



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-SEVENTH YEAR

# 1640<sup>th</sup>

MEETING: 16 FEBRUARY 1972

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1640) . . . . .	1
Adoption of the agenda . . . . .	1
Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia:	
(a) Letter dated 15 February 1972 from the representatives of Guinea, Somalia and the Sudan to the President of the Security Council (S/10540);	
(b) Fourth report of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) (S/10229 and Add.1 and 2);	
(c) Interim report of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) (S/10408) . . . . .	1

## 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.

## SIXTEEN HUNDRED AND FORTIETH MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 16 February 1972, at 3 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Mohamed FAKHREDDINE (Sudan).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Argentina, Belgium, China, France, Guinea, India, Italy, Japan, Panama, Somalia, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Yugoslavia.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1640)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia:
  - (a) Letter dated 15 February 1972 from the representatives of Guinea, Somalia and the Sudan to the President of the Security Council (S/10540);
  - (b) Fourth report of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) (S/10229) and Add.1 and 2);
  - (c) Interim report of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) (S/10408).

### Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

### Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia:

- (a) Letter dated 15 February 1972 from the representatives of Guinea, Somalia and the Sudan to the President of the Security Council (S/10540);
- (b) Fourth report of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) (S/10229 and Add.1 and 2\*);
- (c) Interim report of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) (S/10408\*\*)

1. The PRESIDENT: This meeting of the Security Council has been convened in response to the request made by the representatives of Guinea, Somalia and the Sudan in their letter dated 15 February 1972 (S/10540) for the resumption of the consideration of the question of Southern Rhodesia. In the same letter the three African representatives on the Security Council also requested that in accordance with rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure it invite Mr. Abel Muzorewa, President of the

African National Council to address the Council. I propose that the Council deal first with that request.

2. Accordingly, if there is no objection, I shall take it that the Council decides to accede to the request that it extend an invitation under rule 39 to Mr. Abel Muzorewa.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. Muzorewa took a place at the Council table.*

3. Mr. MUZOREWA: Some of you may have been to Sunday school and been taught that you are not supposed to talk about yourself, because to do so is not considered proper Christian behaviour. But, if the Council will allow me to do so, I should like to talk a bit about myself. A few weeks ago I saw my name in a newspaper where I was referred to as an African nationalist. I was very surprised. I looked at it again to see whether the writer really was referring to me, because I have never thought of myself as a nationalist. I thought I was a person, a child of God, the husband of one wife, the father of five children—a person who was in need of liberation and crying out very loudly for it. And someone looked at me and described me as an African nationalist. If that is what an African nationalist means, then I am one.

4. It is a great honour for me and the people of Zimbabwe to be invited by the three African members of the Security Council to put before the Council the feelings and grievances of 5.5 million suffering human beings in my country. The body I represent, the African National Council—ANC—is the only body in Rhodesia that has any right to speak for the vast majority of the population of that country.

5. What is ANC? The African National Council was formed in December 1971 as a spontaneous grassroots reaction to the announcement of the terms of the Anglo-Rhodesian proposals.<sup>1</sup> Although having a formal structure, it represents the demands of the African people in the country to express their view as to the terms of the settlement. ANC is not a political party and it is not interested in building up a large membership as such, but it is prepared to join with any person of any political party or organization who wishes to say No to these proposals. ANC claims to represent the overwhelming number of persons in the country, who have rejected the proposals as being unacceptable to them. The objectives of ANC, therefore, are to explain and expose the dangers of accepting the settlement proposals and to co-ordinate the campaign for

\* *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Special Supplement No. 2 and Corrigendum and Special Supplement No. 2A.*

\*\* *Ibid., Supplement for October, November and December 1971.*

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, document S/10405.

their rejection. ANC calls for a non-violent rejection of the settlement terms, a demand which it believes to be the inevitable conclusion that will be reached by those who are engaged in testing opinion.

6. We are determined that history shall not record that the Africans of Rhodesia accepted the betrayal of their birthright. We are supported in this stance by a wide spectrum of opinion in Rhodesia, including teachers, farmers, workers, students, and the churches. Indeed, even some of the Chiefs have risked their positions to oppose the Anglo-Rhodesian proposals for a settlement together with us.

7. The Home-Smith deal which we have been presented with is racist both in substance and in its consequences. It is based on the illegal and racist Rhodesia Front Constitution of 1969 and its claim to provide majority rule is ridiculed by constitutional experts. It is also a deliberate attempt to deceive millions of persons into thinking that they could have freedom in a police State. But even if the proposals were in fact what Sir Alec Douglas-Home says they are, their implementation assumes the good faith and honour of Mr. Smith and the Rhodesia Front Party. I am sure most of you here will agree with me that the record provides no good reason why any sensible person should make that assumption. The history of Rhodesia is a long, sad and sordid record of betrayal and broken promises. The illegal régime of Mr. Smith is an outfit of men who have already torn up the 1969 Constitution, and now the British Government, apparently in all seriousness, believes that it is unreasonable that the Africans should not trust him to respect the present constitutional proposals.

8. The African National Council puts forward the following specific criticisms motivating its rejection of the settlement proposals embodied in the document, entitled "Why the ANC says 'No' to the settlement proposals".

9. Both before and after the unilateral declaration of independence the British Government carried on a dialogue with Rhodesian authorities to the complete exclusion of the recognized African leaders. The basic demand of ANC is that no settlement of the Rhodesian problem can be achieved without the active participation of the African people, through the leaders of their choice, in the actual process of negotiation leading to any settlement to be approved by them. ANC accordingly rejects these proposals, which have been arrived at without consultation with the people of Rhodesia. Further, it believes that after the cynical disregard for law represented by UDI, the so-called Republican Constitution of 1969 is a high-water mark in such lawlessness and can never be made the basis for any settlement. ANC, on behalf of the overwhelming majority of the people in Rhodesia, cannot in any circumstances accept a settlement whose result, directly or indirectly, is the legalization of UDI and the Republican Constitution. ANC believes that the present proposals do not amount to any significant amendment of the 1969 Constitution. In this case—unlike that on previous occasions when the fate of the country was being considered—the African people can at least say No to those proposals and attempt to block them even though they have not been consulted during the stages of their negotiation. This is the first and last chance

for the African people to pass a verdict on white minority rule. To our mind, the proposals are a constitutional fraud, a prescription for increased racial bitterness and an inevitable blood-bath, and an insult to the dignity of every African in Rhodesia. The proposals contrary to some arguments, do not decolonize Rhodesia; rather, they recolonize the country, and to ensure the success of this dangerous and dishonourable venture the British Government seems prepared to subsidize it. Our rejection of these proposals is therefore unanimous.

