
SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 16th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. DOLGUCHITS (Byelorussian Soviet
Socialist Republic)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 95: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA AND NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 93: QUESTION OF SOUTHERN RHODESIA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.4/33/SR.16
9 November 1978
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 95: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA AND NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued) (A/C.4/33/L.1)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited members of the Committee who wished to do so to explain their vote on draft resolution A/C.4/33/L.1.

2. Mr. MIR MOTAHARI (Iran) said that his country had always supported the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and defended the inalienable rights of colonial peoples in southern Africa to self-determination and independence, and would continue to do so until the last traces of colonial domination had been eliminated from Africa.

3. The fact that his delegation had not voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/33/L.1 was not due to any change in his country's policy with regard to colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination but to its reservations about the wording of paragraph 14; if the document had been voted on paragraph-by-paragraph, his delegation would have voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole but abstained on that paragraph.

4. Mr. JERNSTRÖM (Finland) said that his country had always supported colonial countries and peoples in the exercise of their right to independence. It had never hesitated to condemn the activities of foreign economic and other interests that were impeding the accession to independence of colonial territories.

5. Draft resolution A/C.4/33/L.1 dealt with the extremely disquieting situation prevailing throughout southern Africa. South Africa, by reason of the inhuman policy of apartheid it was pursuing, its illegal occupation of Namibia and its support of the Smith minority régime, was the principal culprit. Accordingly, his delegation supported the spirit of the draft resolution but had been compelled to abstain in the voting because it felt the arbitrary singling out of certain countries in paragraphs 6 and 7 to be unjustified. Moreover, the document contained some unduly general condemnations on issues that should be dealt with by the Security Council.

6. Mr. AYE (Burma) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution on the activities of foreign interests but had reservations about the wording of paragraph 6.

/...

7. Mr. MORENO-SALCEDO (Philippines) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution but would have abstained on paragraphs 6 and 7 if they had been voted on separately.

8. Mrs. UNAYDIN (Turkey) said that her delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/33/L.1, although it fully endorsed its essence and its spirit. Her delegation was resolutely opposed to the activities of foreign economic and other interests that were perpetuating colonial situations. Putting an end to such activities was of vital importance for a political solution of questions relating to southern Africa. Furthermore, it should be borne in mind that Turkey maintained no relations - political, diplomatic, military, economic or cultural - with South Africa and that, accordingly, none of the provisions of the draft resolution were applicable to it.

9. Accordingly, her delegation would ordinarily have voted in favour of the draft resolution; its abstention was due to its objections to the wording of several of the operative paragraphs in which specific countries were accused of collaborating with South Africa and to its rejection in principle of condemnations of that kind.

10. Mr. LOVALD (Norway) said that his delegation had always supported United Nations resolutions on the activities of foreign interests in southern Africa and it shared the concern of the sponsors of the draft resolution on that subject. However, it had been unable to vote in favour of the document because it found the wording of certain paragraphs unacceptable.

11. Mr. LAL (Fiji) reaffirmed that his delegation had always opposed the economic activities pursued by certain countries in collaboration with the racist régimes in southern Africa. He had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/33/L.1 because he endorsed its content. He had reservations, however, with regard to the wording of paragraphs 6 and 7, because the list of countries collaborating with South Africa was not exhaustive. Moreover, the question raised in paragraph 13 had been referred to the competent organ of the Security Council. His delegation would continue scrupulously to apply the economic sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and the arms embargo against South Africa.

12. Mr. ALBUQUERQUE (Portugal) said that on more than one occasion his delegation had openly denounced all economic activities which impeded the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It felt bound to reiterate that position all the more strongly in view of the disturbing accounts recently published concerning the activities of certain foreign economic interests and the ways they had devised to dodge mandatory sanctions against the Salisbury régime. The fact that foreign investment was being used not, as was sometimes the case, for the social and economic development of the Territories, but as a means of oppression or to support racial and colonial domination could no longer be tolerated.

/...

(Mr. Albuquerque, Portugal)

13. His delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because, although it shared the beliefs of the sponsors, the text was, in its view, seriously unbalanced; no reference was made to investments by foreign interests in small territories which, in most cases, had increased the well-being of the population, whereas in other resolutions reference was made to the need to increase such investment. Moreover, his delegation had reservations about the wording of paragraphs 6, 7 and 13 which, in its view, were unduly selective; it was unfair to accuse certain countries of collaborating with South Africa while ignoring violations of the mandatory sanctions by other countries.

14. Mr. URRUTIA (Peru) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution, which reaffirmed the inalienable rights of colonial peoples to independence and condemned the activities of foreign economic and other interests in colonial territories. Nevertheless, his delegation objected to certain paragraphs which made arbitrary and discriminatory references to some of the countries collaborating with South Africa, and it would have abstained on those paragraphs if they had been voted on separately.

