



Chairman: Mr. Keith JOHNSON (Jamaica).

AGENDA ITEM 68

Question of Southern Rhodesia (*continued*) (A/8423/Add.1, A/8423/Add.2 (parts I and II), A/C.4/L.990 and Rev.1)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS
(*continued*) (A/C.4/L.990 AND REV.1)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that the delegations of Burundi, Chad and Jamaica had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.990.
2. Mr. NYIRENDA (Zambia) said that, at the very moment at which he was taking the floor to submit draft resolution A/C.4/L.990 which was before the Committee, Sir Alec Douglas-Home, the United Kingdom Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, was holding talks in Salisbury with the racist clique of Ian Smith, who had been repeatedly described by the United Kingdom Government as a régime of traitors. While negotiations were going on with the representatives of less than 250,000 whites of Southern Rhodesia, the rights of more than 5 million Africans, who were treated as foreigners in their own land, were being ignored. It was possible that the United Kingdom Government and the Salisbury régime had already come to an agreement to legalize the 1965 rebellion. Sir Alec himself had declared recently that he would go to Salisbury only if there was some progress in the talks about talks that had been going on in secret between his emissaries and the rebels. When he had decided to go to Salisbury, he had told the House of Commons, on 9 November 1971, that considerable progress had been made in the talks. Nevertheless, anyone who recalled the disturbing developments that had taken place in Zimbabwe since 1965, including the enactment by the rebels of *apartheid*-type legislation, could not fail to wonder what was the "progress" to which Sir Alec had referred.
3. Ian Smith had said again and again that majority rule could not be introduced in Zimbabwe either during his lifetime or in the remote future. He had more than once spoken contemptuously of the principle of one man, one vote, as tantamount to the counting of heads of sheep. A few weeks earlier he had said that there were many countries in the world which would be better governed than they currently were if they insisted on some sort of qualification for their voters. Recently, referring to the so-called five principles, Ian Smith had declared: "In the first place, I do not believe they are principles: they were laid down by the United Kingdom Government and we have tried . . . to help it to draw up a constitution that satisfies its principles. But they are not our principles". In the face of that statement, the United Kingdom Government had the audacity to talk about "progress" in relation to those dubious five principles, which had been categorically rejected by the rebels. A Reuter despatch from Salisbury, dated the preceding day, stated that the leaders of the Zimbabwe liberation movements had submitted a memorandum to Sir Alec Douglas-Home in which they stated that the fact that they had not been consulted about the negotiations convinced them that the United Kingdom was prepared to "sell" the 5 million Africans.
4. Zambia's position with regard to the talks was crystal clear: it totally condemned the very idea of negotiating with the rebels and it held firmly to the principle that there should be no independence before majority rule. Consequently, in its grave concern about the talks going on between the United Kingdom Government and the rebel Smith régime, his delegation, together with a number of others, had drawn up draft resolution A/C.4/L.990, which he urged should be considered in all urgency and which he hoped would receive the affirmative vote of the majority of members of the Committee.
5. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) said that his delegation had always maintained that the United Kingdom Government should hold talks with the leaders of the Zimbabwe liberation movements and not with the rebel régime of Ian Smith. His delegation supported the principles set forth in operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.990 and urged the members of the Committee to vote in favour of it.
6. Mr. ABDILLEH (Somalia) said that he wished formally to propose a few amendments to the draft resolution. In his opinion, operative paragraph 1 should not start by negating something but by reaffirming a principle; he accordingly proposed that it should be redrafted to read: "*Reaffirms* the principle that there should be no independence before majority rule in Southern Rhodesia". The idea in operative paragraph 2 had not yet been affirmed by the United Nations and could not therefore be reaffirmed. He thought, moreover, that the last phrase of that paragraph, namely, "and must be endorsed by the people", was somewhat vague, for it might be asked by what means the people would be able to express their support; in order to rectify that lack of clarity, the words "on the basis of universal adult suffrage" should be added. It should be borne in mind that, when Ian Smith had proclaimed the alleged republic, he had used tribal electoral colleges which had enabled him to control the whole proceedings and it was essential to prevent that happening again. Furthermore, the situation would not be fair unless the imprisoned and exiled

nationalist leaders were released and allowed to return. He proposed that, in order to take that point into account, operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.990 should read:

“Affirms that any settlement relating to the future of that Territory must be worked out with the fullest participation of all nationalist leaders representing the majority of the people of Zimbabwe and must be endorsed by the people on the basis of universal adult suffrage, and to this end calls on the United Kingdom Government urgently to release all political prisoners and detainees and to create conditions enabling the return of nationalist leaders in exile;”

7. Mr. SERONEY (Kenya) said that his delegation had decided to sponsor draft resolution A/C.4/L.990, not because it cherished any illusions about the results of the talks going on in Salisbury but in order to place on record the views of the Government of Kenya with regard to the so-called “negotiation of a settlement” to which Sir Alec Douglas-Home, the United Kingdom Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, had referred in his statement in the House of Commons on 9 November 1971.