10. Despite all the intimidation of the African people by their employers, the Government, the police, the District Commissioners and the British Government, they have been unanimous in their rejection of the Anglo-Rhodesian settlement proposals. The world has been told by the Smith régime that only four people, the Todds and the Chinamos, have been detained and only 14 people have been killed since the arrival of the Pearce Commission in Rhodesia. But the information available to ANC is that 31 people were killed by the police in Gwelo, Salisbury, Umtali and Shabani following the disturbances that took place during the first week of the work of the Pearce Commission, that 250 were detained and 1,000 were arrested—those who stood up for their dignity in rejecting the proposals.

11. The African National Council calls upon the Security Council to press the United Kingdom Government to honour the principles of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, paragraph 1 of which states:

"The subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and co-operation."

12. The African National Council requests the United Nations to accept the African expression of refusal of the Anglo-Rhodesian settlement proposals as a genuine reflection of the feelings of the 5.5 million Africans, who, despite intimidation, have expressed their political attitude against the racialism of the Smith régime backed by the British Government.

13. The African National Council is suspicious that the British Government is going to find an excuse to implement the most unacceptable proposals by blaming it on "African intimidation". Already its Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, Sir Alec Douglas-Home, has indicated that this is the last chance and there will be no other constitutional conferences even if the answer is an overwhelming No. Now, one wonders why the Commission was ever sent to test the acceptability of the settlement proposals if the only desirable answer was Yes. With this in mind, the African people are already preparing themselves for a long confrontation with the racist régime and therefore call upon the international community not to recognize the independence imposed by the British Government. We realize that the British Government is desperate to get rid of the problem, to trade with Rhodesia, to give

the régime international respectability, and most important, to open channels of investment in Rhodesia. This is most unacceptable to the Africans. We therefore call upon the Security Council not to change its present attitude, which forbids States Members of the United Nations to have economic or diplomatic relations with the Smith régime. We know, too, that in order for the sanctions to be withdrawn the Security Council must give its consent and the General Assembly must accept Rhodesia as one of the States Members of the United Nations. We are totally opposed to this and we could accept a situation where Rhodesia became a Member of the United Nations only if it followed a Government elected under the principle of "One man, one vote".

14. Even in spite of violations there is no question of the effectiveness of sanctions: hence the desire of the Smith régime for a settlement. The economy is gradually grinding to a halt because of the lack of foreign currency, necessary capital for the advancement of the economy and the lack of machinery and vehicular spare parts used in the Army, Air Force, railways and industrial sectors.

15. The Africans accept sanctions as a price for their freedom and declare as our enemy any person who claims on our behalf that sanctions should be withdrawn to alleviate African suffering through lack of employment. In fact, sanctions were never designed to hit Africans—and this has indeed been the effect, because it is the farmers, miners, importers and exporters that have suffered as a result of sanctions. None of these are Africans.

16. The African National Council calls upon the Security Council and the States which support the cause of human freedom to intensify the sanctions by fully blockading Beira and Lourenço Marques under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter in respect of all goods exported from or imported into Rhodesia. Without the facilities offered by the Portuguese through these ports the Smith régime would have collapsed long ago. It is our determination to see racism eradicated, and that can be achieved only by getting rid of the present régime in Salisbury.

17. The African National Council hopes that the United Nations now recognizes that Britain has defaulted in its responsibility to promote majority rule in Rhodesia because its policies in southern Africa are influenced by racial considerations, and that explains why it has not been able to stand by the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter. The African people of Rhodesia have been deeply shocked by the blatant disregard for the Charter, for human suffering in Rhodesia and for international law by the United States in violating Security Council resolution 253 (1968), imposing sanctions on Rhodesia. In my opinion the purchase of chrome by the United States had no motives other than encouraging and boosting the morale of the racist régime in order to make it defy the world. I was wondering whether it was not time someone investigated to establish whether or not the United States violated the law. If it did, it is time someone brought the United States before the International Court of Justice. Whatever the motives, the Africans believe the United States action to be an expression of bad faith.

18. All along, the British Government has been claiming an international prerogative to look after Africans who are victims of the régime, who escaped either from detention or from police surveillance. But what we have seen is many of these victims being ignored and some being deported from country to country and, in other countries, being sent home to face persecution by the police. I call upon the Security Council to confer proper international refugee status upon the refugees and to grant asylum to those who find it necessary to leave their territory. That would alleviate the suffering the African people of Rhodesia have put up with during the past six years since the unilateral declaration of independence.

19. Africans in Rhodesia have been extremely surprised to see streams of Europeans continuing to come to Rhodesia, displacing the Africans from their land and their jobs despite Security Council resolution 253 (1968) explicitly calling upon Member States not to allow their citizens to emigrate to Rhodesia. I hope that from now on Member States will do their best to stop such immigrants, who continue to prop up the racist régime in Rhodesia.

20. As to the solution of the problem, when we ask for freedom we are in no way saying that the settlers should be expelled from our country. On the contrary, we are seeking a peaceful and just means of racial coexistence in order to avoid the impending bloodshed. We call upon the British Government to assist those white people who do not want to live under majority rule to leave for various parts of the world where there are white governments, and in this connexion we are prepared to pay the price of repatriation—as was the case in Kenya. The sum of £50 million, which the British Government believes it is generously giving us, could best be used for the repatriation of those who would like to leave the country. We are aware that over 140,000 whites out of a total of 243,000 still hold British citizenship, and only 35,000 have no other home, while the rest come from various European and Commonwealth countries. It is therefore clear to us that African life is being made impossible by foreign citizens. We call upon the States Members of the United Nations and upon the World Bank, the Commonwealth Development Corporation and other international organizations to participate in this scheme and solve the problem as they did that of Kenya in 1962 and 1963. We are prepared to sit down and frame a constitution acceptable to us as a whole with those white people who accept non-racism, which is brought about by majority rule.

