



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-THIRD YEAR

**1408<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 26 MARCH 1968

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1408) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia: letters dated 2 and 30 August 1963 addressed to the President of the Security Council on behalf of the representatives of thirty-two Member States (S/5382 and S/5409): Letter dated 12 March 1968 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Algeria, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta and Zambia (S/8454) .....	1
<i>Annex</i> : Resolution on Rhodesia adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity at its tenth ordinary session .....	13

#### 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.

## FOURTEEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTH MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 26 March 1968, at 3 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Ousmane Socé DIOP (Senegal).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Algeria, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, Hungary, India, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1408)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia: letters dated 2 and 30 August 1963 addressed to the President of the Security Council on behalf of the representatives of thirty-two Member States (S/5382 and S/5409):

Letter dated 12 March 1968 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Algeria, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta and Zambia (S/8454).

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

**Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia: letters dated 2 and 30 August 1963 addressed to the President of the Security Council on behalf of the representatives of thirty-two Member States (S/5382 and S/5409):**

**Letter dated 12 March 1968 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Algeria, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta and Zambia (S/8454)**

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): In accordance with the Council's earlier decision, if I hear no objection I shall invite the representative of Jamaica and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zambia to take places at

the Council table in order to participate in the debate without the right to vote.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. K. Johnson (Jamaica) and Mr. R. C. Kamunga (Zambia) took places at the Council table.*

2. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary) (*translated from French*): It is extremely disturbing to note that, although the Council has only just concluded its discussion of the illegal and tyrannical domination of the people of South West Africa by a white racist minority, we are again called upon to discuss essentially the same problems concerning Zimbabwe, or Southern Rhodesia. It is really astonishing to see to what extent the racist régimes of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia are following the same policies; but it is far more disturbing to see the marked resemblance in the attitude taken by some Powers to those two régimes, since the sternness of the language used in both cases is accompanied by remarkable lack of action.

3. As we all know, the racists of Salisbury, like those of Pretoria, are constantly talking about defending the values of Western civilization. By so doing, they are trying to obtain the support of those in other continents who are pursuing a policy of domination and intervention. We regret to note that the obvious motives of the racists of Salisbury and Pretoria are welcomed with understanding in some Western countries.

4. In considering the latest pseudo-judicial murders committed by the illegal régime of Ian Smith, we must stress that the Council cannot confine its deliberations solely to the revolting executions of the Zimbabwe patriots. The Smith régime makes no secret of its intention to commit other crimes of the same kind. About 100 Zimbabwe patriots sentenced to death some years ago are now waiting for a clique of racist settlers to decide whether or not they will be executed for the crime of having fought for the genuine independence of their country.

5. Although this intolerable situation has persisted for years, some people pour out soothing statements about the true intentions of Ian Smith and his accomplices. But the facts speak for themselves and belie the promises and assurances of those who would have us believe that patience and understanding will eventually force the fascists of Salisbury to give way. We do not believe that the Smith clique will abandon its policy of deportation and execution because the events of the past have convinced us that appeasement and compromise with fascists lead only to the same kind of disastrous results that we have still fresh in our minds.

6. The following question arises: how is it possible that a clique of racist settlers dares to defy international public opinion? Several factors should be considered in the reply to that question: the first—and perhaps the most important—factor is the policy which the United Kingdom pursues with regard to the usurpers in Salisbury. Despite repeated statements about the illegality of the régime, the British Government has never ceased to give it *de facto* recognition. It has maintained official contacts with this small group of rebels and the British Prime Minister has conducted official negotiations with Ian Smith aboard a British ship. Moreover, if we remember the harsh sentences, the long periods of detention and the deportations meted out to the foremost leaders of the national independence movements by the British colonial authorities, and if we remember how often Governments not to the liking of the United Kingdom Cabinet were dissolved in dependent territories—actions which were never brought before the Security Council—then we are forced to conclude that the rebels of Salisbury are given completely different treatment. It is often said that this difference of treatment may be due to the colour of the skin of the Salisbury racists. We should like to believe that this is not so, but, speaking frankly, we can find no other valid explanation of the attitude of the United Kingdom.

7. The fact that the repeated resolutions of the General Assembly have not been carried out by the British Government and that its delegation has done everything in its power to prevent the Security Council from adopting truly effective sanctions against the rebels can only convince Ian Smith and his friends that the United Kingdom and its allies will frustrate any effort that might lead to the result desired by the overwhelming majority of our Organization. I regret to have to add that the statement made in this debate by the United Kingdom representative has shown us that his country continues to pursue a policy which contains nothing constructive.

8. The second factor is that the attitude taken by the British Government is faithfully followed by its allies in NATO. While these countries verbally denounce the fascists of Salisbury, they continue to help to maintain them in existence. Allow me to refer to the statement in the British weekly, the *New Statesman*, which says in its issue of 8 March of this year, quoting publications of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, that trade between the Smith régime and the Federal Republic of Germany and other NATO countries has considerably increased since the so called “selective” sanctions were decided upon by the Security Council. It is significant to note that, as the Soviet Union representative showed at the 1400th meeting when he quoted an official statement of the Berlin Government, the German Democratic Republic has adopted a position which is diametrically opposed to that of West Germany. One may rightly wonder what miracle produced the curious results of those sanctions. For example, industrial production in Southern Rhodesia was 6.5 per cent higher in 1967 than in 1966 and in the past two years the establishment of 450 industrial enterprises has been approved in the Territory. Those figures are taken from the *Financial Times* of 2 January 1968. The Secretary-General’s report of 30 November 1967 [S/7781/Add.4] gives more precise and detailed infor-

mation on the subject. We have sometimes been criticized for failing to comprehend the sacrifices which the United Kingdom has had to bear as a result of the imposition of some sanctions. However, we have never been asked, as far as I can recall, to evaluate the enormous profits which have resulted from colonial conquests. Consequently, we are convinced that the United Kingdom can put up with the trifling sacrifices which result from the inevitable process of decolonization.

9. A third and equally important factor is the role played by South Africa and Portugal in helping their allies in Salisbury. Everyone knows what efforts these three bastions of colonialism and racialism have made to curb progress in Africa. It would be unnecessary to quote figures to prove the crucial role which South Africa and Portugal have played in their efforts to protect the Salisbury régime from the effects of the sanctions decided upon by the Security Council, which, moreover, were far too limited. The nefarious alliance of these forces of darkness against national independence movements has often been pointed out. We find it significant that the members of this unholy alliance continue to maintain close links with the leading members of NATO, who never tire of explaining to us the spiritual values which unite them.

10. It is well known that a large number of the Members of the United Nations, including the socialist countries, have conscientiously carried out the decisions of United Nations organs. My country, for example, informed the Secretary-General on 6 March 1967: “The Government of the Hungarian People’s Republic has implemented fully the provisions of Security Council resolution 232 (1966) and actually went beyond them long before the adoption of the said resolution. Hungary is not among the countries having export or import trade with Southern Rhodesia.” [See S/7781/Add.2, annex.]

11. This is how the socialist countries intend to defend the interests of the Zimbabwe people and to help them achieve true independence. We are in favour of total sanctions against the Smith régime and it is not we who have been delaying them for years. There can be no question of the responsibility of some Western countries for the maintenance of the fascist régime of Salisbury. These countries have protected the Ian Smith clique against the consequences of truly effective sanctions. Their moral and actual responsibility for the murder of the Zimbabwe patriots is also well established.