15. Mr. RAKA-NOU (Papua New Guinea) said that his delegation had always supported the elimination of racial discrimination in southern Africa. He had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/33/L.1, although he believed that it would have been better not to single out certain countries for condemnation, as was done in paragraphs 6, 7 and 13.

16. Mr. JUWANA (Indonesia) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution and understood its aims very clearly; he had reservations, however, concerning the wording of paragraphs 6 and 7, in which certain countries were specifically accused of collaborating with South Africa. If votes had been taken on individual paragraphs, his delegation would have abstained on the paragraphs in question.

17. Mr. GHAZALI (Malaysia) said that he had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/33/L.1 because it fully subscribed to efforts by the United Nations to end all collaboration with the racist régimes in southern Africa. He had reservations, however, about paragraphs 6 and 7, in which certain countries were singled out as collaborating with South Africa. His delegation would have abstained on those paragraphs if they had been put to the vote separately, because they were not helpful in solving the problem.

18. Mr. HALFHUID (Suriname) said that he had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/33/L.1 because he subscribed to its principles and objectives, but he had reservations concerning paragraphs 6 and 7 and would have preferred them to be worded differently.

19. Mr. ARNELLO (Chile) said that, although he had voted for the draft resolution voted upon at the previous meeting, he had serious reservations concerning the provisions of some of the operative paragraphs.

/...

(Mr. Arnello, Chile)

20. His Government had always supported the cause of peoples aspiring to political independence in the exercise of their inalienable right to self-determination, but he could not endorse the statements appearing in paragraphs 6 and 7 of the draft, which contained provisions that discriminated against certain countries and were contrary to the purposes of the United Nations Charter. The tendency towards politicization apparent in some draft resolutions was to be deplored, for it damaged the cause that they were meant to uphold. If the sponsors of the draft resolution analysed the results of the vote and the reason for the reservations expressed by numerous States, they would find that an increasing number of countries were refusing to politicize such important questions.

21. Mr. MACRIDIS (Greece) said that he fully endorsed the principles set out in draft resolution A/C.4/33/L.1; he had abstained in the vote because he found unacceptable the wording of operative paragraphs 6, 7 and 13.

22. Miss DUBRA (Uruguay) noted that her country had always opposed any action harmful to the interests of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. She had voted for the draft resolution because she supported its general thrust, but she had reservations concerning the wording of certain operative paragraphs in which some countries were, inter alia, accused of maintaining diplomatic relations with South Africa. The fact that countries with very different ideological concepts had established diplomatic relations did not mean that they supported each other's views.

23. Mr. OKOUA (Togo) said that his delegation felt that it was of the utmost importance to eliminate the consequences of colonialism and regarded it as the duty of the international community to condemn categorically all activities that impeded realization of the legitimate aspirations of peoples to freedom. However, his delegation felt that all blameworthy acts should be denounced without exception, without discrimination and without being arbitrarily selective. It was in the light of those considerations that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/33/L.1

24. Mr. DIARRA (Gambia) said that he had also abstained in the vote on the draft resolution. Although he endorsed the substance of the draft, he found unacceptable the wording of operative paragraphs 6 and 7, which were discriminatory in nature and, therefore, incomplete. More moderate language would have been more effective than the categorical condemnations contained in those paragraphs.

25. Mrs. OSODE (Liberia) said that she strongly supported the principles set out in draft resolution A/C.4/33/L.1, which had been adopted at the previous meeting. Her delegation had abstained in the vote because it could not associate itself with the provisions of certain operative paragraphs containing arbitrary condemnation of some countries for collaborating with South Africa. It would have been preferable for the countries that had direct access to the documents concerning collaboration with South Africa to make them available to the regional groups so that the latter could consult on the question; in that way, progress could have been made towards attainment of the objective that lay at the basis of the draft resolution.

/...

26. Mr. GAZDIK (Hungary) said that, like the overwhelming majority of members of the Committee, he had voted for draft resolution A/C.4/33/L.1. The draft showed clearly that, despite the efforts of the United Nations and the international community, the racist régimes in Salisbury and Pretoria were continuing, with the support of Western imperialist circles, to plunder the natural resources of Namibia and Zimbabwe and were intensifying their repressive measures against the peoples of those countries. As was stated in operative paragraph 4, foreign economic, financial and other interests constituted a major obstacle to the political independence of those Territories. Despite the repeated urgings of the United Nations, Western companies were, through their activities, continuing to support colonial elements in southern Africa. Those activities obviously could not be tolerated much longer.