21. The PRESIDENT: I thank Mr. Muzorewa for his statement.

22. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): Mr. President, through you I should like to express the appreciation of my delegation to Bishop Muzorewa for the information he has imparted to us on the situation in Southern Rhodesia.

23. In the course of his statement he touched upon an aspect of which the Security Council is actively seized, that is, the question of sanctions. As members will see from the agenda, we have yet to consider not only the fourth report of the Committee on Sanctions but also an interim report contained in document S/10408.

24. However, before going on to those two particular reports I should like to ask the Bishop whether sanctions are hurting the Africans or the minority régime and whether a relaxation of sanctions would in the opinion of the African National Council be a boon to the inhabitants of Southern Rhodesia at this stage?

25. Mr. MUZOREWA: I believe that the answer, if I understand the question correctly, is found in my statement. I regret that, owing to the short notice I had in coming here, it was not possible to distribute it to the members of the Council. In that statement I said:

"The Africans accept sanctions as a price for their freedom and declare as our enemy any person who claims on our behalf that sanctions should be withdrawn to alleviate African suffering through lack of employment. In fact, sanctions were never designed to hit Africans—and this has indeed been the effect, because it is the farmers, miners, importers and exporters that have suffered as a result of sanctions. None of these are Africans".

26. Admittedly there are some people who have been displaced from their jobs, but just the same the answer is that they are saying, "This is the part which we can play as we try to achieve this most important goal of freedom." In other words, no members should feel that they should refrain from using the power they have in sanctions under the pretence that they are helping Africans, because we are calling for sanctions ourselves.

27. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): The position of my delegation on the question of Southern Rhodesia was made quite clear during the debates in this Council on 29 and 30 December 1971 and again during its recent meetings at Addis Ababa. The fact that the Council was unable to proceed further with the consideration of the matter in Addis Ababa because of a British veto does not necessarily close the door to consideration of this question. In fact, in the opinion of my delegation, the Council has the responsibility of seeing to it that this question is continuously discussed until such time as a solution based on justice and fairness is arrived at—in consultation with all the peoples of Southern Rhodesia. We know this is not the case so far. We know that the proposals arranged between the British Government and the rebel régime in Southern Rhodesia were proposals arrived at without any Africans being brought into the consultations. This has been made quite clear again by Bishop Muzorewa.

28. The point I want to make at this stage is this. In the anxiety that has been caused by the launching of these proposals, the Council seems to have shifted the priority it had placed on sanctions. Now we feel as if we are being caught up in the proposals at the expense of trying to make sanctions workable and enforceable. This is an exercise on which the Security Council has in the past been of one mind, and it grieves my delegation now to receive continuously reports in the press of States preparing to enter into the Southern Rhodesian market with great vigour. I have before me a newspaper report which says that on Tuesday—that is, yesterday—a large freighter was expected to dock at Beira to take on 25,000 tons of chrome from Southern Rhodesia for delivery to the United States. I have

another report which says that two American companies, Foote Mineral and Union Carbide, are expected to receive large consignments of chrome from Southern Rhodesia, one consignment expected in the middle of March and another towards the end of March.

29. The interim report on the question [S/10408] which was brought to the attention of this Council on 3 December 1971 was unique in that it contained a unanimously adopted set of recommendations from the Committee on Sanctions in an effort to impress upon the international community the need to enforce sanctions with all the power at its command. It is the hope of my delegation that at its next meeting, which I trust will be held not later than next Monday, the Council will immediately take up the series of recommendations contained in the supplementary report, so as to emphasize the earnestness and the importance this Council attaches to its own decisions.

30. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The statement the Council has heard from Bishop Abel Muzorewa, head of the African National Council, has once again convincingly shown us that the people of Zimbabwe, in spite of threats, persecution and savage reprisals, which the Southern Rhodesian racists with the obvious connivance of the British authorities have carried-out against peaceful demonstrations, have convincingly demonstrated a unanimous negative attitude to the deal made between the British Government and the Southern Rhodesian racists.

31. The background information and specific facts given to the Council by Bishop Muzorewa supplement the information supplied at the Security Council's meetings in Addis Ababa by representatives of the two main Zimbabwe people's parties, ZAPU (Zimbabwe African People's Union) and ZANU (Zimbabwe African National Union). All this information comes down to one thing: the British Conservatives and the Southern Rhodesian racists have not succeeded in misleading the people of Zimbabwe, or in trapping and entangling them in agreements worked out in Salisbury between the British representatives and Ian Smith without the participation of representatives of the people of Zimbabwe. The Africans have categorically and unanimously answered "No" to the question whether the so-called agreement on the terms of a settlement are acceptable to them. The reaction of the people of Zimbabwe is entirely understandable and legitimate.

32. Who would gain from the implementation of these proposals? The racists of Southern Rhodesia, for it would mean the legalization of their unlawful régime and the lifting of sanctions imposed by the Security Council. Application of the proposals would also be to the advantage of the imperialist monopolies in Britain for it would mean absolving Britain of responsibility for the situation in Southern Rhodesia and legalizing the activities of British—and not only British but also American—monopoly capital in the country. The Home-Smith deal was undertaken to the detriment of the vital interests of the people of Zimbabwe. Going through with the deal would signify indefinite endorsement of the racist régime's rule in Southern Rhodesia, of the policy of racial discrimination, of the policy of *apartheid*, and of the inferior political and

economic status of the overwhelming majority of the people of Southern Rhodesia.

33. As was pointed out in a statement by the Soviet delegation during the Security Council meetings held in Addis Ababa, the leader of the Southern Rhodesian racists, Ian Smith, himself admitted with cynical candour his dream of a thousand-year rule of the white racists over the people of Zimbabwe. Not only the people of Zimbabwe but all progressive anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist forces throughout the world have raised their voices against the Home-Smith deal—an obvious farce, as is the work of the Pearce Commission on the so-called test of acceptability.

34. It is quite easy to see why all this is happening. It can be explained by the fact that at the root of the Home-Smith agreement is the theory, hateful to all those who favour equality for all people irrespective of their race, national origin or colour, of the racial supremacy of the white racists over the Africans, and their imperialistic doctrine regarding what they call the incapacity of Africans for self-government and independence. These Fascist and racist theories and doctrines have long since been exposed and reduced to ashes by the actual developments and the founding of many sovereign African States after the victorious national liberation revolution which took place all over Africa after the war in which the Soviet armed forces crushed Hitler's fascism, which had proclaimed the idea of a thousand-year rule of the German racists over all peoples of the world.