12. In view of the circumstances, expressions of despair are often heard. We are told that nothing can be done. We refuse to accept that. We do not deny that the policy which the United Kingdom and its allies have pursued for years has created a very serious situation which calls for strong measures. The execution of the Zimbabwe patriots has revolted world public opinion; but however barbaric those executions were, they are only a symptom of a very dangerous situation. It is the existence of an illegal régime which is the main problem. Consequently the Hungarian delegation considers that: First, the universal indignation of the members of the Council, and indeed of all mankind, should be reflected in decisive action, namely, the application of the severest possible sanctions against the criminal

dique in control of Southern Rhodesia. Such action should be taken by the United Kingdom, which is responsible for the territory. Secondly, the sole purpose of this concerted action, which should be supported by all Members of the United Nations, must be to overthrow the illegal régime of Ian Smith. We cannot agree that the goal of our action should be to change the policy of an illegal régime, as we heard one speaker say the other day. Thirdly, the United Kingdom must take the necessary steps to help the Zimbabwe people to attain national independence immediately.

13. The Hungarian delegation would support any steps which would make it possible to achieve those objectives.

14. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call on the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Zambia.

15. Mr. KAMANGA (Zambia): Mr. President, the first task of my delegation this afternoon is to express our sincere congratulations on your assumption of the Presidency of this important organ of the United Nations. We are fully convinced that under your wise and able leadership the proceedings of the Council on the grave situation in Southern Rhodesia will be crowned with success.

16. My second task is to welcome Deputy Foreign Minister and Ambassador Malik of the Soviet Union who is here as the representative of one of the greatest Powers of our times. It is a great pleasure for me to welcome him in view of the close and friendly ties which exist between the people and Government of the Soviet Union and the people and Government of Zambia. It is in this context that my delegation believes that the Soviet delegation, led by this experienced diplomat, will make a substantial contribution to the solution of the problem now before the Council.

17. The Security Council is holding this urgent meeting at the request of African countries to consider the deterioration of an already serious situation in Rhodesia. The emotions of anger and anguish which the illegal hanging of five Africans by the racist minority régime in that country has engendered have quite properly been felt by all civilized mankind, which stands now shocked by a nightmare that, with appropriate action, could earlier have been prevented. It is, therefore, right and proper that this event should remind the United Nations, and particularly the Council, of the basic and abhorrent evilness of racism in the establishing of political systems, and should emphasize the need for effective measures to be taken to eliminate discrimination such as that based on race and oppression and exploitation of man by man throughout the world.

18. My delegation has not asked to be allowed to address this urgent meeting on the degenerating situation in Rhodesia only on the basis of Zambia's proximity to that country; it has done so also, and even more, because now, more than ever before, we are convinced, even as all our previous predictions have since come true, that the day is not far off—unless Britain can even at this late hour take appropriate action—when the whole situation will be completely out of hand and will engulf not only innocent civilians on the frontiers between Rhodesia and neighbouring African independent countries, but, willy-nilly, will,

sooner rather than later, draw the Governments concerned into a direct confrontation with the rebel régime on a purely racial basis.

19. Having said that, let me at this stage express my thanks to you, Mr. President, and to other members of the Council, for allowing me to address the Council both on my Government's behalf and on behalf of the Organization of African Unity, of which Algeria, Senegal and Zambia are the official co-representatives at all Security Council meetings on the burning question of Rhodesia. The other two members have already expressed their views on the abhorrent rule of tyranny and murder under the cloak of justice which characterize Southern Rhodesia's racist régime. I support fully the views set forth and the noble stand taken by our colleagues of Algeria and Ethiopia at these deliberations.

20. Needless to say I am, on behalf of my Government, equally moved by and grateful to many other members around this table who have come out strongly against the barbaric events of the last few weeks, and those still going on in Rhodesia. Acknowledgement is due, too, to all those who have recognized the special plight into which the illegal acts of Smith and his henchmen have thrown my peace-loving and still developing young nation. The extreme hardships into which geography and the British colonial policies of the previous decades have thrown us were enough to break any but the most courageous of leaders, which, of course, my President under the fast deteriorating situation, tries hard to continue to be. The sacrifices which the people of Zambia are called upon to make spell for them misery and discomfort which strain the very political and economic fabrics through which the leadership hoped to consolidate their people's hard-won independence and freedom.

21. The opposition in Rhodesia to a black participation in Government has taken on such arrogance and contempt that it now presents the most negative threat to our deliberately balanced policy of humanism, which is without distinction as to race or colour. What kind of threat Smith poses for the rest of the world, therefore, needs very careful re-examination both in its specific relation to Zambia and in its general relation to the rest of Africa and the world. For Zambia, first, as I have just mentioned, the régime's doctrine of separatism is the very opposite of Zambia's and, indeed, of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

22. To maintain the special privileges which the white community enjoys in Rhodesia the régime has to perpetuate a class distinction, with colour as the only distinguishing mark. Like South Africa, it has systematically to reduce the freedom of the majority of its black members and bring them to the state of serfs and helots in order to maintain the special cheap labour which makes its agricultural and mining output cheaper and competitive on a world market. It will do this by persuasion through cheap psychological processes playing up the fears of those Africans who are willing to question the régime's practices but dare not. It will, as it has done all along, tyrannize them using all the familiar tactics Hitler used in the 1939-1945 War, the Africans' only crime being their readily acknowl-

edged ability to assume leadership in state and industry, and therefore their ability to reduce to a relative but deserved state of impotence not all, but a significant number of the present members of the white community and their sons whose only advantage over most of even the as yet uneducated Africans is merely having a white skin.

23. Like South Africa, the régime has taken every administrative step and even committed acts of violence under the law—yes, and even illegal acts—to ensure that the African is permanently and effectively excluded from the basic fruits of a civilized living. And yet Rhodesia speaks out in the name of Christianity and justice, as if it and not those whom Rhodesia oppressed were the enduring victims of the pernicious system it has created. Rhodesia did not find its acquired power and apparently impregnable position by accident. Nay, as if by special design, Britain laid all the foundation for the present strength of the régime which, through its oscillating policies and irresponsible rejection of the use of force at a critical stage in history, it has in effect continued to protect.

24. To a Rhodesia cast in this mould we in Zambia pose a clear threat. Just about any excuse will do, and the United Nations, and in particular Britain, which moralizes and temporizes with such duplicity, will soon find that the blood-bath which they say they have been seeking to prevent will finally overtake us all.

25. Let me elaborate a little. Britain has so far said two things about the use of force: it has said it will not use force to bring about a political settlement; it has also said it will consider the use of force only in the event of a breakdown of law and order. This particular statement must be analysed, since unless the Council realizes how Britain has been leading the African masses in Rhodesia down the path to perdition, the Council runs the risk of believing its professed but really hollow sincerity, and will unwittingly bear witness to a sure sell-out—a sell-out moreover, which would be equal to that of South Africa in 1910 but which will not be countenanced in this day and age by the Africans in Rhodesia and which, therefore, must lead down the path to war. The signs of this are already numerous on the frontiers. More Africans are dying in skirmishes with the racist troops, and the Rhodesians and their South African supporters are swooping down on our Zambia both by air and by land.