27. His delegation was particularly pleased at the wording of paragraphs 6 and 7, which condemned by name the countries responsible for the present situation in Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa. It also supported the measures called for in the draft resolution, which aimed, inter alia, at expanding the scope of sanctions and placing an embargo on oil shipments to South Africa and Rhodesia. It would, for its part, spare no effort to ensure full implementation of the provisions of the draft.

28. Mrs. PETERS (Bahamas) said that, if her delegation had been present for the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/33/L.1, it would have abstained.

29. Mr. GUNA-KASEM (Thailand) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution because it supported the latter's underlying principles. Thailand had always condemned apartheid and supported the efforts of the United Nations to eradicate that evil.

30. However, he had serious reservations concerning the wording of paragraphs 6 and 7 of the draft, which condemned certain countries in a selective and arbitrary manner while making no mention of others. He hoped that that practice would be abandoned in the future. If a separate vote had been taken on the two paragraphs in question, his delegation would have abstained.

31. Mrs. MAUALA (Samoa) said that her delegation would normally have voted for the draft resolution and, in any event, supported the latter's principles and substance. It had, however, abstained because it felt that the countries named in the draft were not the only ones that were collaborating with South Africa.

32. At the same time, she deplored the hypocrisy of certain countries which were merely paying lip-service to sanctions. One deplorable example was that of the British oil companies which were selling oil to Southern Rhodesia. The Western countries must show through concrete action that they were concerned at the situation in southern Africa, for it was their present attitude that was enabling the racist régimes to remain in power.

33. Mr. NEIL (Jamaica) said that his delegation condemned the role played by foreign economic and other interests in strengthening the oppression and exploitation of colonial peoples for purposes of economic gain. His delegation

/...

(Mr. Neil, Jamaica)

fully and firmly supported the basic demand made in the draft resolution: the complete and immediate disengagement of foreign interests from the Territories controlled by racist minority régimes.

34. Although it had some doubts about the wording of paragraphs 6 and 7, which created certain difficulties with regard to the selection of countries, and although it felt that certain assertions made in paragraph 7 were not sufficiently supported by the available evidence, his delegation, taking the draft resolution as a whole and taking account of the importance it attached to the need for the cessation of all activities that impeded the process of decolonization, had voted in favour of the draft.

35. Mr. DAWADI (Nepal) said that the peoples under colonial rule had inalienable rights and that the foreign interests operating in the colonial Territories must not infringe those rights. His delegation supported the draft resolution as a whole but thought it unfortunate that in paragraphs 6 and 7, instead of condemning foreign interests in general, the sponsors had chosen to condemn certain countries by name. His delegation had for that reason been obliged to abstain in the vote.

36. Mr. de ALMEIDA SANTOS (Brazil) said that the provisions of paragraphs 6 and 7 of the draft resolution were improper and their wording was not justified by the facts.

37. Mr. NEYTCHEV (Bulgaria), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that his country's position was well known and that his delegation had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution because it strongly believed that the activities of foreign economic and other interests were a serious obstacle to the process of self-determination. He was surprised that, even though the facts spoke for themselves, some countries were still trying to deny them and to place the blame on others. That was a threadbare manoeuvre which would not succeed, for everyone knew who was really obstructing the process of decolonization. The position of the Western monopolies was absolutely indefensible.

38. Mr. SCHRÖTER (German Democratic Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that in the Third Committee, the United States representative, referring to what he called statistics of the Government of South Africa, had already claimed that the German Democratic Republic maintained trade relations with South Africa. In reply, the representative of the German Democratic Republic had reiterated that his country strictly adhered to the decisions and resolutions adopted by the United Nations in support of the just struggle of the African peoples for the final elimination of all forms of colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism and maintained no relations whatsoever with South Africa. At that stage it might have been conceivable that the United States representative had been the victim of false information deliberately spread by the racist régime of South Africa. The Pretoria régime clearly had an interest in spreading such slanders, in order to mislead world public opinion and split the alliance of all the forces that took a resolute stand against the anti-human policy of the racist régime.

/...

(Mr. Schröter, German
Democratic Republic)

39. However, the United States representative had seen fit to make the same allegation in the Fourth Committee. It therefore had to be assumed that he was seeking to divert attention from his own country's collaboration with South Africa. The United Nations had repeatedly demanded comprehensive sanctions against the racist régime, and the German Democratic Republic had backed those demands without any reservations. It was common knowledge who was really responsible for the failure to implement such measures. The Prime Minister of South Africa himself had recently paid tribute to that country's alliance with the West to defend the ideals of the free world. There was a proverb which stated: "Tell me who you live with and I will tell you who you are".

40. Mr. PENAZKA (Czechoslovakia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said he categorically rejected the untruthful accusations made by the United States concerning alleged trade exchanges between Czechoslovakia and South Africa.

