

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1993rd  
MEETING**

Thursday, 2 November 1972,  
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

*Chairman:* Mr. Zdeněk ČERNÍK  
(Czechoslovakia).

*In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Samuels  
(Guyana), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

**AGENDA ITEM 66**

**Question of Southern Rhodesia (continued) (A/8650,  
A/8663, A/8664, A/8723/Add.1, A/8759 and Add.1)**

**GENERAL DEBATE (continued)**

1. Mr. OGOLA (Uganda) said that successive Governments of the United Kingdom had maintained two positions about their role in Southern Rhodesia: on the one hand they seemed to accept the fact that Southern Rhodesia was a United Kingdom colony and that the United Kingdom alone could exercise authority there, but on the other hand they did not agree to be held accountable for the misdeeds committed against the African masses there. The purpose of that contradictory attitude was to give the United Kingdom rights without obligations and to exclude any external forces interested in the elimination of the colonial *status quo* in the colony, while at the same time shielding the United Kingdom from criticism. That attitude was largely responsible for the difficulties of the colony, where the situation had become extremely grave. The African majority, obliged to abandon power to a racist minority, were undergoing appalling suffering. They were denied the most basic rights; they had no political rights; their spokesmen had been imprisoned for years, their fate unknown; the economic life of the country had been poisoned and the institutions of justice had become the main source of injustice. The African people of Zimbabwe were thus being persecuted by the State itself, which used all the institutions at its command for that purpose. It would be noticed that the terrorism practised in Southern Rhodesia did not arouse the indignation of the international community as did such acts of international terrorism as the hijacking of aircraft. Yet in the case of Southern Rhodesia, as in the case of South Africa and the Portuguese Territories, there was what might be termed hijacking of entire populations and their natural resources by a racist minority. The white minority was in fact intensifying its oppression of the African majority, depriving the Africans more and more of their fundamental freedoms by means of iniquitous laws brutally imposed upon them. Everyone knew what happened to Africans who tried to resist the seizure of their land: they were expelled and imprisoned, their houses were burnt to the ground and they were herded into camps.

2. His delegation took a serious view of the arbitrary acts of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia, especially in connexion with human rights and fundamental freedoms. It was common knowledge that Bishop Muzorewa, who had spear-headed the opposition to the settlement proposals of Sir Alec Douglas-Home and Ian Smith, had had his travel documents impounded when he had intended to leave Southern Rhodesia to seek medical attention abroad. Uganda demanded the immediate release of all the leaders of the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU), the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) and the African National Council and the restoration of freedom of speech and travel to Bishop Muzorewa.

3. The constitutional deadlock in Southern Rhodesia was due to a fundamental error on the part of successive United Kingdom Governments and the racist minority in Southern Rhodesia. That error lay in the fact that they deliberately ignored the existence of the Africans and the fact that they were the majority of the population and were the authentic owners of the land and its natural resources. That was what had happened early in the year, when the so-called settlement proposals had been agreed upon without the representatives of the African majority even being consulted. Fortunately, thanks to their traditional methods of communication, the Africans had immediately become aware of the proposals and their implications and, when the moment had come, they had categorically rejected them. They could not have done otherwise, for to accept the proposals would have been to agree to leave political power in the hands of an alien minority which over the years had shown cruelty beyond comprehension. That negative verdict had been arrived at after serious consideration and the Pearce Commission had declared that the African population had sufficiently understood the proposals.<sup>1</sup> His delegation accordingly urged the United Kingdom Government to make immediate arrangements to convene a constitutional conference in which all interested parties would participate. As a preliminary step, however, the United Kingdom should demonstrate its good faith by taking the following action. It should assure the United Nations and the entire world community that it would not grant independence to Southern Rhodesia until majority rule had been established there; it should order the immediate release of all political detainees and guarantee their freedom of speech and movement; it should immediately put a stop to the use of South African police and para-military personnel in Southern Rhodesia. The international community,

<sup>1</sup> See *Rhodesia: Report of the Commission on Rhodesian Opinion under the Chairmanship of the Right Honourable the Lord Pearce*, Cmnd. 4964 (London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1972).

for its part, should maintain and strengthen sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and should consider extending them to South Africa.

4. Much had been said about the effect of sanctions on the Africans. Some people had pretended to be concerned about the interests of the Africans, whereas their sole concern was to ensure that the interests of the white settlers were not affected by the sanctions. The testimony of African representatives had made short work of that hypocrisy: the Africans were well able to live with the sanctions. In that connexion, the fact that the United States had recently violated the sanctions by importing chrome from Southern Rhodesia, thus betraying African interests, could not but arouse indignation. In contrast to that, his delegation was grateful to the USSR delegation for its initiative in proposing a week of solidarity with the colonized peoples of Africa and submitting a draft resolution to the General Assembly to that effect (A/L.680 and Add.1 to 3). His delegation, which had become a sponsor of the draft resolution, was delighted that it had just been adopted almost unanimously.