26. The point is this: After a country has declared itself independent; after it has tyrannized over everybody and muzzled the press; after it has browbeaten the courts into giving it *de facto* recognition; after it has gone on from there to effect hangings in defiance of the highest constitutional safeguard, which, in this case was the Queen's reprieve—a Queen, moreover, to whom the régime conveniently held allegiance; after foreign troops have entered a territory and the responsible metropolitan Power has spent its last vestige of legal advice to prove its own impotence—after all this, if not even before, is it not time that it was recognized that law and order have broken down in that country? Is Britain waiting until the throats of Europeans have actually been slit, and does it intend to move in then only in order to help the Europeans fight back the enraged black insurgents? Just what can Britain mean? In our minds, the voluntary, quixotic exploits of

the Congo rescue operations conducted by the combined forces of the West in 1966 mean only one thing: there is a coalition of racism between a conniving Britain and a recalcitrant Rhodesia. We fear the worst for the consequences and appeal to the Council to give the matter a new assessment and join us in reminding and urging Britain to live up to its responsibilities in Rhodesia by the only means that has any chance of success, that is the use of force.

27. Just let the Security Council for one moment try to look at the situation in Rhodesia the way it strikes an African living there. He sees that under the guise of maintaining law and order the courts under the rebel régime in Rhodesia have been able to legitimize the detention of persons by Smith and his clique without trial, and even to apply the Rhodesian Front legislation, such as the 1967 amendment to the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act which, with all the totalitarian trimmings including the shifting of the burden of proof, imposes a mandatory death penalty for the so-called unauthorized possession of arms of war. This Act makes such actions as the organization of a strike "an act which . . . is likely . . . to cause substantial financial loss within Rhodesia to any person . . . equally punishable by hanging, though it is not mandatory". This is the illegal, iniquitous, hideous law under the guise of which hangings of black people are being carried out by the white racists today in Rhodesia.

28. As Austin and Lichtenstein, correspondents on Rhodesian affairs of *The Times* of London, reported in an article which appeared in that newspaper on 12 March, "The Courts have already accepted, and applied with little protest from the House of Commons, the mandatory death clause of this Law", meaning the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act of 1967.

29. Nor does the reaction of the Rhodesian Whites in Salisbury serve to discourage Smith. The following account will bear witness to a sad demonstration of the barbarity and inhumanity of the white settlers in that country. On Thursday, 7 March, a day after the executions of James Dhlamini, Victor Mlambo and Duly Shadreck, Anthony White reported from Salisbury as follows:

"Demonstrators protesting against yesterday's execution of three Africans were attacked today in the heart of Salisbury by angry Whites who ripped up their placards and turned a water hose on them.

"The demonstration was in Salisbury's Cecil Square, opposite Parliament House. The demonstrators gathered in such a small number because of a law forbidding larger gatherings. They stood ankle-deep in bouquets of flowers and wreaths, holding such placards as 'In memory of Rhodesian statesmanship' and 'In memory of Rhodesian justice'.

"The violence flared up when one of a group of lunchtime hecklers suddenly stepped forward, grabbed the placards and tore them up. He kicked aside a pile of flowers and wreaths. Then another white bystander, in his late twenties, grabbed a garden hose and turned it on the protest group.

"The demonstration had started at 7.30 a.m. Small groups took turns of an hour and a half, each team being relieved by another.

"One of the demonstrators said: 'This is a mourning gesture—not on behalf of the executed men but in the name of humanity'. But there were jeers and hostile reactions from many white passers-by. One white motorist stopped his car and shouted: 'Where's your hammer and sickle?' There were a few police around the square at the time but they made no attempt to intervene."

30. This is the behaviour of people who call themselves civilized, people who claim to be the defenders of Western democracy and civilization. In the name of democracy and Western civilization they discriminate against black human beings, oppress them and treat them as if they were slaves and quite without feelings. What is there to be learned from a Western democracy so practised? It denies even the ordinary, basic freedoms of life: freedom of movement, freedom of speech, freedom of action and all other kinds of freedom which are the standard attributes of what we know as a civilized society.

31. As I speak now, all the black nationalist leaders and hundreds of their brothers are under detention in concentration camps in Gonakuzingwa and Whawha. No one is allowed to see them, not even their wives. The moving story reported in *The Times* of Zambia on 13 March will illustrate this. It is said that Mrs. Joshua Nkomo last saw her husband in October 1966. Since then the rebels have constantly refused to allow her to see him, and have refused to answer her letters on this subject. Indeed, we are not even sure whether Nkomo and Sithole are still alive.

32. The kind of freedom which 220,000 white racists allow to the 4 million black people cannot endure for long. The Africans will not take it lying down, and indeed they have begun to rise in small but significant numbers. The rest of Africa looks on and wonders how long it will be before it too is dragged into the quagmire of a racial war.

33. We in Zambia feel particularly sensitive because of our proximity to the boundary. That is why we have been outspoken critics of the blundering policies of the British Government over the last two years and four months. Nor can Britain escape responsibility. It will be recalled that by an Act of Parliament passed by the House of Commons in November 1965, the British Government affirmed its authority and responsibility concerning Southern Rhodesia. Further, the British Government does not deny that it is its responsibility to topple the rebel régime in Rhodesia; it has promised not to grant independence to the minority régime without majority rule. This policy, adopted with the accord of the Commonwealth nations only a year ago, was stated very clearly, although we now fear that, with typical subtlety, it is conditioned by all kinds of ifs and buts. Yet the British Government insists that it will not use force against Rhodesia, nor will it impose any economic sanctions which will bring it into direct confrontation with South Africa. The British say now that they intend to extend and strengthen the application of sanctions. One is left with the unanswered question of how they intend to do so if they deliberately refuse to run the risk which any such policy of sanctions necessarily entails. Is Britain now going to turn round and say that it cannot use force in Rhodesia because it does not wish to be confronted by South African troops in that Territory? If South Africa will not mind its

own business, is it not the duty of Britain to say "hands off Rhodesia" instead of using South Africa as an excuse for stalling?

34. The British Prime Minister seems to delight in political riddles. Recently he said in the House of Commons, referring to Rhodesia: "The régime itself slammed the door on the possibility of further contacts by proceeding with the illegal hangings of three men and then two more." The Prime Minister added that the executions took place while the British Government was considering new ideas with regard to settlement which had been brought back from Rhodesia by former British Prime Minister Sir Alec Douglas Home; this in spite of Britain's own earlier declaration that it would not deal with a treasonable régime and of the clear recommendations of the General Assembly to the British Government not to enter into any negotiations with the representatives of the rebel régime. The United Kingdom made repeated attempts during the past year to arrive at some understanding with the rebels, culminating, of course, in the ridiculous *Tiger* constitution<sup>1</sup> which proved—very conveniently, I must say—to be the paper tiger that it was.

35. Speaking of the possible reaction of the Security Council, Mr. Wilson is reported to have said that the passionate feelings which the executions had aroused internationally, and consequently at the United Nations, had created a new situation, and he thought that "some desperate and perhaps some unrealistic proposals" might come out of a meeting of the Security Council to be called soon at the demand of the African nations. He is further reported to have said: "Perhaps a little less forceful talk and a little more practical action might get the right answer." What practical action can he expect if he himself started off by throwing away the golden opportunities which existed just before and shortly after the unilateral declaration of independence? For our part, we in Zambia have not merely talked; we have acted—and to our great cost, as Britain well knows.