41. The representatives of African, Asian and Latin American countries knew best on whose side the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic had always firmly stood in the historic struggle for the liberation of peoples; its position did not have to be proved. Together with the other socialist countries, Czechoslovakia did not merely orally condemn the monstrous system of racial segregation in South Africa, but also actively fought against it. It had always scrupulously observed all the United Nations resolutions and has severed all contacts with the Republic of South Africa as early as 1963.

42. The current instance was not the first time that certain countries, on the basis of information supplied by the Western press and other dubious sources, had sought to cast a shadow on the policy of Czechoslovakia. Their aim was to compromise the anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist socialist countries in the eyes of the peoples struggling for the implementation of their rights to self-determination and independence and to divert attention from their own co-operation with and support for the racist régime in South Africa. That stratagem would not succeed.

43. Mr. ZDROJOWY (Poland), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, expressed surprise that the United States representative should have cited unreliable information from dubious sources concerning the alleged co-operation between Poland and South Africa, when Poland's steadfast position in the struggle against apartheid and colonialism was known to all. It was common knowledge that Poland maintained absolutely no relations whatsoever with South Africa. The accusations of the United States representative were designed solely to divert the attention of the Committee and the international community from those who were really responsible for maintaining the racist régimes in power.

44. Mr. GRAHAM (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said his delegation had never intended to question the dedication of the socialist countries to the common struggle against apartheid and colonialism. Furthermore, it had never sought to imply that the volume of trade between the socialist countries and the racist régimes was greater than the volume of trade between those régimes and the Western countries. The truth, no matter how painful,

/...

(Mr. Graham, United States)

must nevertheless be told, and it had to be acknowledged that many countries were in fact trading with South Africa and Southern Rhodesia; it was therefore completely unfair to name and condemn only the United States and other Western countries in that connexion.

45. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 95 and suggested that the Rapporteur should be requested to submit the report on that item directly to the General Assembly.

46. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 93: QUESTION OF SOUTHERN RHODESIA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued) (A/33/23/Add.1, A/33/61, A/33/63, A/33/118, A/33/151, A/33/206, A/33/279, A/33/291; A/C.4/33/2)

47. Mr. KAMARA (Senegal) said that for more than 10 years the United Nations had been faced with the same problem, whose presentation had undergone only purely formal changes, and the Organization was still in the same impasse. There was no need to recall all the meetings and conferences on the question, the latest of which had resulted in the Anglo-American proposals.

48. The régimes in southern Africa vied with each other in duplicity, Machiavellism and political schemes in which violence alternated with feigned willingness to negotiate, their multiple manoeuvres being aimed at enabling Ian Smith to command widespread support among the white electorate and the so-called moderate black Rhodesians who were ready to work for the preparation of a new constitution. Ian Smith had responded to the Anglo-American settlement plan by the internal settlement, which was in fact a hoax and a sham. Ian Smith could not continue his game for ever and he knew it. His internal settlement was an interminable list of elements involving so many guarantees for the whites that it precluded any real solution. For that reason the internal settlement, which was an artificial contrivance, had not been supported by any reasonable State or serious body: both the Organization of African Unity and the Security Council had denounced it as being unlawful and unacceptable. Furthermore, eight months of implementation had shown the internal settlement to be a failure.

49. From the political standpoint, various crises, some of them very serious, had shaken the heterogeneous team placed in power by Ian Smith; moreover, the expected reforms had been inadequate or had remained unimplemented. From the economic standpoint, the number of whites who were forced to leave the territory each year was very significant. The statement by the United Kingdom representative at an earlier meeting of the Committee showed that business in Southern Rhodesia was stagnating: the gross national product had declined, as had production, and there was a deficit in the territory's balance of payments, accounts and budget.

/...

(Mr. Kamara, Senegal)

50. The main cause of that situation was undoubtedly the state of war in Rhodesia, whose frontiers were being assaulted by the freedom fighters who had been forced to seek a military solution because efforts to reach a peaceful settlement had failed. Military expenditure was therefore increasing at the expense of agriculture and industry, and insecurity reigned almost everywhere, including the towns.

51. In order to escape from that awkward situation the Rhodesian Government was reacting violently and desperately, unfettered by any scruples. It was attacking neighbouring countries, notably Zambia and Mozambique. Those attacks would merely strengthen the resolve of the freedom fighters, but they warranted more than oral condemnation by the Members of the Organization. Primarily, the countries attacked and the Zimbabwe liberation movement needed material aid in order to resist such acts of international banditry and to prevent them from recurring.

