy will be adversely affected and its income reduced by something in the order of \$20 million a year”.²

And he added:

“A drop in income such as that diminishes the capability of the State to meet the needs of its people and, consequently, to provide for human rights. That is confirmed by the fact that the rich countries, which are always recommending respect for human rights, are those which cause the conditions that vitiate such rights.”³

87. The ambivalence of conduct reflected in the treatment given to us poor countries, it must be said yet again, does not derive from the people of the United States but from the manipulations of the major financial consortia in the sectors of power.

88. As is also reflected in the matter which gave rise to the convening of this Security Council meeting, it is those same sectors of influence which condone the illegality of a régime which has based its power on a system of oppression and violence. While the weak countries are driven by difficult demands to achieve miracles within very short time-limits, the hand of friendship is held out to a rebel leader who bears a very heavy responsibility. That hand is held out knowing that his presence not only will be used for his own ends but also will mean that latent racism will rise to the surface. The attention he is given might be interpreted as tacit acceptance of his conduct, and that will naturally disconcert people.

89. The Security Council has had to deal with a fait accompli. Patiently and with high-minded dedication, the

Chairman of the Committee on Sanctions, Ambassador Jaipal, has time and again taken up the thread of a fabric that has been visibly damaged, until, in co-operation with the African Group and through laborious consultations, he has managed to arrive at a draft resolution which attempts to repair the damage and reaffirm the principles. It has been prepared in such a way that the text does not dwell on the more negative aspects of the problem so that the precedent established does not savour of jurisprudence and its harmful effects are mitigated by the reaffirmation of a moral basis and a feeling of reiterated good faith and hope. This latent hope comes from on high and in any good cause, whatever the circumstances that seem to run counter to it and keep it from final success, it is always the providential factor that turns discouragement into renewed faith and an ill wind into a following breeze. Those are the reasons we voted in favour of the draft resolution.

90. Finally, Sir, my delegation wishes to thank you for the comprehensive way you have handled this matter, in a manner characterized by the proverbial wisdom of the French mind, and I wish you every success in your presidency during the month of October. Similarly, I wish to express again my admiration for Ambassador Hulinský, whose lot it was to have a very busy September. However, thanks to his thoughtfulness and experience, it was a fruitful period.

91. Mr. NGUEMA-MBA (Gabon) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, it is with special pleasure that I extend to you the congratulations of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency of this important organ, the Security Council. In the circumstances, so fraught with consequences, in which this debate is held, the Council can only rejoice at being able to benefit from your experience and skill. I would also address my congratulations to your eminent predecessor, the representative of Czechoslovakia, who guided the work of the Council last month with great tact and competence.

92. My delegation is seriously concerned by the situation in Zimbabwe. As we all know, that explosive situation remains critical. In fact, the rebel chief, Ian Smith, not only continues to adopt new measures further to strengthen his illegal régime, but is still forcing the majority African population to endure the most horrible trials and atrocious suffering.

93. The position of my delegation on this entire matter is well known. We abide by the decisions of the Organization of African Unity and the General Assembly. Yet I wish to state once again that no solution to the Rhodesian problem can bring real peace unless it is effectively upheld by all the parties to the conflict. Therefore any arrangement designed to give power to the so-called representatives of the Rhodesian people would be doomed to failure.

94. In this connexion, my delegation supports all those who feel that the holding of a conference with the participation of all the parties offers the best and the only hope of a peaceful settlement in Zimbabwe.

95. But, to return specifically to the subject on our agenda, I wish to say that my delegation’s deep concern is

² *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-third Session, Plenary Meetings, 11th meeting, para. 363.*

³ *Ibid.*, para. 364.

reflected in what today might be called the statement of the African Group regarding the visit to the United States of Ian Smith, the rebel chief [S/12885, annex II].

96. Therefore I shall limit myself to saying that my delegation does not quite understand why such an equivocal attitude has been adopted towards Ian Smith when it is remembered that, in the past, the Anglo-American efforts to convene a conference of all the parties in order to find a solution to the Rhodesian problem were always frustrated by the recalcitrance of Smith himself.

97. Having voted in favour of the draft resolution that has just been adopted, my delegation fervently hopes that this visit will not enable Ian Smith to convince anyone that his so-called internal settlement would be acceptable, or, above all, to give rise, among the members of Congress or among the American people, to support for the lifting of the sanctions imposed by the United Nations against the illegal régime in Rhodesia. We hope that the United States Government will never allow such an important decision of the Security Council to be made meaningless.