36. My delegation is not surprised that the British Government has reacted in this manner to the barbarous and cold-blooded assassination of these black nationalists. British policy on the Rhodesian situation has been and remains evasive and protective of the interests of the British settlers. The interests of the 4 million black people of Zimbabwe are apparently negotiable, whereas those of the white settlers are not; hence the contacts which the British Government renewed with the treasonable Smith while it was not prepared to consult the aggrieved people of Zimbabwe, who are after all the innocent party in this situation. The *Tiger* Constitution was, in their view, a spectacular example of British duplicity aimed at selling out black interests to the white settlers.

37. Let me say, even at the risk of repetition, that my delegation is not impressed by the pious words uttered by the British representative in this Council when he says that

---

<sup>1</sup> For the statement and document of the meeting between Prime Minister Harold Wilson and Mr. Ian Smith on board HMS *Tiger*, setting out proposals for an independence constitution, see: *Rhodesia—Proposals for a Settlement, 1966* (London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1966), Cmnd. 3159.

his Government has "maintained the principles on which we believe a just settlement should be based" [1399th meeting, para. 55]. Can utterances such as Mr. Wilson's, which I quoted earlier, be said to reflect any desire or determination on the part of the British Government to settle the impasse?

38. We believe and are convinced that the British Government is perfectly capable of settling the Rhodesian situation with such help as it might request, but mainly the use of force. We cannot address our condemnation of the acts of murder perpetrated by the rebels in Rhodesia to the rebel régime because, in terms of Britain's own Act, it is Britain which is the sovereign Power in Rhodesia. To us, the British Government is the legal administering Power in Rhodesia, and all acts of violence perpetrated by the rebels are, therefore, carried out in the name of the British Government.

39. My delegation is convinced that British policy on Rhodesia, dubious and vacillating as it may appear, may not be altogether free from guile. We see it rather as the work of an intelligent actor trying to mislead the world. The alternative is equally difficult to accept; and that is that all the reputed intelligence of this great Power has been outweighed by Smith. Rather than say that the lion has lost his strength and cannot roar any more, the probable truth is that the British Government follows a well-charted course, makes well-planned manoeuvres and cleverly manipulates the racial situation, favouring kith and kin. In a way, the British Government has decided who should win this struggle in the end. Indeed, some of its national newspapers—notably *The Daily Telegraph*—have openly cheered Smith and jeered at the Africans as terrorists.

40. The Security Council should not close its eyes to the fact that a racial war has begun in southern Africa. The Rhodesian and South African freedom fighters who have joined forces to fight against the racist and illegal régime in South Africa have described it as an open war, and the struggle is to be regarded as such. The people of Zimbabwe are sacrificing their young men in the fight for freedom.

41. If the reports we receive are to be relied upon, more than 100 freedom fighters have lost their lives in the Zambezi Valley since the war started in August. Rhodesian and South African forces stand glowering at Zambia from across the Zambezi and accuse us openly of aiding the freedom fighters. After all, it was Vorster who recently threatened that his Government would hit so hard that Zambia would not forget it. Clearly, the Council must address itself to this problem and examine what measures can be taken to forestall any breach of peace and international security in that part of the world.

42. The fact that we share a common border with Rhodesia, South West Africa, Mozambique and Angola, where black people are still struggling to emancipate themselves, is a matter of geographical accident and of great concern to us. I wish to assure the Council that my country is not responsible for the instability and struggle which exists between our borders. I wish to bring to the attention of the Council the serious and grave threat the Rhodesian situation poses to my country. I should like to confirm the

request which has already been voiced by the friends of Zambia that effective measures be provided to protect Zambia from a sneak invasion which might come in the form of a reprisal by trigger-happy white settlers in Rhodesia. This matter is serious and urgent.

43. May I now turn to the question of economic sanctions imposed by the Council on 16 December 1966 [resolution 232 (1966)] at the request of the British Government. As we all know, those sanctions have now been in effect for nearly one and a half years. But, as we predicted, they have failed.

44. Their effect on Rhodesia has been very little, if any, but they have imposed a serious hardship on my country instead. Alfred Friendly Jr., the special *New York Times* correspondent in Rhodesia, writing on 22 March 1968, summed up the Rhodesian situation in the following terms:

"Rhodesia is a going concern. It has won its rebellion against Britain, and in the most vital economic sectors it has beaten the effort to impose sanctions on its imports and exports.

"Since 11 November 1965 when it declared its independence of Britain, Rhodesia has lost as much as two thirds of its volume of \$126 million tobacco exports, but it has managed to evade restrictions on oil imports and is believed to have more than a year's supply in storage."

On the contrary, Zambia's oil supplies are hand-to-mouth in nature. Development projects are at a stand-still due to serious shortages of oil in Zambia. Rationing, on the order of five gallons of petrol per month, is still in operation in Zambia.

45. Mr. Friendly goes on to say:

"So far the challenge has involved little conspicuous sacrifice by the 250,000 Whites who live a country-club existence among some 4.3 million Blacks in Rhodesia . . ."

46. I do not wish to bore the Council with figures and facts to show how and why the selective mandatory sanctions which my delegation never believed would work but which we supported as a matter of principle have failed.

47. We all know that Britain, which maintains a naval blockade off the Mozambique port of Beira with its pipeline to Rhodesia, explains away the flow of oil to Rhodesia through Lourenço Marques on the grounds that it serves the Portuguese colony as well as a few other neighbouring States. We cannot therefore understand the logic of further sanctions unless those sanctions are backed by the use of force to make them work effectively on Rhodesia before they can ruin Zambia.

48. The past record of sanctions has shown up the difficulty of taking only half-hearted measures. Portugal has kept open the rail connexions and seaports, particularly Beira, Mozambique, Rhodesia's principal export and import channel. One report stated that Mozambique had supplied Rhodesia with enough oil to ensure a stockpile against two years of sanctions. Portugal had also reportedly been exporting Southern Rhodesia's embargoed goods, primarily tobacco and sugar. Furthermore, oil continues to be



transported across the border from South Africa, reportedly in excess of the minimum amount required. All this is facilitated by new fast rail service connecting Rhodesia with South Africa, not to mention proposals for additional rail service. Zambia's President Kaunda recently complained that eleven Member Governments—including those of Britain, Japan, West Germany and many western European countries—were breaking the oil embargo.

49. My delegation condemns the activities of the Government of Portugal and the South African authorities for sustaining the Rhodesian rebels and aiding them to beat the sanctions. As Members of the United Nations, clearly they should be under the obligation not to frustrate the effort which is being made with the sanctions called for by that body. Two colonial States cannot be permitted to disrupt the collaborative efforts of the international community. We raise our voices, furthermore, in condemnation of the acts of the trading partners of those two States which give them encouragement to continue with their iniquitous policies.