52. The States which gave no substantial assistance to the liberation movement were precisely those which were responsible for the current situation in Rhodesia. The State which bore the greatest responsibility was the United Kingdom, which had failed to assume its historic responsibilities with regard to the territory at the critical moment. Furthermore, it was, generally speaking, those responsible States which had assisted the illegal Rhodesian régime - which could not last more than three months without them - and which continued to do so. They circumvented the sanctions imposed by the United Nations, took no effective step to prevent their nationals from becoming mercenaries in Rhodesia and sometimes used their own proposal for a peaceful settlement as a means of manoeuvring with a view to creating in an independent Zimbabwe conditions that would despoil the Patriotic Front of the fruit of the victories it had won in the field. It was for the reason that the combatants themselves, the front-line States and the international community as a whole must remain vigilant and demand a genuine settlement.

53. However, the current situation gave no grounds for optimism. Although Smith had declared that the Executive Council in Salisbury was currently ready to participate unconditionally in an all-party conference, that statement might conceal some new manoeuvre. In any case, the disquieting coincidence between that position on the one hand and the simultaneous unprovoked attacks on Zambia and Mozambique must not be forgotten.

54. Thus, it was apparently not yet possible to break the deadlock. In the meantime, the United Kingdom and United States delegations on the one hand and the Southern Rhodesian delegation on the other hand had considered the five main points of the United Kingdom-United States proposal and had determined the elements of agreement and disagreement between them. It would seem that, since the Southern Rhodesian régime had agreed to participate in a conference of all parties concerned, the United Kingdom and United States delegations were displaying some optimism and preparing to turn their efforts towards the leaders of the Patriotic Front. His delegation hoped that they would succeed in persuading the Patriotic Front leaders to agree to attend and negotiate.

/...

(Mr. Kamara, Senegal)

55. As the international community had, in principle, approved the settlement proposal of the United Kingdom and the United States, those two countries should make all the arrangements needed to implement it. They should conduct the necessary negotiations more firmly, under the supervision of the international community, and should also take the steps indispensable for preventing the illegal Smith régime from continuing to frustrate the efforts of the United Nations. Only in that way could there be any hope of finding a satisfactory solution to the problem of Southern Rhodesia, a solution which could lead to a genuine transfer of power to the majority as soon as possible.

56. His delegation would therefore support a firm resolution in favour of the struggle of the Zimbabwe liberation movement and emphasizing the need to strengthen and expand the sanctions so as to impose real constraints on the Smith régime.

57. Mr. LAPOINTE (Canada) deplored the fact that the situation in Southern Rhodesia had worsened since 1977. While welcoming the constant efforts of the United Kingdom and United States Governments to find a solution to that continuing tragedy, his delegation did not minimize the very real difficulties that lay ahead in the immediate future.

58. When Security Council resolution 253 (1968) had been adopted, Canada, a member of the Council at the time, had expressed satisfaction that procedures for the implementation and verification of measures taken against the illegal régime had been strengthened by the adoption of that resolution. Now, ten years later, Canada still believed that effective enforcement of the sanctions was one of the best ways for the international community to bring pressure to bear. For that reason, his Government welcomed the United States legislation nullifying the Byrd amendment and thereby closing one of the most important loop-holes which had, since 1971, prevented the implementation of a fully effective sanctions programme. However, his delegation found cause for concern in the revelations of the Bingham report with regard to the evasion of sanctions. It welcomed the fact that the United Kingdom Government was currently studying that report; however, any economic measures that Government might adopt could not have the desired effect so long as South Africa refused to co-operate in the enforcement of sanctions against the illegal régime.

59. While recognizing that the United States Government had violated the provisions of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) by admitting Ian Smith to its territory, his Government had taken note of the United States view that the visa had been granted on an exceptional basis in the hope that Mr. Smith's visit might facilitate negotiations involving all parties to the Southern Rhodesian conflict. After meetings with representatives of the United States Government, Smith had in fact undertaken to participate in an expanded conference to discuss the United Kingdom-United States proposals. At the same time, however, there had been an escalation of the violence in and outside of Southern Rhodesia, and those acts of aggression could not but increase the international community's scepticism concerning Mr. Smith's sincerity. Member States had always had considerable doubt about the Salisbury régime's real intentions with regard to the "internal settlement". Little or no progress had been made thus far. Already the illegal régime seemed to be retreating from its promise to hold free elections based on

/...

(Mr. Lapointe, Canada)

universal suffrage by the end of 1978. Instead, it had declared martial law over wide areas of the country, and black Southern Rhodesians were being conscripted on much the same basis as whites.

60. The recent military operations in Zambia had killed hundreds. As the guerrilla war intensified, there was a dramatic increase in the number of atrocities attributed to both sides. The brutality of the Southern Rhodesian punitive expeditions made it difficult to believe Mr. Smith's assertion that he truly wanted a genuine transfer of power to the majority.