5. The colonialist, neo-colonialist, imperialist and racist camps seemed to be seized with panic, which robbed them of all common sense. Instead of abandoning their indefensible political doctrines, they did their best to present them in a favourable light. The Western imperialist countries had a long history of lying. To justify their actions, they misused words whose true meaning they feared. In 1914-1918 they had said that they had gone to war to save democracy and they had said the same in 1939-1945. Yet there was nothing that they feared as much as democracy. In view of the fact that imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism survived and thrived by extensive exploitation of other peoples, it was quite obvious that they did not really want democracy, but that did not prevent them from paying lip-service to it.

6. His Government did not recognize the Smith régime as the legitimate régime of Southern Rhodesia and it did not consider that that régime was entitled to speak on behalf of the African majority or to impose its version of independence on them. The United Kingdom alone was responsible for ensuring that Southern Rhodesia attained independence in accordance with Article 73 of the Charter of the United Nations. Unfortunately, it was clear from the statement made by Lady Tweedsmuir at the recent Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference that the United Kingdom was not considering taking any further initiative to bring about a settlement of the problem of Southern Rhodesia. Without such a positive initiative on the part of the United Kingdom, the only alternative was armed struggle.

7. In conclusion, he paid a tribute to the members 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 for the comprehensive report that they had produced on the question of Southern Rhodesia (A/8723/Add.1). His delegation pledged itself once again to persist in

demanding justice, dignity, freedom and independence for the people of Zimbabwe.

8. Mr. ROSAS (Chile) said that, although the United Nations had made remarkable progress in the matter of decolonization, its decisions had remained ineffective because the colonial Powers had the support of the imperialist countries and of the interests of multinational enterprises which cared nothing for human dignity, freedom and self-determination when those principles ran counter to their objectives. Chile was taking part in the discussion mainly in order to reaffirm its rejection of the illegal and racist régime of Southern Rhodesia, in conformity with its traditionally anti-colonialist and anti-racist position. It was for that reason that during the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Georgetown from 8 to 12 August 1972, Chile had whole-heartedly endorsed the agreement whereby it had been decided to provide material assistance to the national liberation movements which were struggling against colonialism. In addition, Chile would not cease to strive for the achievement of the inalienable right of the Zimbabwe people to self-determination and independence.

9. In 1964, despite the pressure exerted by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Ian Smith had started on the course which had led to the unilateral declaration of independence. The Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), which was held at Cairo that year, had adopted a resolution in which they had called upon all African States resolutely to oppose independence for Southern Rhodesia since those who had proclaimed it were clearly a minority and racist group. The Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Algeria, Zambia and Senegal had been instructed to bring the problem before the Security Council. Nevertheless, independence had subsequently been proclaimed and since that time the United Nations had constantly sought for solutions to the problem without so far achieving any tangible results. The illegal racist régime had immediately begun to take reprisals against the Africans, who outnumbered them by five to one, in order to consolidate their privileges and perpetuate their domination and exploitation of the black majority of the population. Racial discrimination had increased, as had arbitrary mass detentions, while people had been driven from the land on which they had lived since time immemorial. Unfortunately, the administering Power had not taken any really effective steps to bring down the illegal racist régime, despite the resolutions adopted by the Security Council and by the General Assembly. The United Kingdom was certainly aware of the need to put an end to the illegal régime and to prepare the country for independence through a democratic system of government, in accordance with the aspirations of the majority of the population. That Power should therefore be reminded of its heavy responsibility. It should give proof of its total dedication to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and its respect for the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and of its good stewardship as the administering Power.

10. At the time of Southern Rhodesia's unilateral declaration of independence, the United Kingdom had joined in the world community's condemnation, stating that it would adopt the measures required to put an end to the situation. It had, however, repeatedly refused to use force, proposing instead recourse to economic sanctions, which had in fact been adopted but had unfortunately not been applied.

11. The conciliatory policy of the administering Power had merely shown that it was impossible to negotiate a settlement with the illegal racist Smith régime.

12. The sanctions decided upon by the Security Council had not been applied and the attitude of those who, having voted in favour of the sanctions, had then refrained from applying them was deplorable. For its part, Chile considered that the strategic interests of certain States could not be equated with the value of human freedom. A decision taken by a legislative organ did not represent the will of a State since in the field of international relations responsibility did not lie with any specific authority within a State but with the State itself.