35. The conscience of the peoples of the world cannot admit the preaching of such theories and doctrines or their practical manifestations in any form, be it fascism, racism, zionism, or South African and Southern Rhodesian *apartheid*. Racism and *apartheid* have been condemned by the United Nations as a crime against humanity. And no one can doubt that the British agreement with Smith is essentially just that—racist and imperialist.

36. At first sight it might not seem very clear why the British Government should be so stubborn in imposing on the people of Zimbabwe settlement terms which are so repugnant to them. Indeed, it is doing so in spite of the promises that the British Government itself was so lavish in giving in the course of holding talks with Smith. The British Government declared, and the British representative here in the Council stated, that if the people of Zimbabwe did not like these agreements then Britain would renounce them. What is preventing the British Government now from immediately renouncing these agreements and proceeding to take the action proposed by the African representatives in Addis Ababa, including that of promoting the country's political and constitutional advancement on a negotiated basis or through the convening of a conference involving the authentic representatives of the people of Zimbabwe?

37. We can see that the British Government is not moving towards such action. The United Kingdom delegation during the Security Council's meetings away from Headquarters—as the distinguished representative of Somalia has already pointed out here—used its veto in the vote on the draft resolution submitted by the African countries condemning the whole scheme of the “test of acceptability”

and the Pearce Commission. The reason for such behaviour by the United Kingdom delegation is of course not, as they claim, that the results of the Pearce Commission's work are not yet known. The British Government knows the results—knows them better than anyone else. The real reason is to be found in the imperialist basis of Britain's policy towards Southern Rhodesia and in the attempts by the imperialist monopolies of Britain, and not only of Britain, to form with other Powers a military colonial bloc in southern Africa, to check the development of national liberation movements of those African peoples that are still under the domination of racists and colonialists, and to imperil the independence of African States—that is the essence of the whole matter, and no tirades or diplomatic manipulation can disguise the real reasons and motives behind British policy in Africa.

38. At this stage of the discussion of the Southern Rhodesia question in the Security Council the Soviet delegation intends to confine itself to these brief remarks on the substance of the matter. It reserves the right to make more detailed comments on this question when it is discussed further.

39. In conclusion, the Soviet delegation feels that it must once again stress the fact that the Soviet Union strongly condemns the deal between Britain and Smith's racist régime and rejects the unworthy manoeuvres to endow this usurpers' minority régime with a semblance of respectability and legitimacy. We condemn the savage reprisals of the racists against the peaceful demonstrators in Southern Rhodesia and the mass arrests of patriots who are demanding freedom and independence for their country.

40. The British Government is directly responsible for what is now happening in Southern Rhodesia and for the fact that the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, is conniving in the usurpers' racist rampage over the country.

41. The Soviet delegation supports the efforts of the representatives of African countries at the United Nations to put a stop to the monstrous crimes committed by the racists with the support of foreign imperialist forces, against this long-suffering country. We, with the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations, support the adoption of effective measures to oust the racist régime in Southern Rhodesia and create conditions in which the people of Zimbabwe can exercise their legitimate right to self-determination and independence, free from any kind of outside interference or pressure.

42. Mr. KOMATINA (Yugoslavia): It is my delegation's firm conviction that we were right in having this meeting of the Council on the Southern Rhodesian question called two weeks after our exhaustive deliberations on African matters in Addis Ababa. There are several reasons for that. First, the Council decided long ago to be continuously seized of the Southern Rhodesian matter, and we must persevere and give an unmistakable sign of our constant readiness and alertness to do so. Secondly, we have to show that the fact that twice recently we were not able to adopt a draft resolution because of a veto does not prevent us from insisting on having all developments there under our closest

attention. Thirdly, because of some most recent developments, more specifically in the field of violations of sanctions, as reported in the interim report of the Committee, it is now time for the Council to address itself to the two reports that deal with matters of sanctions and that have been before the Council for some time. Fourthly—last but not least—we were very well advised indeed to let Bishop Muzorewa speak to us today. My delegation can hardly think of anyone more qualified to give us information and insight into the struggle of the people of Zimbabwe, their successes and their needs.

43. We are indeed most grateful to Bishop Muzorewa for coming here and addressing us. We were quite impressed by his clear and forceful presentation of the essential facts and considerations. They are very helpful in understanding the true situation in Southern Rhodesia, the epic struggle that the people of Zimbabwe are waging for their basic individual and national rights against all attempts to maintain the old or to impose new forms of colonialism, racial discrimination and minority rule over them. We support them there. Bishop Muzorewa cautions us that a clear and loud No may be interpreted as the result of African intimidation. He has brought us a most welcome confirmation that sanctions should stay, that they do hurt the Smith régime and that no African asks for their dismantling.

44. My delegation set forth its views on the Southern Rhodesian situation in the course of our meetings at Addis Ababa. There is no need for me to repeat them here and now. My delegation specifically addressed itself to all the matters concerning our collective duty to maintain and strengthen the sanctions system that we unanimously imposed against the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia. My delegation suggested then that we should try to do all we could to persuade the United States to rescind the unfortunate decision to re-establish chrome imports from Southern Rhodesia. The Yugoslav delegation is very much disturbed by reports that the shipment of large quantities of chrome ore might actually be taking place now or are about to take place, and in Addis Ababa we suggested, among other things, that we should consider the possibility of applying the sanctions automatically against those who are violating them.

45. My delegation thinks that the Council should deal with these matters without any unnecessary delay. We, for our part, are ready for immediate consultations. We think that further meetings on these matters should take place very soon, and we would support all efforts to deal with these items effectively and expeditiously in order to make it possible for the Council to adopt a meaningful decision.

46. Mr. JAMIESON (United Kingdom): I do not think it necessary to exercise a right of reply in full to the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union. Standard stuff, so no need for a standard reply. But I should like to take him up on one point, where he said that the Africans in Rhodesia had unanimously answered No. This is not an assumption with which we think it right the Council should agree.