61. The hardships caused by the escalating and prolonged conflict were affecting the populations of neighbouring countries as well. Thus, Zambia had been forced to take difficult decisions in order to prevent its economy from collapsing. Canada could well understand the frustration felt by the Zambian authorities when they had found it necessary to open their southern frontier to rail traffic from South Africa and Southern Rhodesia.

62. Canada had, from the first, supported the United Kingdom-United States initiative for bringing peace to Zimbabwe by a gradual transition to majority rule which would take place under international supervision and allow the participation of all Zimbabweans. It was therefore disheartened at the apparent ambiguity of the statements made by the members of the multiracial Executive Council and at their continuing reluctance to engage in realistic negotiations. The international community must strengthen its determination to put an end to the violence. Consequently the Patriotic Front must be encouraged to co-operate within the framework of the United Kingdom-United States formula, and the members of the multiracial Executive Council must have it made clear to them that continued acts of violence could only bring their downfall. Mr. Smith and his colleagues must be made to understand that only through the negotiations envisioned in the United Kingdom-United States plan could there be any hope for the people of Zimbabwe, even in the short term.

63. Mr. CHOUDHURY (Bangladesh) reaffirmed that there could be no acceptable solution of the Southern Rhodesian conflict without the establishment of majority rule, which would involve participation by all the parties concerned, in particular by the Patriotic Front, on the basis of the "one man, one vote" principle. Any just and permanent solution of the problem of Zimbabwe must be based on the total transfer of power to the people of Zimbabwe and on recognition of its inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

64. Zimbabwe was on the brink of civil war; the isolated minority régime was using every possible means to cling to power. The so-called concessions made to certain African factions under the "internal agreement" could not mask the real intent of the illegal régime, which was to divide the African majority and maintain white domination in Zimbabwe. The façade of tolerance set up by the régime had not prevented the intensification of the repression and brutality from which the people of Zimbabwe suffered. Torture and imprisonment continued, and thousands of Africans were confined in so-called "protective villages", which were simply disguised

/...

(Mr. Choudhury, Bangladesh)

concentration camps. In its desperation, the illegal régime not only had intensified repression but had also resorted to acts of aggression against the front-line States.

65. Since Smith had usurped power in 1965, condemnation by the international community had been spontaneous but ineffective. The United Nations had been quick to declare the Smith régime illegal and reaffirm that the people of Zimbabwe was the only true repository of sovereignty. It had made the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, responsible for finding solutions that could end the conflict, and it had imposed progressively widening sanctions on the racist régime. However, those measures had not had the desired effect, owing to the attitude of certain Powers which had evaded the sanctions and especially to the close collaboration between Pretoria and Salisbury.

66. Meanwhile, the armed liberation struggle had been constantly intensified. The immense sacrifices and courage of the Patriotic Front had brought it successes which had forced the minority régime to modify its recalcitrant stand and to make concessions. Endeavouring to use subterfuge to divide the people of Zimbabwe, Smith had announced on 3 March 1978 the conclusion of a so-called "internal settlement", whose main objective was to legitimize the power held by the white minority. Bangladesh, of course, categorically condemned those manoeuvres and rejected as unacceptable any settlement arrived at unilaterally under the auspices of the illegal régime.

67. Bangladesh had welcomed the initiative taken by the United Kingdom as the administering Power in the Territory, with the support of the United States. Despite some shortcomings, the United Kingdom-United States proposals could serve as a basis for further negotiations aimed at securing the independence of Zimbabwe, so long as they would ensure the termination of the illegal régime, a return to legality, the dispersal of the present armed forces and security forces and the cessation of all acts of aggression against neighbouring African States. At the same time, Bangladesh was convinced that the extension and tightening of sanctions would put increased pressure on the illegal régime and thereby expedite the transition to majority rule and independence. His delegation also hoped that the patriotic forces of Zimbabwe would be able to bridge their differences and usher in a new era of freedom, dignity and progress in the country.

68. Mr. CARASCALAO (Indonesia) said that the past year had brought many developments in the situation in Zimbabwe. However, despite the initiatives taken by some Member States to bring about a negotiated settlement of the problem, the situation was growing graver by the hour, and the people of Zimbabwe apparently could expect a protracted war against the illegal Smith minority régime. No matter how hopeless the situation appeared, now was the time for the international community to redouble its efforts towards establishing genuine majority rule in Zimbabwe. His delegation had therefore been relieved to learn that, contrary to certain rumours, the United Kingdom and the United States had not abandoned their initiatives to convene an all-party conference.

69. Indonesia's position was clear. His Government fully supported the struggle being waged by the people of Zimbabwe for freedom and independence; further, it was

/...