13. In conclusion, he advocated that action should be undertaken that precluded any possibility of survival for the Smith régime, which, in collaboration with foreign companies, was pillaging the natural resources of the people of Zimbabwe and depriving them of their legitimate rights. The United Nations should make use of all means available to it forthwith in order to create conditions in which the African people would be able to express their wishes and decide their future in a democratic way without discrimination of any kind.

14. Mr. SIDIK (Indonesia) recalled that since the twenty-sixth session, when four resolutions had been adopted relating to Southern Rhodesia, the United Nations had dealt with the question on numerous occasions. On 27 April 1972, the Special Committee had adopted a resolution reaffirming the inalienable right of the people of Zimbabwe to self-determination, freedom and independence, the legitimacy of the struggle for national liberation and the principle of no independence before majority rule in Southern Rhodesia (see A/8723/Add.1, para. 23). The Security Council, too, had considered the question at Addis Ababa without managing to adopt draft resolution S/10606<sup>2</sup> because of the negative vote of the United Kingdom. At New York, however, it had adopted resolution 314 (1972), in which it urged all States to implement fully all Security Council resolutions establishing sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. Since the release of the report of the Pearce Commission in May 1972,<sup>1</sup> it had renewed its efforts to find a solution to the problem of Southern Rhodesia, in particular by adopting resolution 320 (1972) concerning sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

15. It was the United Kingdom which bore the responsibility for solving the problem of Southern Rhode-

sia and the international community should not relieve it of its duties. The latter should, however, do all within its power to compel the Smith régime to agree to a constitutional conference with the participation of the people of Zimbabwe. To that end, all States should adhere strictly to the Security Council resolutions concerning sanctions, as the representatives of ZAPU and ZANU had stressed in the Committee (1988th meeting). Those representatives had advocated not only a tightening of the sanctions but also a blockade of all Mozambican and South African seaports. The Indonesian Government had no difficulty in complying with the sanctions scrupulously since it had no relations with Southern Rhodesia. The same was not true of all countries and a tribute was due to those which abided by the sanctions scrupulously despite the losses which that entailed.

16. The international community should strive to identify those States which continued to disregard the sanctions and should inform world public opinion in general, and the nationals of the defaulting States in particular, of their activities; States were susceptible to world public opinion, but even more so to the opinion of their own citizens. In that way, it might be possible to create in such States an outcry against their policies of co-operation with Southern Rhodesia which would prompt their citizens to exert pressure on their legislative bodies to rescind such policies. States should also conduct surveys to identify precisely which business organizations were engaged in trade or any other form of economic co-operation with Southern Rhodesia and should then organize a world-wide boycott of such companies. In that regard, his delegation welcomed the statement made by the representative of Denmark who on the previous day had informed the Committee (1991st meeting) of the action taken by his Government to prosecute Danish firms or individuals violating Danish legislation concerning sanctions.

17. Not content with disregarding the sanctions and, more generally, United Nations resolutions concerning Southern Rhodesia, South Africa and Portugal actively and overtly supported the illegal minority Smith régime. Unfortunately, owing to that support Southern Rhodesia seemed to have improved its economic and military position, thereby making the international community's task more difficult. It was clearly the design of those three countries to establish an *apartheid* front in Africa as a base from which to extend their racist policies throughout Africa. The situation prevailing in Southern Rhodesia thus posed a danger to the whole of Africa.

18. Recently, for the first time in their history, the indigenous people of Zimbabwe had had an opportunity to express their opinion freely. Their rejection of the proposals for a settlement had been a clear indication that they wanted to exercise their right to self-determination and independence. Their negative response must not serve to maintain the *status quo* in Southern Rhodesia; it was the duty of the international community to explore every available avenue for a settlement of the complex issue. The Indonesian delegation would continue to lend its support and co-operation to that end.

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-seventh Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1972*.

19. Mr. CHETTRI (Bhutan) said that, although the question of Southern Rhodesia had been on the agenda of the Fourth Committee for a number of years, the situation had not changed and the people of Southern Rhodesia were compelled to continue to struggle for their inalienable right to freedom and self-determination. The question of Southern Rhodesia had many facets because it involved not only the problem of the establishment of majority rule but also the suppression of the basic human rights of a large section of the people of Zimbabwe who continued to live as second-class citizens in their own country. Aided by certain colonial and other countries with interests in Southern Rhodesia, the minority Government felt secure enough to reject any reasonable proposal for a settlement of the Rhodesian question. The economic sanctions imposed by the United Nations had thus far yielded little results because some of the major economic Powers of the world continued to carry on lucrative trade with Southern Rhodesia, a fact which was deplorable.