50. Allow me, in conclusion, to sum up the position of my Government and that of the Organization of African Unity: first, we remain convinced that the most effective way of bringing the rebels to their knees is the use of force. We call upon the British Government to realize that this is the only realistic measure. We particularly call upon it to face up to its responsibilities. Secondly, we hold the view that the British Government is fully responsible for the recent assassinations of African nationalists in Southern Rhodesia. We condemn British failure to take decisive measures to prevent the assassinations and to topple the illegal régime. Thirdly, we declare the existing selective mandatory economic sanctions to be both a farce and a fiasco and totally incapable of ever inflicting harm on the rebel régime in Salisbury, and we condemn the actions of the South African authorities who, in support of their policy of *apartheid*, have aided and abetted the rebels in their efforts to beat the sanctions. Fourthly, my Government wishes to state to the United Kingdom Government that the responsibility for settling the Rhodesian situation is and remains the responsibility of the British Government, which is the administering Power. Fifthly, we are convinced that the situation in Rhodesia has reached a tragic state of chaos and that law and order does not exist there, and consequently we request the British to respect their policy as pronounced by Mr. Wilson, when he said on 11 November 1965: "Our troops are asked to preserve law and order and to avert a tragic action, subversion, murder and so on." We submit that that stage has now been reached and that, finally, British troops are required to proceed to the Territory to preserve law and order.

51. Mr. President, once again may I thank you very much indeed for giving me this opportunity to express the views of my country before this very important Council.

52. Mr. DE CARVALHO SILOS (Brazil): We meet today, at the request of the African countries, to consider the question of Southern Rhodesia in view of the recent events in that country. The conscience of the whole world has already expressed its total repudiation of the illegal execution of five African nationalists by the Government of

Salisbury, in callous disregard of the reprieve granted by the British Crown in the exercise of its rights as the Administering Authority of Rhodesia. The Rhodesian hangings deeply shocked the Brazilian Government and Brazilian public opinion and so today we join our voice to those which have strongly condemned that appalling deed. We urge the Salisbury régime not only to refrain from any new crimes, but also to reconsider the disastrous course upon which it has been embarked since November 1965 and which can only spell more untold sorrow and suffering for a population which has been denied every basic political and civil right.

53. My Government has fully supported the actions taken by the United Nations in coping with the serious situation in Southern Rhodesia. We have fully applied the economic sanctions recommended by Security Council resolution 232 (1966). In February 1968, the Brazilian Government, by executive decree, ordered all national authorities to implement the selective embargo decided upon by the Council. As far as the Brazilian Government is concerned, this policy has been and will continue to be strictly enforced. During the twenty-second session of the General Assembly, the Brazilian delegation voted for resolution 2262 (XXII), which was approved by 92 votes.

54. No doubts seem to exist around this table as to the substance of the problem before us. We all agree on the need for taking positive action to stop Southern Rhodesia from continuing along the perilous path it has chosen. The problem, is, however, one of method, of what can best be done to attain this purpose. My delegation feels that the Security Council should strongly censure the *de facto* régime in Southern Rhodesia for the illegal execution of the five African nationalists and that it should also warn Salisbury against the repetition of such crimes.

55. My delegation believes, however, that this is not enough and that the Council should move forward, proceeding to a thorough examination of the whole situation in Southern Rhodesia in the light of the Security Council decision of 16 December 1966 and its aftermath. The discussion of the real effectiveness of the selective sanctions applied to Southern Rhodesia has produced more heat than light. This is no time to reopen the issue, but the fact is that no precise and irrefutable conclusion has been reached on it. One fact stands out clearly, however: although Southern Rhodesia's economic life seems to have been hurt, the Salisbury régime has somehow managed to survive and to ignore its condemnation by the international community.

56. Thus it seems to us that the course of wisdom lies in this Council's tightening to the breaking point the economic pressure on Southern Rhodesia. This can be effectively done through a broadening of the trade embargo, which should finally convince the white minority in Rhodesia that the time has come to reassess past and present policies, to accept the reality of change and to withdraw its support of the Smith régime, putting an end to the rebellion. In applying selective sanctions to Rhodesia, the Council has not even partially utilized the entire range of economic measures which it can take under the Charter of the United Nations; and, as we all know, economic sanctions are only one of the many kinds of sanctions,

short of the use of force, available to the Council under Article 41 of the Charter.

57. To broaden the present embargo and to tighten the controls on its application represent, in the view of the Brazilian delegation, the best action for the Council to take. My delegation is ready to support any decision by the Council along those lines.

58. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): The Government and people of Pakistan have expressed their horror at the action of the usurper régime of Ian Smith in putting to death five freedom fighters of Zimbabwe. This brutal crime, perpetrated in defiance of the authority and majesty of the Queen, has aggravated the threat to international peace and security in southern Africa.

59. In the view of my delegation the primary responsibility for protecting the human rights of the people of Zimbabwe pending the transfer of power to them must remain that of the United Kingdom as the administering Power. Everything that is humanly possible must be done to ensure that no more killings of freedom fighters take place. Operation paragraph 4 of Security Council resolution 217 (1965) of 20 November 1965 called upon the administering Power to quell the rebellion of the racist minority régime. Unfortunately, the performance of the administering Power has fallen short of our expectations.

60. The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom gave the assurance that his Government would not rule out the use of force in the event of a breakdown of law and order. One is constrained to ask: is not the contemptuous defiance of the authority and prerogative of the Crown and the recourse to a reign of terror indicative of a collapse of law and order? My Government does not have the slightest doubt that the acts of murder had a purely racial motivation and were designed to intimidate the Zimbabwe freedom fighters. They furnish a shocking reminder to us all of the inadequacy of the action taken so far by the international community. Indeed this inadequacy has emboldened the Smith régime to extend the inhuman system of *apartheid* to Southern Rhodesia; the representatives of Algeria and Ethiopia have already drawn our attention to this.

61. It is inevitable that this campaign of repression should proportionately increase resistance on the part of patriots. A former Premier of Southern Rhodesia, Mr. Garfield Todd, stated recently that "events are pushing Africans to seek opportunity through violence".

62. The gravity of the situation in the southern part of Africa cannot be met by half measures taken haltingly. If I do not now intend to speak at length, it is because my task has been lightened by the lucid and comprehensive analyses of the situation made by the representatives of Algeria and Ethiopia and other colleagues, notably by the Foreign Minister of Zambia a few moments ago.

63. The Security Council has to address itself to one concrete question: why has the grave situation in Southern Rhodesia continued and worsened despite the adoption of resolution 232 (1966) of 16 December 1966? In other

words, why is it that selective economic sanctions imposed under that resolution have failed to bring the Smith régime to its knees? Selective mandatory sanctions were adopted by the Security Council in December 1966 because voluntary sanctions had failed. Originally the Security Council had expected the economic collapse of the Smith régime as a result of the restrictions on the trade of Southern Rhodesia under the scheme of voluntary sanctions.

64. The United Kingdom Government had also pledged its faith in peaceful negotiations to resolve the problem of leading the people of Zimbabwe to independence. Both this expectation and this faith ran counter to the evaluations made and warnings given by African Member States with which my delegation was in complete agreement. They turned out to be ill-founded. Thereupon, the Security Council, at the instance of the administering Power, adopted selective mandatory sanctions against Southern Rhodesia to bring about the fall of the Smith régime. It was the considered judgement of the African and Asian Member States at that time that even the selective sanctions would not be adequate to achieve the end in view.

65. Events since December 1966 have fully justified their stand. It is clear that the usurper régime has been able to make the necessary adjustments in its economy and thus to absorb the effects of the partial measures adopted by the Security Council. In the Introduction to his annual report to the General Assembly on the work of the Organization, the Secretary-General pointed out that sanctions so far had not caused any "insuperable difficulties"<sup>2</sup> to the illegal authorities in Southern Rhodesia. Further, he made it clear that the Governments of South Africa and Portugal, which control the trade routes of Southern Rhodesia, had fortified the Smith régime in its defiance of the international community.