8. His delegation reaffirmed its support of all previous General Assembly resolutions on Southern Rhodesia, and in particular of paragraph 3 of resolution 2652 (XXV) of 3 December 1970, in which the General Assembly affirmed “that any attempt to negotiate the future of Zimbabwe with the illegal racist minority régime would be contrary to the provisions of resolution 1514 (XV)”.

9. Kenya would have preferred Sir Alec not to go to Salisbury or to have any dealings with the rebel régime until it had capitulated; unfortunately, it would seem that it was the United Kingdom Government, and not the Smith régime, which had capitulated. His delegation hoped that Sir Alec would be left in no doubt whatever about what Kenya, Africa and the whole world thought of his visit and of his recognition, by implication, of the rebel régime. A few days before Sir Alec's departure for Salisbury, Mr. Mungai, the Kenyan Minister for Foreign Affairs, had said that there were three requirements before any acceptable solution could be negotiated for the problem of Southern Rhodesia: there must be no independence without African majority rule; the Africans—and particularly the leaders who were currently imprisoned by the Smith régime—must participate fully in any move to settle the future of Zimbabwe; and all discriminatory legislation must be repealed, in recognition of the inalienable right of the Africans to independence and sovereignty. Mr. Mungai had also set out Kenya's views on the “five principles” mentioned by Sir Alec in his statement in the House of Commons. It was the considered view of the Kenyan Government that there could be no guarantee that the Smith régime would respect those principles, even if a settlement was arrived at on the basis of the principles. Moreover, those principles did not specifically recognize that there could be no independence before majority rule.

10. His Government totally rejected the idea of “unimpeded progress towards African majority rule”, for the following reasons, which had been set forth by Mr. Mungai.

It would not guarantee independence to the Africans; it would not ensure the repeal of discriminatory legislation; it would not guarantee full African participation in talks to decide their future; it would not lead to the release of African leaders from prison; it would not prevent a powerful alliance of Smith with Portugal and South Africa in perpetuating white minority rule in southern Africa and in wiping out liberation movements; it would enable Smith to use the current negotiations to obtain the lifting of sanctions and then to revert to the status of the unilateral declaration of independence; it would not remove the threats to the security of sovereign African States to the north of Southern Rhodesia; and it would weaken the African position with regard to Namibia because, if the unilateral declaration of independence was accepted, South Africa could try to obtain recognition of its annexation of Namibia.

11. His delegation suspected that Sir Alec was thinking of a constitution purporting to guarantee unimpeded progress towards majority rule in about 30 years' time, with a loan for the education of the African population added as a parting gift to Smith. The Africans, however, remembered how the United Kingdom Government had sold the Africans in South Africa to the white minority through a settlement based on the 1910 Constitution and they were not interested in constitutional guarantees; they considered that majority rule was the only guarantee that Southern Rhodesia would not go the same way as South Africa.

12. Kenya hoped that the delegations which had abstained the previous year in the vote on the resolution concerning Southern Rhodesia would support draft resolution A/C.4/L.990, as a last appeal to the United Kingdom Government not to betray the people of Zimbabwe and condemn them to a future in which their only remedy would be a bloody racial struggle. The attitude of the United Kingdom was peculiar. The United Kingdom Government, which had brought the question of the Smith rebellion before the United Nations, now refused to listen to the United Nations on the pretext that it did not want its hands tied in the negotiations. If it had followed the course advocated by Africa in 1965 in the matter of Southern Rhodesia, there would have been no need for it to raise the question in the Security Council. He wondered whether raising the question in the United Nations had been only a trick to gain time for the Smith régime.