47. In this connexion, we have all listened with interest to what Bishop Muzorewa had to say about the present

situation. I think many members of the Council will know that he has on a previous occasion said that it is important that the Pearce Commission, before which he has played a leading part in the submission of views, should be allowed to complete its task. If I may say so, Bishop Muzorewa is Chairman and a very persuasive advocate of the African National Council, which was founded, as he has told us, explicitly for the purpose of opposing the proposals. Therefore, he is a useful person for us to have heard here, and he will undoubtedly be regarded as a very useful witness to the Pearce Commission. But that, with due respect, does not necessarily mean that he speaks for all Rhodesian Africans and that, as the representative of the Soviet Union has implied, all Rhodesian Africans have rejected the proposals. To assume that is to prejudge the matter, because there is testimony from other Africans in favour, of the proposals—not all of it wholeheartedly in favour, perhaps, but taking the line that these are proposals which, if the Africans really work them, can lead to useful results.

48. I do not want to argue further about that, because it is the task of the Pearce Commission to judge the acceptability or otherwise of the proposals to the Rhodesian people as a whole. Until it has completed its task, no one can claim to be a better judge. As I have said, Bishop Muzorewa has himself spoken in favour of the Commission completing its task. If I may say so, this is what my own delegation has been arguing from the outset in suggesting that the Council should suspend its judgement on the proposals until we know the results.

49. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): Following the statement just made by the representative of the United Kingdom, I should like to ask Bishop Muzorewa whether he can let us know the proportion of Africans that have said Yes to the proposals and whether they are to be found among the so-called tribal chiefs or others?

50. Mr. MUZOREWA: It would be wrong to say that I had implied that 100 per cent of the Africans were rejecting the proposals. We have been claiming from all that we have observed, with the international press present as a witness in my country now, that about 99 per cent of the African people are saying No. We have organizations that have endorsed their stand with us. As far as I know, there was one Member of Parliament who said publicly that he was accepting the proposals. There was one Chief who claimed that his followers were saying Yes with him. With regard to the Chiefs who, we were told, accepted the proposals *in camera*, in the presence of their two big immediate bosses, we do have evidence from the Chiefs that we were not told the whole truth of what went on *in camera*. Certainly, it can be said very plainly, very openly, that about 99 per cent of the people in Rhodesia today have been saying No.

51. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): It is being said that the African National Council has been able to generate opposition to the proposals by a policy of intimidation and that, as a result, the rebel régime is now trying to draw up charges against the Council. Could Bishop Muzorewa give us any information on this aspect?

52. Mr. MUZOREWA: It would be unrealistic to deny that there could be a few cases of enthusiastic, militant, isolated



young people who might be intimidating somebody. But if the African people were going to give an answer under pressure of intimidation, then we should have had 99 per cent of them saying Yes, because they are suffering the worst intimidation from an organized system. They arrest people before and after the Pearce Commission comes to a place. The civil servant District Commissioners had told the people, before the arrival of the Pearce Commission, all over the rural areas, that they would not want people other than the Chiefs, the headmen and the councillors to come.

53. Fortunately, when the Pearce Commission arrived, Lord Pearce announced that they would call for the silent majority to come forward and register their opinion. The following morning 10,000 people showed up, and one of the members of the international press who had been at the desk the whole day came to me in the evening and said that he had not seen a single African who had written Yes on his form.

54. In spite of the intimidation that has come from those I have mentioned, and in spite of that from the white employers, we still find people saying No. So I should like to deny that the overwhelming majority of people, without organized intimidation, would not come and say No. Instead, the intimidation is coming from the other side, which is the worst one. Indeed, we have suggested to the Pearce Commission that we have nothing to fear, nothing to hide. If the Pearce Commission wants to change its method and come to a place and give each person a paper and let him write on it privately and then give his paper back, we are willing to do that. This is a challenge to the Government which claims that people are being intimidated.

55. There would be no way of knowing what a person had written down on his paper. If the Government wants to do that, we are prepared to go into the one-man, one-vote method, because we have nothing to be afraid of and nothing to hide.

56. The PRESIDENT: Before I call on the next speaker, I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have just received a letter from the representative of Saudi Arabia requesting that he be authorized, in accordance with Article 31 of the Charter, to participate without vote, in the debate on the question on our agenda.

57. As I hear no objection, I take it that the Council in accordance with Article 31 of the Charter, decides to accede to that request.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. J. Baroody (Saudi Arabia) took a place at the Council table.*

58. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I have asked for the floor in order to make a short reply to the statement of the United Kingdom representative.

59. First of all, however, I should like to thank the distinguished Bishop for giving such a comprehensive reply in answer to the doubts expressed by the United Kingdom representative.

60. In my statement I said that the Africans have categorically and unanimously answered No to the question whether the so-called agreements on the terms of a settlement are acceptable to them. I hold that the response of 99 per cent of the people of Zimbabwe to the shameful racist and imperialistic deal between Smith and Home constitutes a unanimous reply. I trust that the Security Council will take note of the answer given by the distinguished Bishop to the Somali representative's question, to the effect that 99 per cent of the people of Zimbabwe have said No to the British and Smith proposals. There may well be 1 per cent of traitors of the people of Zimbabwe and they for various reasons might say Yes. But the United Kingdom representative himself acknowledged in his statement that even this Yes is not whole-hearted. That is the true picture.

61. Thus the Security Council and its members can have no doubts in the matter. The people of Zimbabwe unanimously answered No, and consequently the only proper way out of the situation is for the British Government immediately to withdraw the Pearce Commission from Southern Rhodesia and follow the sensible advice given at the Security Council's meetings at Addis Ababa by the representatives of African sovereign States and the representatives of national liberation movements in the colonial territories of Africa.

62. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): I should like to ask one last question on the matter of opposition. Does the African National Council have an opportunity of explaining its position and the reasons for its opposition to the African people through the medium of radio or television?

63. Mr. MUZOREWA: The African National Council does not have access to radio or television.

64. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia.

65. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I wish to thank you, Mr. President, and the members of the Council for allowing me to address the Council on this question which is not perennial in the sense that it has been with the United Nations for many, many years, but which, I should say, is becoming a burning issue that is confronting us continuously—and rightly so.