98. Mr. HULINSKÝ (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of my delegation, I would first of all extend to you, Sir, my sincere congratulations on your accession to the high office of President of the Security Council for this month and assure you of our complete co-operation.

99. In this connexion, I am very pleased to refer to the very positive trends that have occurred in the development of relations between France and Czechoslovakia. Both our countries are making efforts to bring about a harmonious and balanced development of their mutual relations based on their rich traditions and the role which France and Czechoslovakia have been playing in the process of détente and peaceful co-operation in Europe. The visits to France in 1975 by the head of Government and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Czechoslovakia, as well as the exchange of parliamentary and other delegations, have provided new impetus in this regard. The visit of the Secretary of State from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of France to Prague last July has confirmed our common interest in further deepening and developing relations between the Ministries of Foreign Affairs in our two countries at an operational level.

[The speaker continued in Russian.]

100. The decision of the Government of the United States to grant an entry visa to this country to the head of the illegal racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia merits particular attention from the Security Council, since it may have serious consequences not only for the just solution of the Rhodesian problem but also for the effectiveness of the further work of the Council itself.

101. As far as the Czechoslovak delegation is concerned, we fully share the assessment of Mr. Smith's visit made by the African Group in a statement of 6 October [S/12885, annex II]. Together with the African and other States members of the Council, we consider that this visit is a direct violation of the spirit and letter of Council reso-

lutions on the question of Rhodesia, in particular resolutions 253 (1968) and 423 (1978), and that it contravenes the Charter of the United Nations. The Czechoslovak delegation already indicated its position at the meeting on 6 October of the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968).⁴ The decision of the United States Administration undermines the efforts of the international community aimed at the complete isolation of the illegal racist régime. Its significance and danger can be fully appreciated, particularly if we view this in conjunction with other steps undertaken by the United States in order to repeal unilaterally the mandatory economic sanctions that have been imposed against the illegal régime. The decision of the United States Administration is clearly aimed at giving a semblance of legality to the minority régime or to the so-called internal settlement which is the result of an illegal deal concluded on 3 March this year.

102. The consequences of that decision are extremely dangerous and, therefore, we cannot justify it by referring to "democratic principles" nor the so-called attempt to maintain negotiations on a solution to the Rhodesian problem. Its result can only be an intensification of the recalcitrant attitude of the authorities towards the transfer of power to the majority. In the statement of the African Group to which I referred previously the following is stated:

"Such a gesture to the rebel leader can only serve to embolden the illegal régime in its recalcitrance and continued defiance of the will of the international community, enable the rebel leader to persist in his treasonable acts against the administering Power and further encourage him in his policies of repression and callous brutality against the people of Zimbabwe."
[Ibid.]

103. In view of what I have just said, the Czechoslovak delegation supported the call for the Security Council to adopt the sort of resolution that would clearly express the fact that the action of the United States Administration represented a violation of the relevant resolutions of the Council and was also contrary to the aim of achieving a just solution of the Rhodesian problem.

104. While we voted in favour of the draft resolution which we have just adopted, we should like to point out that, in our opinion, it ought to have expressed more specifically that we are here witnessing a violation of Security Council resolutions and the Charter of the United Nations.

105. Finally, I should like once again to thank members of the Council for the very kind words they have addressed to me at today's meeting.

106. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of Czechoslovakia for the very kind words he said about my country and me.

107. Since there are no more speakers, I should now like to make a statement in my capacity as representative of FRANCE.

⁴ S/AC.15/SR.316.

108. I should like to pay a tribute to my predecessor, the representative of Czechoslovakia, who presided over the Council's work in September with skill, authority and effectiveness. I should also like to thank my colleagues for the very kind words addressed to me.

109. The terms of the resolution that we have just adopted express feelings shared by the French delegation. The granting of a visa to Ian Smith in fact runs counter to the régime of sanctions against Rhodesia established by resolution 253 (1968).

110. The United States Government has told us that by allowing the rebel leader to come to this country it has

taken a calculated risk and wishes to make use of this occasion in order to bring Ian Smith to reason. We have no doubt of its intentions; we are even ready to express the hope that the United States Administration will succeed in forcing its visitor to see the light and realize that he has to transfer power to the true representatives of Zimbabwe. Nevertheless, the initiative adopted has not taken into account the terms of a resolution approved and supported by the United States Government itself. It is for that reason that the French delegation cast its vote in favour of the resolution just adopted.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