13. Despite General Assembly resolution 2652 (XXV), the United Kingdom Government, which had at first dismissed as rumours newspaper reports of the conversations with the illegal régime, had gone ahead with the negotiations and Sir Alec was currently in Southern Rhodesia. According to press reports, Sir Alec had met about 100 Africans in Salisbury, who had pressed for revocation of the Southern Rhodesian Constitution, assistance for the education and advancement of Africans, repeal of the Land Tenure Act, the lifting of the state of emergency and the release of political prisoners. He hoped that Sir Alec would bear those demands in mind and he urged the United Kingdom Government to make no settlement with the Smith régime, but on the contrary to take steps to end the rebellion, to repeal the discriminatory legislation and to convene a constitutional conference to provide for majority rule by the people of Zimbabwe.

14. With regard to the amendments proposed by Somalia, he considered the amendments to operative paragraph 1 and the additions to operative paragraph 2 acceptable, but he was opposed to the replacement of the words "*Further reaffirms*", in operative paragraph 2, by the word "*Affirms*"; since it was not the first time that the Assembly was affirming, at least implicitly, the principle in question.

15. Mr. VENEGAS TAMAYO (Colombia) said that the Spanish text of operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.990 was unintelligible.

16. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (Barbados) said that he thought that the amendment by Somalia to operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution would make that paragraph too cumbersome and that the concern of that delegation would be better accommodated by the following wording:

"2. *Affirms* that it is the responsibility of the Government of the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, to ensure that any settlement relating to the future of that Territory must be worked out with the fullest participation of all nationalist leaders representing the majority of the people of Zimbabwe and must be endorsed by the people on the basis of universal adult suffrage;"

He also suggested that immediately following paragraph 2 two new paragraphs should be added which would read:

"3. *Calls upon* the Government of the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, to release immediately all political prisoners and detainees and to create conditions enabling the return of nationalist leaders in exile;

"4. *Calls further upon* the Government of the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, not to reach any agreement with the rebellious minority régime of Ian Smith which would seek to postpone immediate progress towards majority rule in Southern Rhodesia;"

Operative paragraph 3 of the initial draft resolution would become operative paragraph 5. It was unquestionably the responsibility of the United Kingdom to seek a settlement in which nationalist leaders participated.

17. He was concerned about the fact that Sir Alec Douglas-Home was currently in Southern Rhodesia, for he thought that Sir Alec might come to an agreement with Ian Smith which would be a distortion of democracy. It seemed that the idea was to postpone the attainment of independence for 30 or 40 years, thus making it possible for the existing régime to consolidate its power. The conclusion of such an agreement would not only violate General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) but would deny the inhabitants of the Territory their legitimate rights.

18. Mr. TEMPLE (United Kingdom) said that he had taken note of the observations made in the Committee. He recalled that on 10 November he had announced (1947th meeting) that Sir Alec Douglas-Home intended to hold talks in Southern Rhodesia. Sir Alec had been at Salisbury since 15 November. As he had already stated, any agreement that was reached would take into account the five principles

that would constitute the basis for the negotiations. His delegation could not therefore accept a new obligation which would prevent his country from reaching an agreement.

19. He also recalled the statement made at the 1556th meeting of the Security Council, on 10 November 1970, by the representative of the United Kingdom to the effect that his country had clearly defined the framework within which the negotiations would be conducted and was not prepared to accept conditions imposed from outside. For that reason, he did not consider it appropriate that the Committee should attempt to lay down conditions for a settlement. His delegation had already made two statements and had nothing to add, for no results had yet been achieved. He promised, however, to provide the Committee with all the statements by Sir Alec Douglas-Home upon the latter's return from Southern Rhodesia.

20. Mr. CASTILLO ARRIOLA (Guatemala) said that he wished to make a few comments in the light of the statement by the United Kingdom representative, for consideration by the sponsors when they met to give the draft resolution its final form. The United Nations had repeatedly declared that the Smith régime was illegal and had stated that the responsibility for rectifying the situation in Southern Rhodesia lay with the United Kingdom. In previous years, Guatemala had said that it was not right to blame the United Kingdom for not complying with United Nations resolutions because that country had done all that it could. In the current year, however, the fact that direct negotiations were being held between the United Kingdom Government and the illegal Smith régime led it to the inevitable conclusion that such contacts implied indirect recognition of the illegal régime by the United Kingdom. It was essential that such recognition should not be reinforced either directly or indirectly by the United Nations. Accordingly, in the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, in which the General Assembly would note a statement by the United Kingdom Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, which implied recognition of the illegal régime, it must be made clear that responsibility for the risks involved in that recognition lay with the United Kingdom, not with the United Nations.

21. He agreed with the representative of Colombia that the wording of the Spanish text of operative paragraph 1 was not clear. He suggested that it should be replaced by the following text: "*Afirma el principio de que no debe haber independencia antes de que haya un gobierno de la mayoría en Rhodesia del Sur*". He reserved the right to speak again on operative paragraph 2.