20. His delegation had listened with great attention to the moving statements made in the Committee on 25 October 1972 by the representatives of the liberation movements of Zimbabwe (1988th meeting). They had shown clearly the complexity of the problems involved and had described the atrocities which the illegal minority régime inflicted on the people of Zimbabwe. Bhutan agreed with the many delegations which had said that more effective measures had to be adopted if the minority Government of Southern Rhodesia was to be brought down. Bhutan was ready to support any concrete proposals and urged all countries scrupulously to observe the economic sanctions imposed by the United Nations, as did Bhutan, which had no relations whatsoever with the illegal Government of Southern Rhodesia. In conclusion, he reiterated his country's support for the struggle of the people of Zimbabwe.

21. Mrs. ANDERSEN (Norway) recalled that, when the agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Smith régime concerning a Southern Rhodesian settlement had been made public, the Norwegian Government, whose views on the question were well known, had pointed out that a number of questions remained unanswered and that the proposals made in the agreement gave the impression that the establishment of majority rule and democratic rights for the African population would be postponed indefinitely. It had added that any settlement must ensure full equality for the African population and that all measures of racial discrimination must be immediately revoked.

22. Despite those considerations, her delegation had felt at the time that it was premature to reject the agreement before the African population, which was the party most directly concerned, had pronounced its verdict. That verdict had been stated clearly and unambiguously in the conclusions of the Pearce Commission:<sup>1</sup> the majority of the Africans rejected the proposals and did not consider them acceptable as a basis for independence.

23. Thus no progress had been made and the situation of the African population, far from improving, had actually worsened, according to the reports of the representatives of ZANU and ZAPU (1988th meeting). There had, however, been one new development, in that the Africans had for the first time had an opportunity to express their views on a question of crucial importance for their future and that they had expressed them massively, clearly and unmistakably. No one could any longer doubt the unanimous desire of the African population to exercise their right to self-determination and independence on a basis of justice and equality.

24. The international community must continue its search for an acceptable solution to the problem of Southern Rhodesia. In that connexion, she reaffirmed her country's support of the sanctions imposed by the Security Council; it was of utmost importance that all countries Members of the United Nations should enforce the sanctions, for that offered the only hope for the establishment of a Southern Rhodesian society based on justice and equality.

25. Mr. NGANDU MUALABA (Zaire) said that once more the Fourth Committee was required to ponder the problem of Southern Rhodesia and to seek means of restoring to the Zimbabwe people the rights usurped by a racist minority. In a few days' time the Smith régime would have been in existence for seven years and it had no more reason to worry at present than it had had in the past. In fact, the economic sanctions imposed against it had remained ineffective, and not only Portugal and South Africa but other countries continued to maintain economic and trade relations with the Salisbury régime. One example was the Rhodesian chrome imported by the United States.

26. Since 1965 the United Nations had devoted many meetings to the question and had adopted various resolutions, including, in particular, Security Council resolution 288 (1970). At the beginning of the present year the Security Council had met at Addis Ababa to consider again the situation in southern Africa. The great hopes aroused by that meeting had been immediately disappointed as a result of the veto which the representative of the United Kingdom Government had exercised with respect to Southern Rhodesia. In September the Council had again found its way blocked by the United Kingdom veto. That attitude outraged everyone who believed in human rights and the virtues of democracy.

27. The Zimbabwe people had decided to reject the so-called "proposals for a settlement" of 21 November 1971 between the United Kingdom and Southern Rhodesia. Instead of drawing the obvious conclusions and taking the necessary steps, the administering Power had remained silent and its Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs had seen fit to make no comment on the Southern Rhodesian problem in his statement in the General Assembly on 27 September 1972 (2042nd plenary meeting). The United Kingdom was clearly making no effort to co-operate with the United Nations in the matter.

28. Meanwhile, in Southern Rhodesia, the Republic proclaimed by Ian Smith in March 1970 was consolidating its position and was daily tightening the stranglehold of *apartheid* on the defenceless Zimbabwe people. It was high time for action to be taken, and his delegation declared once again its support for all the measures recommended at the Ninth Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU at Rabat, especially the convening by the administering Power of a national constitutional conference which would include the true representatives of the Zimbabwe people.

29. For some time important developments had been taking place as a result of remarkable changes in attitudes which had previously been considered

unshakable. Those changes of attitude and position would certainly result in profound changes in outlook, which would themselves lead to tremendous upheavals in the world situation. All those developments would strengthen co-operation between nations and the cause of peace.

30. It was to be hoped that those responsible for the situation in southern Africa, as also their allies, who made themselves out to be defenders of morality and so-called Christian civilization, would follow those examples, abandon their outmoded ideas and mistaken attitudes and finally put an end to colonization.

*The meeting rose at 4.30 p.m.*