66. It was a privilege for me to listen to His Grace the Bishop. Are you Anglican, Sir?

67. Mr. MUZOREWA: United Methodist.

68. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Then I think I can say "Your Grace" instead of "Your Lordship". I was enlightened by what His Grace mentioned this afternoon. Indeed, we had all come to the conclusion, which has been reaffirmed by His Grace, that the Pearce Commission is a dead letter. I think it was none other than my colleague the representative of Somalia, my good friend, who saw that nothing would come out of it. Not that we merely followed suit, but it was obvious to every one of us that that mission would come to nought. The age of prophecy is over. When I was asked: "Why are you not going to Addis Ababa, since

you always appear in the Council on colonial issues? ”, I replied—with all due respect to my African brothers and their dignity and aware that the people of Africa should feel that the Council is concerned with their affairs—that nothing would come out of the meetings in Addis Ababa because I knew that the British would veto any draft resolution that would be acceptable not only to the Africans but also to the people of Rhodesia.

69. So it was an academic series of meetings in Addis Ababa. I am not going to rationalize and say it was good or bad. I leave it to the history of the Council—not its past history but what will be written about it in the future.

70. What I should like to draw to the attention of my colleagues is that the Council is in a rut—as it has been on many issues before—but it is getting to be more so on questions of which it is seized nowadays for the simple reason that the policies predicated on the balance of power and spheres of influence still obtain in the world. It is not on the basis of justice that the Council takes decisions. No doubt its members—diplomats representing their respective Governments—are imbued with a sense of justice. But they are not free agents nor, I dare say, are the politicians behind them because they are all enmeshed in policies that do not differ very much from those adopted by the League of Nations. Let me remind my colleagues that I happened to be an observer *ex officio* of that international organization.

71. Then why am I taking the floor? Just to talk? I have been talking for 27 years, and I find that we have reached a cul-de-sac, a dead end. I am talking because there are ways and means that might perhaps constitute the basis of solutions in the future, provided the politicians or the leaders—whatever name you wish to call them—by force of circumstance change or adapt their policies in such a way that world public opinion may not consider the United Nations as a superfluous Organization. Otherwise it will be the end of the United Nations, and I should feel sad to see the end of this Organization, because there is no alternative to it. There would be bilateral agreements, multilateral agreements and clashes between groups of nations. I am not talking about ideologies now, but about national self-interest or a group of nations that have common interests.

72. This is the fourth time I have addressed myself to the Rhodesian question. What I have already said I need not repeat. It is on record. However, I have heard His Grace, the Bishop, and I believe that being a man of religion he is an honourable man, a man that preaches love knowing that when Christ was asked: “What is God?”, he replied: “God is love”, and a Bishop who is an exponent of the Christian religion and who, I am sure, would not counsel force. It must be that the people of Southern Rhodesia is suffering so much indignity that even a Bishop is crying to high heaven and presenting the case of Southern Rhodesia before you, gentlemen.

73. Now, of course, His Grace was right when he answered our colleague, my good friend from the United Kingdom, that—and I am paraphrasing—you do not need to have 100 per cent opposition to the Smith-Home plan, or any percentage for that matter, to denote what the situation is. Some one here mentioned that part of the people advocates

secession or complete independence, or segregation if you want to call it by that name since race is mentioned. For example, here in the host country there are two parties. Some members of the Government, who are not in the party, sometimes speak but they are not speaking for the majority of the people. So we are confusing the issue by going into too many details.

74. The question is: what can be done under the present circumstances? Will you gentlemen come here time and again and go around in circles? And some of you are ominously silent because you have nothing more to say. What can you say? Many of you tried—and I listened carefully—to propose solutions, but none of those solutions was acceptable to either side.

75. How do we get out of the rut? Let us briefly examine the situation of the whites. The Security Council may recall that I said that they have a genuine fear that they will be deluged by the blacks: 250,000 whites on the one hand and 5.5 million blacks on the other. What His Grace mentioned today is very plausible, namely, the International Bank financing the repatriation of those who are not Southern Rhodesians as such, but who came from the outside, from various parts of Europe. However, even the so-called white Southern Rhodesians would not want to leave. It is as if the Red Indians in this host country became stronger and asked the International Bank or any other financial organization to finance the removal of all the whites from the United States—because after all, this continent belonged to the Red Indians.

76. We have to face the facts. The whites are there, for good or evil. It is not for me to go into the morality of how they came to be there. Many of their ancestors probably went there in good faith in order to find opportunities. And they prospered. With all due respect to His Grace, even if the Bank were to give the whites a billion dollars I do not think that they would emigrate. They are tenacious in clinging to the land. They consider it their homeland. Again, we do not say that they should or should not consider it as their homeland; that is beside the point. Therefore, although it sounds plausible to repatriate those who are racists among the whites, I think it is not practical.

77. Again, in spite of the fact that I said that all I had mentioned on this question of Southern Rhodesia was on the record, I must say that neither the Africans, nor the Asians, if they were to ally themselves with the Africans, are in a position to fight and dislodge those whites. I am sure the Bishop would counsel mercy concerning any blood-bath of the kind he said might take place—God forbid—in the future. After all, we are the United Nations; we try to resort to peace rather than bloodshed.

78. As a result of my personal experience I have stated to the Security Council time and again that we should put aside any literature on the question of sanctions, that sanctions will not work. Economics is stronger than politics. And in the world politics revolve around economics. My good friend Ambassador Malik once said that this is the Marxist theory. I am not a Marxist, but I say to the Security Council that it is the same thing; we came to the same conclusions.

79. Even if our good friend, the representative of the United Kingdom, and 50 per cent or 60 per cent of the people of the United Kingdom saw the injustice that is meted out to the blacks in Southern Rhodesia from the political and racial point of view, and were to say, "Let us ask Ian Smith and those who are of the same opinion to come here to the United Kingdom and live amongst us as our kith and kin", I do not think that this would work. First, Ian Smith and his cohorts will not emigrate because they are happy there. They are the leaders and lord it over the whites and the blacks in Southern Rhodesia. Secondly, any Government, Labour—and I stand to be corrected—or Conservative, will fall if the United Kingdom does anything which is inimical to the interests of those whom they consider their kith and kin in Southern Rhodesia—and in South Africa, for that matter.

80. I should like to remind the Council that the Government of the United Kingdom, after 10 years of negotiation, recently agreed to join the Common Market, which is a conglomeration of Western States. And those Western States have common interests, not only common economic interests but also common military interests and alliances. Whether they should or should not have alliances is beside the point, but we have to face the facts. *En passant*, Portugal, too, is a member of the alliance called NATO. The Western countries, because of the community of interests, are not going to turn their backs on the United Kingdom, or on Portugal, for that matter, and do what the blacks in Southern Rhodesia would want them to do. This is the truth, but we either do not have the courage to say it or we clothe it in diplomatic language and embellishments. Therefore, I submit, sanctions will not work.