66. There is overwhelming evidence in support of the Secretary-General's finding. Selective sanctions having failed, the Security Council is now faced with a grave challenge to its authority. It cannot evade its responsibility. It must proceed to adopt the most drastic measures within its capacity. Accordingly, my delegation considers it imperative to proceed now to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and to ensure that these are not evaded by South Africa and Portugal. The rebellion in Southern Rhodesia can be broken only if the following steps are undertaken immediately: first, the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, with primary responsibility for leading the Zimbabwe people to independence, should no longer rule out resolute measures including, if necessary, the use of force. Secondly, the Security Council, acting under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, must now decide upon comprehensive mandatory sanctions, making it clear that all Member States have the obligation under Article 25 of the Charter to accept and carry out the decision of the Security Council.

67. In recommending these measures the delegation of Pakistan accords primacy not only to their economic effect

<sup>2</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Supplement No. 1A, para. 124.

but also to their psychological impact and their political results. We are, however, apprehensive that the effect will be countered, the impact weakened and the results forestalled unless a determination is shown to plug the loop-holes that may be discovered after the application of sanctions. Therefore, the Security Council should not only proceed to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions but should also establish a procedure to close the loop-holes and to ensure the strict implementation of the resolution under its own continuing direction and control, in addition to the Secretary-General's administrative supervision.

68. I venture to submit with all respect that the Security Council, after adopting resolution 232 (1966) under Chapter VII of the Charter, has so far not exercised its own supervision over the implementation of that resolution. We are impelled to call for the continuing direction and control of the Security Council over the implementation measures because the application of comprehensive mandatory sanctions would be a historic step for the United Nations to take. We must not underrate the magnitude, the difficulty and the complexity of the task. If we are to prevent a repetition of past failures in the history of sanctions, it is imperative to reinforce the Secretary-General's supervision of implementation of the resolution with that of the Council itself.

69. In conclusion I would emphasize, on behalf of my Government, that the situation in Rhodesia has become more grave since it was first brought before the Council. What disturbs the world community and should evoke the Security Council's response is not only rebellion and the collapse of the rule of law in a certain Territory, the utter denial of human rights or even the barbarities committed there. Those are no doubt the explosive elements in the situation. But there is also the growing menace of the alliance of racism and colonialism in southern Africa. That sinister alliance has launched an offensive against the forces working towards a just and stable order in Africa. The Security Council cannot now retreat or parley. It has no choice but to go forward and fight the offensive to a victorious end. That is the message that should go from the Council to Salisbury.

70. Mr. LIU Chieh (China): I wish to begin by saying that the Chinese Government and people, in common with all mankind, have been profoundly shocked by the executions recently carried out in Southern Rhodesia in defiance of world opinion.

71. It is now more than two years since the Security Council came to the conclusion that the Smith régime should be brought to an end as speedily as possible. But the measures that have been brought to bear on the situation have been either too limited in scope or too restricted in their application. On 12 November 1965 Mr. Michael Stewart, then British Foreign Secretary, indicated to this Council that the economic and financial measures put into force by the British Government, with the support of the United Nations, would be sufficient to "compel those who have committed this illegal act to realize that they have thereby inflicted grave damage on the trade, economy and currency of their country" [1257th meeting, para. 33]. The result was the adoption of resolution 217 (1965),

which spelled out the steps to be taken by the British Government and the Governments of Member States of the United Nations with a view to bringing the Smith régime to reason.

72. It did not take long to discover, however, that resolution 217 (1965) was incapable of achieving the sort of miracle expected of it. The economic collapse of Southern Rhodesia which was said to be inevitable did not come to pass. A year later, in December 1966, the British Government again came to the Council to obtain its backing for the next step—namely, the imposition of selective mandatory sanctions against the Smith régime. The purpose was to inflict damage on the economy of Rhodesia to such an extent as to convince Ian Smith and his associates that unless they came to terms with Britain their régime would have no future.

73. The African delegations rightly questioned the efficacy of the selective mandatory sanctions. The situation in Southern Rhodesia, they argued, involved more than human rights and fundamental freedoms; it constituted a threat to international peace and security. They therefore pressed for the use of force. On this point I said in my statement before the Council on 16 December 1966:

"I can appreciate the reluctance on the part of the United Kingdom Government to employ military action, but I am not sure whether it is wise or necessary that the legitimate use of force should be ruled out of consideration entirely. The important thing is that the situation should be liquidated as swiftly as possible. Economic sanctions, if they are not effectively applied, will only prolong the agony and cause increasing hardship to the millions of indigenous inhabitants whose welfare we all seek to protect." [1339th meeting, para. 40.]

At that time I also pointed out, however, that the use of force, if it were necessary, had to be left to the discretion of the administering Power.

74. That remains the position of my delegation. Inasmuch as the unilateral declaration of independence is an act of rebellion against the constitutional authority, the British Government has the legitimate right to suppress it with all the means at its disposal, including military action. Indeed, the British Government did not hesitate in April 1966 to ask for authorization to use force to prevent the shipment of oil to Rhodesia via Beira. My delegation well knows that force should not be lightly used. But force, the legitimate use of force, in the prevailing circumstances should not be precluded as a last resort when all possibilities of a peaceful settlement are exhausted. It is significant that this line of reasoning has lately found expression in a responsible section of public opinion in the United Kingdom itself.

75. In the last analysis, of course, the main burden of any enforcement action must necessarily fall on the United Kingdom. That being so, my delegation believes that it is the United Kingdom that must decide whether force can be effectively used. The responsibility of the United Nations is not so much to suppress a rebellion as to protect the interests of the 4 million inhabitants of Southern Rhodesia.

76. So far as the sanctions authorized by the Security Council in resolution 232 (1966) are concerned, my Gov-

ernment has faithfully carried out its obligations. It must be admitted that by and large the selective sanctions have not been a resounding success. Rhodesia's foreign trade has been hurt in some areas, particularly in the export of tobacco and sugar. But in other areas the impact has hardly been felt. Rhodesia has experienced no difficulty, for example, in selling almost all its asbestos and copper and large quantities of its iron ore and chrome. The country produces no oil, but its industry has not been paralysed for lack of oil. Actually, its foreign trade has increased rather than decreased. This has not been confined to what are commonly referred to as Rhodesia's trading partners. Many other countries, including some that have been most vociferous about the imposition of sanctions in order to bring Rhodesia to its knees, have participated in this trade.

77. It is all too clear, therefore, that there can be no effective economic sanctions without the co-operation of all Member States of the United Nations. Unless all Member States of the United Nations are prepared to fulfil their obligations under the Charter, the sanctions cannot be effective.

78. It has been suggested in the course of the present debate that sanctions authorized by the Council should be broadened into a total trade embargo against Rhodesia. My delegation is in favour of such comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions. That, too, requires the full co-operation of all Member States. As far as my delegation is concerned, we are prepared to support any appropriate moves the Council may take to bring to an end the illegal Smith régime.

79. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (*translated from Spanish*): Once again the Security Council is meeting to consider serious events that have taken place in the southern part of Africa. On this occasion we are considering the situation in Southern Rhodesia, where an illegal, minority and racist régime will go to any lengths in its attempt to retain the power it exercises over a people ruthlessly subjugated, exploited and repressed. Once again the Council is confronted with the results of the inhuman and universally condemned policy of *apartheid*.