22. He thought that a paragraph should be added to the draft resolution indicating the role which the United Nations should play in controlling and administering the settlement which the United Kingdom and Southern Rhodesia might reach. After hearing the statements by the United Kingdom representative, however, he had little hope that Southern Rhodesia would enjoy freedom and democracy in the near future.

23. Mr. NEKLESSA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had already stated its position regarding the negotiations between the United Kingdom and Southern Rhodesia. It considered that they represented

yet another violation by the United Kingdom of the decision by the United Nations to put an end to relations of any kind with the Salisbury régime, which had been condemned by the United Nations and by the whole international community. The negotiations between the United Kingdom authorities and the Smith régime, which had begun the previous year, at first in secret and now openly, could only be regarded as collusion between British imperialism and the racist régime of Southern Rhodesia to the detriment of the interest of the Zimbabwe people. It was clear from the statement which the United Kingdom representative had just made that the preparations for that collusion had reached a decisive phase. The negotiations between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Southern Rhodesian régime fully revealed to the whole world the duplicity and the hypocritical nature of United Kingdom policies with regard to Southern Rhodesia. In their statements the representatives of the United Kingdom condemned the régime of the usurpers and rebels, but in fact they conducted negotiations with it and worked towards collusion with that régime with the aim of continuing its existence.

24. Some time previously international public opinion had learned that after a series of meetings with representatives of the United Kingdom, Ian Smith had visited South Africa for consultations with Prime Minister Vorster. The London-Salisbury-Pretoria axis was thus being exposed more openly. The negotiations between the United Kingdom Government and the Smith régime, the fact that the United Kingdom was supplying arms to the Republic of South Africa and other aid to the racists in southern Africa, and the withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (A/8276), all showed that British imperialism supported the racist régimes and was taking the necessary steps to strengthen them. The fact that Sir Alec Douglas-Home's journey to Salisbury coincided with the decision of the United States Congress to raise the embargo on imports of chrome from Southern Rhodesia was noteworthy. Those were all links in the same chain of common action by the colonialist Powers to keep the illegal Smith régime in power. The General Assembly had already stated its position on the decision of the United States Congress with regard to the import of chrome from Southern Rhodesia. Now it should make its position known regarding the negotiations between the United Kingdom authorities and the Smith régime. His delegation wished once more to stress that the aforementioned actions of the United Kingdom Government, which were actively supported by British industrial monopolies and banks, aroused indignation throughout the world and could not fail to arouse the deepest concern of the United Nations. The General Assembly should condemn the negotiations which had been initiated to the detriment of the people of Zimbabwe and in open violation of numerous United Nations resolutions, particularly resolution 2652 (XXV), in paragraph 3 of which the General Assembly affirmed that any attempt to negotiate the future of Zimbabwe with the illegal régime would be contrary to the provisions of resolution 1514 (XV).

25. His delegation supported the aims of draft resolution A/C.4/L.990 but had a few comments to make. Firstly, in

the third preambular paragraph the General Assembly noted the statement made by the United Kingdom Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs in the House of Commons. The General Assembly should not merely "note" but "condemn" or at least "deplore" that statement. Secondly, his delegation would like operative paragraph 1 to be amplified. The paragraph was not very clear, for it might give the impression that the General Assembly was opposed to the immediate granting of independence, when that was obviously not the intention of the draft resolution. He suggested that the sponsors might consider the possibility of amending the paragraph to read: "Reaffirms the need to take steps to ensure the immediate granting of independence to Southern Rhodesia within a democratic system, in accordance with the wishes of the majority of the population".

26. He wished to make it clear that, despite the comments he had made, his delegation found the draft resolution acceptable.

Mrs. Skottsberg-Ahman (Sweden), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

27. Mr. ABDILLEH (Somalia) said that his delegation condemned any attempt to negotiate the future of Southern Rhodesia bilaterally. The draft resolution emphasized the principle that any settlement must be made with the full participation of the representatives of the Zimbabwe people; his amendment, which was based on that principle, took account of the fact that the most important leaders of the Zimbabwe people were in prison or in exile.