81. I spoke to the Council of when I was a nationalist. I hope I have become an internationalist, because nationalism can be very narrow and chauvinistic, and one is sometimes tempted to think that his country is better than any other country. But I personally smuggled lists of arms that were purchased by French agents on the Mediterranean coast and sent to Syria to fight the French military Power there. The French were selling them to kill Frenchmen. I did not shoot. However, I learned from friends in the 1920s in France and in England that during the First World War the steel cartels in Belgium and Luxembourg sold steel to both sides—the Germans and the French.

82. Here is a good friend of mine from Panama. How many ships are owned by Panama that raise the Panamanian flag? And how many ships are Liberian that raise the Liberian flag? There are ways and means of smuggling. What are lawyers for? They exist to do shady things—not all of them, but many of them—and they get away with it. And they rationalize it—this is nothing, it is trade, and trade is legitimate. As I have said, everything evolves around economics.

83. What I am now going to say will please my good colleague and friend from China. I have been an admirer of Chinese art ever since seeing the Chinese exhibit in London in 1937. I marvel at Chinese art. In Piccadilly there was an official exhibit of Chinese art. Lloyds could not afford to insure it, so the British Government sent a couple of warships to accompany some of the ships carrying those

treasures from China to the exhibition in Piccadilly, at the Academy of Art. Also on exhibition were pieces from private collections such as the Evmorphopoulos collection and others. It was a dream, that exhibition. So in my humble way I began to collect plates, small Chinese plates. When I came to this country I went to a Chinese dealer and was told, "Now China is communist; you cannot buy Chinese things here. You are forbidden." But I bought them. They were not smuggled. They were made in China, sent to Hong Kong—and the name "Hong Kong" was stamped on them. And they came from China. And I believe some people in government bought them too through love of Chinese art.

84. Sanctions? What sanctions? If there is no will and no good will, there is no way. Let us be frank with ourselves.

85. This is an unorthodox way to address the Council: to cite personal experiences. But what do you want us to say? Do you just want us to write and prepare sheets of paper and read out our statements without having any effect? "All right," you say, "you are a fatalist and nothing can be done." No, a lot can be done.

86. First, let us establish that sanctions may irk some countries if all countries hermetically seal the country sanctioned. But this is not the case. More than 60 or 70 per cent of States Members of the United Nations will trade with Southern Rhodesia. And let me tell you one thing, and I am not mentioning names. I read not financial newspapers but financial reports. Rhodesian tobacco was being sold in some socialist countries surreptitiously. Diamonds from South Africa were sold, according to reports I received from London—industrial diamonds produced by certain countries, not Western countries—I do not want to embarrass anyone—they were sold by the cartel which was a combination of Western interests and South African interests. Because certain countries outside the pale of those countries could get better prices they sold their industrial diamonds through that South African company.

87. Now, whom are you fooling here? We, as diplomats, are ethical; we are correct. But we do not have things under our control. We are not a tribunal to judge. My heart goes out to my African brothers. After all, in dignity and worth, they are our brothers. There is a common saying: "We are all brothers under the skin". Nothing can be done? Of course, many things can be done. And I have jotted down one or two thoughts, aside from what I mentioned in the last few meetings on this question.

88. I have heard our friend from the Soviet Union, Ambassador Malik, use the words "racist imperialists". That the whites are racists there is no doubt. We have an Arabic proverb which says, "*La yafullu al hadid illa al hadid*", "Nothing cuts iron except iron". If I were a black Southern Rhodesian I would exercise racism as a means—not as an end in itself—against those who practise racism against me. I would be proud to be black. Sometimes I am tempted to think that Arabs are the best people in the world. Then I wake up. We are proud. Each of us should be proud of his origin. That is why I thought new avenues should be explored by the United Kingdom. I do not know whether my statements are sent to the Foreign Office or to the

Colonial Office. Of course, those snooty colonialists may say, "Oh, Baroody: what does he know about Africa, and why should he meddle in African affairs?" Ah, but you meddle, my dear Sirs. You meddle in every part of the world. You built an empire meddling in our areas. We have every right to meddle because all here belong to the same species, *homo sapiens*, mankind.

89. His Grace the Bishop mentioned that there should be autonomy either by way of cantonments or on a municipal basis. In other words, the blacks should rule their communities, not as tribal Chiefs, but also where there are cities—not only in the countryside. Will the British be courageous enough to work on such a new basis with Ian Smith? Because I know Ian Smith will not be dislodged by the words of members of the Council. The only way he can be dislodged is by force of arms. If those who champion the cause of Africa sent troops there, do you think the Western Powers would allow them to wage war against Ian Smith? No. Before they got to the shores of Africa submarines would be sent and the ships would be sunk. They are kith and kin—more than kith and kin, because the whites fight one another. In two world wars, you know, Christians have cut the throats of other Christians. Two world wars: religion is unfortunate in a way. I am not talking of traditional religion or the moral code of religion. Nobody thinks of it. Love, humanity, morality—they are words used only in the church or in the temple. And people cut one another's throats in the name of Christianity—or of any other religion, for that matter; witness what happened lately on the Asian subcontinent.

90. Therefore, the only way for the time being is to make a noise, and not hear so much said any more about this question. Everything that could be said on the Southern Rhodesian question has been said in the Fourth Committee and in the Council. What more is there to say? Now there is another alternative. Are our African brothers well organized and prepared—as I have asked in the Fourth Committee time and again, and in this Council—to have armies march on Ian Smith? Of course this is not the language of the United Nations. We should resolve our problems peacefully, but we are talking about alternatives, if we cannot solve them peacefully. I submit that our African brothers do not have the means to do it, because they need certain types of aircraft and certain arms, and they do not know how to use them yet. It takes time—10 or 20 years—and this is the way of force, and we are supposed to resolve our differences by peaceful means. Therefore we will set that solution aside. The British and their allies know that it is only hot air when we say that we will do this and that there will be a blood-bath. When? In the year 2000? By the year 2000 the whole world may have blown up—not by force of arms but because of the population explosion. Half the population now is starving. When there are 7 billion, I do not know how it will be. Perhaps there will be cannibalism and they will eat one another, but this is another question, and I do not want to digress.