80. The illegal Salisbury régime has imposed the maximum penalty on a large number of Zimbabwe nationals for the crime of having loved their homeland. Five of them have already been executed, after being deprived of their most elementary rights. The same fate hangs over many others.

81. The monstrosity of the crime committed by the racist régime in Southern Rhodesia has shocked the conscience of the world and caused an uproar of indignation and protest. The Government I represent has supported and scrupulously implemented the decisions of the United Nations, and it now adds its voice to that protest and pays a tribute to the martyrs sacrificed at Salisbury. At this tragic time for the tortured, heroic Zimbabwe people, it is our individual and collective duty to condemn the inhuman acts committed by the Smith régime, to safeguard the lives and rights of the prisoners in the condemned cell and, above all, to do all in our power to put an end to the rebellion on which the illegal régime is based and to restore power to those to whom it truly belongs, namely, the Zimbabwe

people. They alone possess the unchallengeable right to elect their own representatives, to exercise the right of self-determination and to choose their own road to their historic destiny.

82. The United Nations and the Security Council, which firmly deny recognition to the minority racist régime of Southern Rhodesia, now have a great responsibility and duty to fulfil. In view of the legal tie between Southern Rhodesia and its administering Power, the United Kingdom, which confers on the latter special responsibility for the Zimbabwe people, my delegation will strive with the other members of the Council to secure the adoption of measures calculated to strengthen previous collective action and as rapidly as possible to achieve the fundamental objectives I have just defined.

83. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I trust that Council members will now allow me, as representative of SENEGAL, to state my delegation's views on the matter before us.

84. "Everything has been said and we are too late, for men have lived and have thought for 7,000 years. We can only imitate the Ancients or glean something from the cleverest of the Moderns." La Bruyère said that back in the 17th century, and that is the thought which comes to my mind as we embark upon the question of Southern Rhodesia.

85. In fact, since 11 November 1965, when the white minority in Southern Rhodesia unilaterally proclaimed the country's independence in defiance of world opinion and of the international sovereignty of the United Kingdom, the Security Council has on several occasions turned its attention to this serious problem.

86. Senegal, which together with Algeria and Zambia has been given a special mandate to follow this matter in the General Assembly as well as in the Security Council, has from the very beginning called for drastic action to put an end to Mr. Ian Smith's illegal régime and thus rescue the Zimbabwe people from being slaves in their own country. We have said repeatedly that this illegal régime could be eliminated only by means of total and compulsory sanctions, or even, if necessary, by the use of force. But we believe that the great initial error committed in this affair was the statement by Mr. Wilson, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, who on 29 October 1965 told the African leaders at Salisbury that if Mr. Ian Smith's Government made a unilateral declaration of independence the United Kingdom would not intervene militarily.

87. Did this not in fact amount to giving Mr. Ian Smith's Government a clear field by assuring it of impunity in advance? It was, moreover, a very surprising action, since the United Kingdom was one of the first Powers to decolonize and to grant freedom and national independence to millions and millions in Africa and Asia. Yet in the course of this emancipation, the United Kingdom seems suddenly to hesitate, to stop and even to draw back, with the psychological vacillations to which the heroes of Shakespearean drama are prone.

88. We are accustomed to read on the British coat-of-arms: "*Dieu et mon droit*". In this Rhodesian affair,

however, the British lion, while still believing in God, no longer seems to be sure of its right.

89. In Lagos in January 1966, the British Prime Minister predicted that Ian Smith's illegal régime would fall in a matter of weeks because of the application of sanctions. Unfortunately, however, Ian Smith's illegal régime is doing very well and has surpassed its former arrogance by disregarding the pardon granted by the Queen to condemned men whose only crime was to defend their country's freedom and their own human dignity.

90. We are forced to admit that selective sanctions have failed. They have failed chiefly because of the trade which, by-passing them, has infiltrated through South Africa and Mozambique. This has only confirmed Senegal's fears, for we said from the very first that economic sanctions are always a delusion. Contemporary history shows that States to which they are applied always succeed in thwarting and evading them. Witness the failure of all the sanctions ever carried out, from Napoleon I's continental blockade against Great Britain to the sanctions which have been applied against Ian Smith's illegal Government, with special mention of the sanctions decreed by the League of Nations against Mussolini's Italy when he invaded Ethiopia.

91. Nevertheless, in view of the tragic worsening of the situation in Southern Rhodesia following upon the hanging of the freedom fighters, the United Kingdom must come to recognize the ineffectiveness of selective sanctions and must assume its full responsibilities by applying more vigorous economic sanctions and if necessary resorting to the use of force.

92. As regards the use of force, here is the opinion of the leader of the British Liberal Party, who made the following statement during the last weekend:

"Great Britain should have sent troops to Rhodesia within three hours of the unilateral declaration of independence and Great Britain should have bombed the railway communications between Rhodesia and Mozambique when the economic sanctions on petroleum were violated."

That is what the leader of the Liberal Party, Mr. Jeremy Thorpe, said in Colchester last week. He added

"It is not too late to consider the use of force to put an end to the régime of Ian Smith."

93. The white minority in Rhodesia has tried to formulate an ideology to justify its misdeeds in southern Africa, south of the Zambesi.

94. Mr. Ian Smith, Pretoria and Portugal are now the champions of the values of Western civilization and Western culture. But these three sinister crusaders have a strange way of defending the values of Western culture, for they do it by hanging, torturing and massacring the Africans. In this way they are not merely mutilating but betraying the real and genuine values of Western culture. It is surely to them that one of the greatest of contemporary Indian poets, Rabindranath Tagore, was speaking when he cried: "Civilization, civilization, pride of the Europeans, you are not a

torch; you are a burning flame and you consume all you touch."

95. Be that as it may, the Security Council must decide to impose total and compulsory economic sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, this time taking the precaution of providing for effective measures to prevent the evasion of such sanctions by trade infiltration through South Africa and Mozambique. To act otherwise would be to foster, in southern Africa south of the Zambesi, the advent of an era of hatred and racial discord leading to bloody disturbances which, sooner or later, would greatly endanger international peace and security.

96. Speaking as PRESIDENT, I now call on the representative of the United Kingdom to speak in the exercise of his right of reply.

97. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I do not propose now to comment on a series of remarkable and thoughtful speeches which have been made this afternoon, nor, indeed, even to comment on the moving address to which we have just listened from our poet President. But I feel that, in respect to the Foreign Minister of Zambia, I should say a word in reply to him.

98. I am indeed sorry that he should speak so bitterly, though I do not believe that he has come all the way from Africa, all the way from Lusaka, only to make sweeping imputations of low motive and bad faith. I fully understand the reasons for the bitterness of his words. Some of them were wounding and insulting. But I well know the strains and the sacrifices which Zambia has suffered, and I may be permitted to say perhaps that I admire the stand which his country has made in the face of those strains and sacrifices, and I well appreciate the depth of feeling of anger and disgust caused by the brutal hangings. I share those feelings, and the last thing that I want to do is to quarrel with the Foreign Minister of Zambia.

99. He rightly said that there is really only one question before us, and that is the question: What practical action can now be taken, what practical and effective action?