(Mr. Carascalao, Indonesia)

convinced that a negotiated settlement of the problem would best serve the interests and aspirations of the Zimbabwe people. Such a settlement, based on majority rule, would not only bring the people of Zimbabwe independence and freedom but have the added advantage of preventing a bloody armed struggle which would impose needless suffering on the population.

70. With that objective in mind, his delegation was prepared to support any peaceful settlement based on the pertinent United Nations resolutions that would provide for free and impartial elections on the basis of universal suffrage and a United Nations presence in Zimbabwe to supervise those elections, in which all political groups would participate. It was self-evident that his delegation was totally opposed to the so-called internal settlement, which had been condemned by the Security Council in its resolution 423 (1978), by the front-line States and by the Patriotic Front.

71. If the international community wanted to force the Salisbury régime to accept a negotiated settlement, it must consider not only stricter enforcement of the sanctions in effect but also the tightening and expansion of those sanctions. If all efforts to reach a negotiated settlement failed, Indonesia would be prepared to support any undertaking to bring about genuine majority rule. In that case the international community should give the freedom fighters whatever material and political support it could. It must also be borne in mind that the struggle for freedom in Zimbabwe had created many economic and humanitarian problems for the neighbouring countries and that steps must be taken to ease their burden.

72. His delegation strongly condemned the Salisbury régime's recent acts of aggression against the front-line States. Those acts of aggression, already condemned by the international community, were another example of the deteriorating situation in the Territory and underscored once more the need for sterner action against the illegal régime. Although the situation in Zimbabwe did not seem very bright, his delegation was convinced that through the valiant struggle being waged by the freedom fighters and the assistance provided by the international community, the people of Zimbabwe would win the ultimate victory.

73. Mr. MOUSSAVOU-GENGHA (Gabon) said that for the past 13 years Ian Smith had continually defied the United Kingdom and the entire international community by seizing, for the benefit of the white minority, the power which legitimately belonged to the African people of Zimbabwe. Not content with reserving for itself the richest land, the Smith régime was stepping up its acts of brutality inside Southern Rhodesia, where the so-called protected villages were being turned into concentration camps and where torture and hangings had become everyday practices. The illegal minority régime of Southern Rhodesia was engaging daily in abhorrent acts of premeditated aggression against Mozambique, Zambia and Botswana, grossly violating the sovereignty, the airspace and the territorial integrity of those countries. Gabon strongly condemned those aggressive acts against independent States Members of the United Nations, which took a heavy toll of human life and resulted in the destruction of infrastructures essential to the economies of those brother countries.

/...

(Mr. Moussavou-Gengha, Gabon)

74. The United Kingdom's attitude to the problem was, to say the least, strange. It refused to take any effectual action, on the fallacious pretext that it could not intervene in the internal affairs of Southern Rhodesia, whose legal status remained for the United Nations that of a British colony. Yet it had not hesitated to suppress the Mau-Mau revolt in Kenya, or to intervene in Aden, or to impose economic sanctions on Uganda. The underlying reason for the failure to intervene in Southern Rhodesia was, perhaps, the fact that the United Kingdom was confronted there with colonists of British origin, not with Africans or Asians. Whereas a number of countries were intent on isolating the illegal régime through the strict enforcement of the economic sanctions imposed by the Security Council, those really responsible for the problem, with the complicity and the direct participation of South Africa, were obstructing enforcement of those sanctions and making them ineffectual. In view of Smith's intransigent posture and the unpardonable passivity of the administering Power, the freedom-fighters in Zimbabwe had no other recourse than armed struggle.

75. Gabon would continue to give its unreserved support to its black brothers of Zimbabwe in their legitimate independence struggle since, as the Lusaka Manifesto stated, all men had the right and the duty to participate, as equal members of society, in the government of their own country. Yet the so-called internal settlement proposed by Ian Smith was merely perpetuating the illegal régime and enabling it to persist in withholding that right from the people of Zimbabwe. Weary of the obvious bad faith of Smith's rebel régime, the liberation movement had decided to step up the armed struggle against that régime, which, despite support from South Africa, was now boxed in, as was demonstrated by its persistent attacks against neighbouring independent countries. His delegation strongly condemned the manoeuvres of the illegal minority régime, which were simply delaying tactics to put off the day when Southern Rhodesia would be ruled by a majority government. The basic problem for Zimbabwe remained the transfer of power to the majority, and Ian Smith's plan did not tackle that problem. The international community should not accept that further attempt by Ian Smith to divert the world's attention from the armed struggle in Southern Rhodesia and to give his illegal régime a semblance of legitimacy.