91. The United Kingdom and its allies are not willing to wage war. Sanctions will not operate. Should the United Nations not play any role? Yes. I have mentioned that time and again, and I repeat it. True education, through

UNESCO. Not through education of the blacks only. I am not talking about spelling but about propagating the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and what we are doing in the field of self-determination. There are many activities in the United Nations that could perhaps contribute to the enlightenment of both blacks and whites. This is as far as we can go. But to send troops, United Nations peace troops, to wage war to maintain the peace, a contradiction in terms? We know there are divergent opinions on that procedure. I doubt that it will ever come to pass in the future. Therefore, to sum up: if the Council members want to have propaganda, it is their privilege.

92. I am not a member of the Council but I have a right to ask to be allowed to speak. The Council may consent or refuse, and it was very gracious of it to allow me to speak out of my humble experience. At least I have been here for 27 years. I should know by this time what works and what does not work. I believe that such meetings of the Council, unless they are bolstered by good will, will not result in any action to liberate our African brothers in Southern Rhodesia or elsewhere. Therefore, I again appeal to my colleague from the United Kingdom kindly to draw this to the attention of his Government. In spite of their preoccupation with their coal-miners and Ulster, the British are still considered the backbone of Europe. We should not dismiss the United Kingdom, because of its troubles, as finished. The British have a tradition of fair play, and one should see the good in a people. No people is perfect. They all have their shortcomings. Thank God, the British have stepped down now from the pedestal of Empire. That is something. But do you think I should be here as a colleague had it not been for a certain climacteric force in Europe that brought down the Empire: the emergence of that tyrant, Hitler? We should still be under French and British Mandates in my part of the world. He was a force. Many considered him evil. I do not make any pronouncements about him. He did not hurt me. He did not hurt my people. He hurt many people and he may have been very evil, but there was hidden evil also in his opponents. He brought down evil and he brought down the Empire with the Third Reich. Do we need a third world war to have our friends and brothers in Southern Rhodesia liberated? Had it not been for the Second World War many of us would still be living under the colonial yoke. I am telling the Bishop: you are a man of religion and I respect you, but this is the truth. There are forces in history. Evil sometimes fights evil, but something good sometimes comes out of war between evil forces. There were evil forces in Europe. They clashed, and we benefited in the colonial territories. But God forbid that we have a third world war, because the whole world may blow up, and then we do not know whether our African brothers will be better off. We shall be burnt because we are in the Middle East, we are in the centre of things, but they might also suffer from the fall-out. Do not think of man, this constipated biped, as an angel. He is evil most of the time. If he were not evil he would not shed blood as he has done within my lifetime. Two world wars, holocausts, in the name of democracy. The First World War was to save the world for democracy. There was less democracy after the First World War than there was before it. "Freedom from fear"—that is what Mr. Roosevelt, the famous President of the United States of America said. There is more fear after the Second World War than there was before it. "Freedom

from want"—there is more want now than there was before. War solves nothing, either among nations or on the national level—I mean civil war. Misery, suffering, tragedy: these are the consequences of war. I ask my colleague from the United Kingdom for Heaven's sake to ask his Government to forget about the Home-Smith concoction. It is not plausible. Nobody believes in it. I am sure neither Smith nor Home believes in it. It is not workable, not even plausible. Either you have independence or you do not have independence. Either you give those people what you claim to be the best rule, democratic rule, or you do not give it to them. That agreement does not give it to them.

93. After 30 hears—who knows?—you and I may be gone from this world. We cannot remind one another what will happen after 30 years. People want to live now, in the present. Tomorrow is not ours. As Omar Khayyam said, "Tomorrow I may be with yesterday's seven thousand years". What do I care about tomorrow? Not that we should not provide for tomorrow and plan for it, but we should lay the basis for tomorrow on sound moral ethics. I am not speaking here now only in a religious sense out of deference to the Bishop who happens to be with us, but there is in this world a law of retribution. We reap as we sow. I ask my colleague from the United Kingdom to find out whether cantons and municipal autonomy will work out, so that the black there may know he is ruling himself, so that he has a sense of dignity, so that he knows he is not beneath the white because the white has technology. What of that technology? We are going to die because of that technology and pollution. The ecological alarmists tell us about technology. Technology is not everything, materialistic progress is not everything. We do not live by bread alone. People should lead happy lives as individuals and in communities. What are we getting out of life? Today I was busy. I had to take Turns: I had a sour stomach because I had to eat quickly in order to get to the Security Council meeting. What kind of civilization is this, what kind of progress? In my younger days we used to chat over lunch. Of course, some of you Western nations are advanced in technology, and for that matter the socialists also brag about their industrial output and use astronomical figures. But you do not live by that alone. You live as individuals. We are guests. We are here today, and gone tomorrow. Let

us live at peace with our brothers, whether Africans, Europeans, Latin Americans or North Americans, and no matter what ideology they believe in. Stop repeating platitudes that get us nowhere.

94. I thank the Council and apologize to my colleagues here if I have touched any susceptibilities, which was not my intention. But I thought that once and for all I could give you the benefit of my humble experience on this question in the light of what has been going on in the United Nations.

95. The PRESIDENT: As there are no further speakers I am sure members would wish me on their behalf to thank Bishop Muzorewa for the statement that he made. That statement has served to illustrate in a most moving manner the concerns of the people of Zimbabwe. We share these concerns, we share the desire of the people of Southern Rhodesia for a just settlement of the future of their country and we support their determination that their human and civil rights should be restored and upheld.

96. The meeting of the Security Council this afternoon, soon after its series of meetings in Africa, should amply demonstrate the concern of the international community. I should like therefore to assure Bishop Muzorewa that the Council will continue to recognize the legitimacy of the struggle of the people of Southern Rhodesia to secure the enjoyment of their rights as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and in conformity with the objectives of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The Security Council, in its resolution 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968 on Southern Rhodesia, condemned all measures of political repression including arrests, detentions, trials and executions which violate fundamental freedoms and the rights of the people of Southern Rhodesia. There is no reason to suppose that it has retreated from that position. I hope therefore, Sir, that on your return you will carry back to your people from all of us in the Council a message of hope for their future and for their freedom.

*The meeting rose at 5.25 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.

---