100. The representative of Hungary said that British policy had no constructive elements. That is not so and we shall show that that is not so. One of the most unsatisfactory customs of the Council is to quote one's own speeches, but I ask permission to refer to what I said when I spoke a few days ago, because the Foreign Minister of Zambia was not then present. I said then:

"My earnest recommendation to the Council is that we should at once undertake a full and careful review of past action and future possibilities, and I accordingly place myself at the disposal of the Council for urgent consultation. I sincerely trust that that offer will be accepted in the spirit of full co-operation in which it is made.

"I do not for a moment forget or deny the practical difficulties we must honestly face and the real limitations on what can in fact be done. We have not failed to state them. But I greatly hope that, however strong the feelings of members of the Council, and before they make up their minds, there will be a readiness to consult on the basis of the hard facts and the practical possibilities. I

trust that we shall not run away from our responsibilities by resort merely to sweeping declarations and demands that cannot be met.

"I trust that we shall not allow ourselves to be defeatist in the sense that we abandon further practical and effective action, limited and unspectacular though perhaps most of it must be, in favour of mere invective and dispute among ourselves." [1399th meeting, paras. 58-60.]

I said that when I spoke before, and I repeat it to the Foreign Minister.

101. I made the offer of consultations. It has been taken up and we have been pursuing those consultations in a spirit of complete frankness and in an endeavour to find common ground for our advance. I made the offer to members of this Council and, as the Foreign Minister of Zambia will know, I made the same offer to him. When he came to New York I put myself at his disposal for a discussion with him, which I undertake will be a full and frank discussion, so that he can understand the practical difficulties which I have to explain to him, and I can better understand the course which he believes that we should follow. I am convinced that nothing but good can come from such consultations. Maybe disagreements, maybe strong feelings will remain, but I am sure that it is necessary—and I have no doubt that he will agree—that we must in the present situation sit down together to see what can be done.

102. I cannot believe that in so doing members of the Council and the Minister of Zambia, so closely concerned, will be wasting our time. Because in all the statements I have read and seen in recent weeks on the appallingly difficult problem which faces us, I have seen amongst the African and Asian statements that—whatever else is asked for—there is a demand that we should examine what more can be done to make sanctions more fully effective. We are ready and anxious to carry out that survey, and to do it not alone, but in full and, I hope, friendly consultation.

103. I do not wish to misrepresent anyone. I know that the decision taken by the Organization of African Unity a month ago contained many requirements and included a number of major demands. But you will permit me, perhaps, to read the final demand that was made by the Organization of African Unity at the meeting<sup>3</sup> which took place just over a month ago in Addis Ababa. The final requirement reads as follows:

"Entrusts the African Group at the United Nations with the task of working tirelessly for the effective implementation of Security Council resolution 232 (1966) and to work for an extension of the present selective mandatory sanctions, so that they become comprehensive

and mandatory as envisaged under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations in view of the deterioration of the grave situation in Rhodesia."

104. I have before given to the members of this Council an undertaking that we are indeed prepared to consider this recommendation in all its aspects and to bring our knowledge and experience to the discussion. Having heard many speeches this afternoon which indicate not only the depth of feeling but also the desire to go forward with action that can be practical and also effective, I am glad to repeat my offer that we should continue the consultations we have begun, urgently and thoroughly.

105. I am glad that the Foreign Minister of Zambia has come to join us. I trust, in fact I feel confident, that he will bring his knowledge and experience to help us towards the decisions which we hope that in this Council we can shortly take.

106. Lij Endalkachew MAKONNEN (Ethiopia): Mr. President, since our colleague Lord Caradon has made reference to a part of the resolution adopted by the Foreign Ministers of the Organization of African Unity, and since the particular part that he quoted is going to appear in the verbatim record of this meeting of the Council, for the sake of making the record full and complete I am duty bound to request that, with your permission and with the agreement of my colleagues, the entire resolution be included in the verbatim record.

107. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The representative of Ethiopia has just made a proposal. He would like the resolution adopted by the Organization of African Unity and quoted in part by the United Kingdom representative to be reproduced in full in the record of this meeting. If there are no objections, I shall so order.<sup>4</sup>

*It was so decided.*

108. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I have no more speakers on my list. Since I believe that most of the members have taken part in the general debate, I should like to make a suggestion to the Council. I think that, starting tomorrow, we should proceed to hold consultations and exchanges of views, and that we should pursue these as far as possible. As soon as sufficient progress has been made to warrant a formal meeting of the Council, members will be informed of the date and time of the meeting. If there are no objections, it will be so decided. Since I hear no objection to this suggestion, we shall act accordingly.

*The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.*

<sup>3</sup> Tenth Ordinary Session of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity, 20-24 February 1968.

<sup>4</sup> The resolution of the Organization of African Unity referred to by the President in his statement is reproduced in the annex to the present verbatim record.

*Resolution on Rhodesia adopted by the Council of Ministers of the  
Organization of African Unity at its Tenth Ordinary Session*

The Council of Ministers, meeting in its Tenth Ordinary Session at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, from 20 to 24 February 1968,

*Noting with approval* the report of the Administrative Secretary-General, and the report of the Committee of Five on Rhodesia as well as the report of the Foreign Ministers of Algeria, Senegal and Zambia,

*Recalling* its resolutions CM/Res.75 (VI) of 6 March 1966, CM/Res.78 (VII) of 4 November 1966, CM/Res.96 (VIII) of 4 March 1967 and CM/Res.108 (IX) of 10 September 1967 concerning Rhodesia, and also resolution 232 (1966) of 16 December 1966 of the Security Council of the United Nations imposing selective mandatory sanctions against Rhodesia, and General Assembly resolution 2262 (XXII) of 8 November 1967,

*Convinced* that the selective mandatory sanctions as approved by the United Nations have completely failed to bring down the illegal racist minority régime in Rhodesia,

*Strongly convinced* that the situation in Rhodesia represents a threat to international peace and security,

1. *Condemns* as a crime against humanity the atrocities perpetrated by the illegal racist minority régime in Rhodesia against the African people fighting for their freedom;

2. *Condemns* the economic, financial and other interests which impede the progress of the African people towards independence;

3. *Condemns* unreservedly the Government of the United Kingdom for its continued failure in assuming effectively its moral

and political responsibilities to the people of Zimbabwe and by allowing the illegal racist minority régime of Ian Smith to consolidate its position in defiance of African and world opinion;

4. *Strongly condemns* all those countries, and in particular Great Britain which, in violation of Security Council resolution 232 (1966) of 16 December 1966 imposing selective mandatory sanctions on Rhodesia, continue to maintain direct and indirect commercial and trade links with the illegal régime;

5. *Reiterates* its conviction that the primary responsibility for toppling the illegal racist minority régime in Salisbury rests squarely with the United Kingdom and remains convinced more than ever that the only way to bring down the illegal régime is by the use of force;

6. *Strongly reaffirms* the right of the people of Zimbabwe to freedom and independence;

7. *Again calls upon* the liberation movements of Zimbabwe to close their ranks and form a common front in their struggle against the common enemy for the speedy and effective liberation of their country;

8. *Entrusts* the African Group at the United Nations with the task of working tirelessly for the effective implementation of Security Council resolution 232 (1966) and to work for an extension of the present selective mandatory sanctions, so that they become comprehensive and mandatory as envisaged under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations in view of the deterioration of the grave situation in Rhodesia;

9. *Decides* to retain the question of Rhodesia on its agenda.

---

#### **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 librairie 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 по всем районам 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.

---