76. In keeping with its commitment to the principle of equality and human dignity, free and independent Africa would continue to give every form of support to the freedom fighters in Zimbabwe until colonialism had been eliminated from that area. Their determination would not weaken; a people's desire for independence was always triumphant in the end, whatever the economic or military power possessed by those whom they had resolved to combat. Accordingly, his delegation was making a solemn appeal to certain States Members of the United Nations to cease all economic and military relations with the racist régime of South Africa - the principal political, military and economic ally of Southern Rhodesia. Gabon was certain that the isolation of South Africa would automatically bring about the collapse of the Smith régime. In addition, his delegation called upon the United Kingdom and the United States of America to put pressure on the illegal rebel régime so that a conference of all the interested parties could be held as soon as possible.

/...

77. Mr. SIDDIQ (Afghanistan) said that more than 12 years had elapsed since Ian Smith had defied the administering Power of Southern Rhodesia and the world community by making a unilateral declaration of independence. The Security Council, in a resolution adopted unanimously in 1965, had called upon the United Kingdom to quell the rebellion. Afghanistan had even advocated armed intervention by the United Kingdom against the illegal racist régime so that the people of Zimbabwe might genuinely exercise its right to self-determination and independence in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)) and the programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration (General Assembly resolution 2621 (XXV)). The world community, acting through the competent United Nations bodies, including the Security Council and the General Assembly, had declared that the Ian Smith régime was illegal and had solemnly reaffirmed that the people of Zimbabwe was the only repository of sovereignty and that the United Kingdom continued to be the administering Power. Since that time, the question of Southern Rhodesia had been regularly placed on the agenda of all United Nations bodies concerned with the problems of decolonization, apartheid and racism.

78. Currently, in order to divert the decolonization of the Territory from its normal course, the illegal régime was proposing a so-called internal settlement which clearly would not resolve the conflict but would instead perpetuate and broaden it. The purpose of the settlement was to legalize the illegal racist régime of Ian Smith and to obstruct the transfer of power from the minority to the majority by retaining the instruments of oppression and domination - the army, the police and the security forces - in the hands of the white minority. The settlement was thus a gross violation of the resolutions and measures adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly against the illegal régime. In fact, it was a deliberate attempt to sabotage the efforts being made by the international community to find a just and lasting solution to the problem of Zimbabwe.

79. His delegation believed that it was essential that the boycott measures taken by international bodies with a view to isolating the illegal régime, both politically and economically, should be maintained and further strengthened. It was essential, too, that the Patriotic Front, the only authentic representative of the people of Zimbabwe, should take full part in efforts to work out a solution. Unfortunately, the Smith régime, with the collaboration of South Africa and the support of some imperialist Powers, was currently trying to divide the liberation movements and to sow discord among them. With the help of military support from those same imperialist Powers, the racist régime was committing numerous acts of aggression against the front-line States, the most recent of which had been directed against Zambia. His delegation strongly condemned those brutal attacks and assured the front-line States of its full support and solidarity in their just struggle to liquidate the illegal racist régime.

/...

(Mr. Siddiq, Afghanistan)

80. The international community must make every effort to bring about the complete liquidation of the Smith régime and thus ensure the transfer of power to the people of Zimbabwe and its lawful representatives. To that end, the scope of the sanctions adopted against the racist régime under Chapter VII of the Charter must be expanded. His delegation unreservedly condemned all violations of the sanctions imposed by the Security Council and their non-enforcement by certain Member States, contrary to their obligations under the United Nations Charter. For example, the decision of the United States Government to allow Ian Smith to enter the United States was in direct violation of the Charter and Security Council resolutions 253 (1968) and 423 (1978). That decision would be interpreted as tacit acceptance of the illegal racist régime and would consequently serve to encourage the leaders of that régime to intensify their acts of aggression against the front-line States and to continue their policy of brutal oppression against the people of Zimbabwe.

81. Only the total liquidation of the racist régime would enable the people of Zimbabwe to attain self-determination and independence. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan would therefore continue to support international efforts aimed at isolating the illegal régime from its allies, and principally from South Africa, with a view to bringing about as promptly as possible the transfer of power to the legitimate representatives of the people of Zimbabwe, namely the Patriotic Front.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

82. The CHAIRMAN observed that, despite his efforts, the Committee had lost more than six hours of meeting-time since beginning its work. As each hour cost the Organization \$7,300, the loss of time represented a heavy expense for the budget. He therefore urged the members of the Committee to be more punctual and co-operative.

83. He said that, at a subsequent meeting, the Rapporteur of the Special Committee of 24 would introduce a report on the six items on the Fourth Committee's agenda which were related to the Special Committee's work. He reminded members that the time-limit for the submission of draft resolutions on Southern Rhodesia was 7 November.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.