28. The CHAIRMAN announced that Nigeria had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.4/L.990.

29. Mr. OULD HACHÈME (Mauritania) proposed that operative paragraph 2 should be amended to read:

"Affirms that the representatives of the majority of the people of Southern Rhodesia must participate in any negotiations for the purpose of reaching an agreement relating to independence, and further affirms that the United Kingdom, as administering Power, has the obligation to create a climate which would alleviate the tension in the country, by encouraging the return of refugees and the release of political prisoners, with a view to eliminating any possibility of intimidation which might influence the holding of free elections based on the rule of democracy;"

30. Mr. TURKSON (Ghana) proposed that the meeting should be suspended to enable the sponsors of the draft resolution to consider the amendments that had been proposed.

The meeting was suspended at 5.15 p.m. and resumed at 5.35 p.m.

31. Mr. TURKSON (Ghana) said that, as the Afro-Asian Group was preparing a substantive resolution on the question of Southern Rhodesia, and taking into account the urgency of the situation and the fact that many delegations had already consulted their Governments concerning the initial text, the sponsors, after consultation with the

representative of Somalia, had decided to accept only the following amendments: in operative paragraph 1 the words "the principle" would be inserted after "Reaffirms"; in operative paragraph 2 the words "Further reaffirms" would be replaced by "Affirms" and the word "freely" would be inserted after "endorsed". Those amendments had been incorporated in a revised version of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.990/Rev.1).

32. For the reasons he had given, he hoped that the representatives of the USSR and Barbados would understand why the sponsors had not accepted their suggestions, which could no doubt be taken into account when the substantive draft resolution on the matter was under consideration.

33. Mr. AHMAD (India) thanked the representative of the United Kingdom for his statement and for undertaking to submit a complete report on the results of Sir Alec Douglas-Home's visit to Southern Rhodesia upon the latter's return to London, but he feared that by then it might be too late. The Government of the United Kingdom should have been worthy of its traditions and should have secured the release by the Smith régime of all the imprisoned African leaders and the return of the exiles, so that they would have been in Southern Rhodesia during Sir Alec's visit.

34. He quoted a press release according to which some African nationalist leaders who were in prison had managed to send statements to Sir Alec in which they rejected any settlement which did not establish immediate majority rule.

35. Although his delegation was not entirely satisfied with the text of the draft resolution, it would vote in favour of it.

36. Mr. OULD HACHÈME (Mauritania) said that his delegation had proposed an amendment to the draft resolution because it considered that the situation in Southern Rhodesia was very serious. What was at stake was the fate of more than 4 million human beings who were subjugated in their own territory by an arrogant racist minority which ignored the Security Council and General Assembly resolutions and paid no heed to international opinion. His delegation would not press its amendment, since the Afro-Asian Group had come to an agreement. That being so, it would join the sponsors of the revised draft resolution.

37. Mrs. COLMANT (Honduras) drew the Committee's attention to operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution and agreed with the representatives of Guatemala and Colombia that the Spanish text was not clear. Her

delegation was prepared to vote on the draft resolution but had some doubts about the precise meaning of the text. She would therefore be grateful if the African delegations would take note of the suggestions for correction of the Spanish version.

38. The CHAIRMAN said that the Spanish text would be corrected.

39. Mr. KAJUE (Sierra Leone) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution despite its defects. His delegation was, however, disappointed that the United Kingdom delegation had rejected the principle in operative paragraph 1. The Government of the United Kingdom had always insisted on the principle that there should be no independence before majority rule and now it did not support that principle. He would like an explanation from the representative of the United Kingdom.

40. In the event of an agreement being reached between Sir Alec Douglas-Home and Ian Smith, he wondered what guarantees the United Nations would have that Southern Rhodesia would carry out its promises. His delegation stressed that the only principle upon which the United Kingdom could grant independence to Southern Rhodesia was the principle of majority rule.

41. Mr. DIALLO (Guinea) assured the delegation of Honduras that the ambiguity of the Spanish text had been noted and would be corrected, as the Chairman had said. He himself would insist on an accurate translation of the text into Spanish; Africa always supported Latin America when constructive suggestions were made.

42. Mr. NYIRENDA (Zambia) recalled that the representative of Sierra Leone had made a specific request to the delegation of the United Kingdom and asked for a reply. As he had said before, about a week previously Ian Smith had stated that he did not believe in the so-called five principles drawn up by the Government of the United Kingdom. On various occasions Smith had also said that he did not believe in majority rule because it was tantamount to counting sheep.

43. Mr. TEMPLE (United Kingdom) said that he had nothing to add. The five principles were very clear and he hoped that his statement had also been so.

44. The CHAIRMAN announced that Barbados and Guyana had joined the sponsors of the revised draft resolution (A/C.4/L.990/Rev.1).

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.