

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1701st
MEETING

Thursday, 26 October 1967,
at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 23:

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: 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: Southern Rhodesia (continued)

Consideration of draft resolution A/C.4/L.870/Rev.1 (continued) 119

Chairman: Mr. George J. TOMEH (Syria).

AGENDA ITEM 23

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: 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: Southern Rhodesia (continued) (A/6700/Rev.1, chap. III; A/C.4/L.870/Rev.1)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION A/C.4/L.870/REV.1 (continued)

1. Mrs. SEGERSTEDT WIBERG (Sweden) said that the position of the Government and people of Sweden on the question of Southern Rhodesia had been made clear on many occasions, both in words and in deeds. As early as November 1965, Sweden had severed all relations with the illegal régime of Ian Smith. She wished to confirm once again that her country had no dealings, commercial or otherwise, with that régime.
2. The international community was committed to the task of bringing down the minority régime which had usurped power in Southern Rhodesia and of helping the people of the Territory to achieve majority rule. That was the basic aim of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.870/Rev.1) and was in complete accord with her country's views.
3. There was no real disagreement with regard to the common goal. The United Kingdom Foreign Secretary had said in the General Assembly, at the 156th plenary meeting, that he did not wish anyone at the United Nations or in Rhodesia itself to doubt the determination of the United Kingdom to see the matter through to an honourable conclusion and that there could be no going back. She would point out that neither could there be any standing still, for there was danger in delay. Ian Smith seemed to be well on the road to introducing the system of apartheid in Southern

Rhodesia. For the newly independent African States, particularly those in the vicinity of Southern Rhodesia, the introduction of such a policy was more than morally abhorrent; it gave rise to fears that the system of oppression by a racial minority was on the offensive and might threaten the security of their States. As long as racism existed the world would know no real peace. There was the ever-present threat that divisions and conflicts between States would develop along racial lines, constituting an increasing danger to international stability and peace.

4. The people of Zimbabwe must be enabled to shape their own destiny in accordance with their freely expressed wishes. The Swedish delegation considered that the United Nations could not accept any settlement of the Southern Rhodesian question that was made without the participation of the African nationalist leaders of the Territory.

5. Her Government found it completely unacceptable that South African personnel had entered Southern Rhodesia in order to help Ian Smith to combat the liberation movement. It noted that the United Kingdom representative had confirmed that such personnel had no right whatever to be in the Territory and that the United Kingdom was doing its utmost to have them evacuated.

6. Her delegation shared the concern and disappointment voiced by all speakers that the action taken so far by the United Nations had not had the desired effect of bringing down the illegal Smith régime. It could not agree, however, that the only conclusion to be drawn was that sanctions should now be abandoned. First, it did not feel that it was possible to state categorically, before all the necessary statistics were available, that the sanctions had had no effect on the Southern Rhodesian economy. Secondly, the sanctions had not been in force long enough to warrant a final judgement. Thirdly, the sanctions imposed so far had been only selective. Finally, they had not been applied by all Member States, despite the commitment of those States under the United Nations Charter to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council. In some countries loop-holes had been left, making violations of the sanctions possible. Two Member States, Portugal and South Africa, had flagrantly defied the provisions of the sanctions programme and had offered aid and comfort to the outlawed régime. Those two Governments had shown a total disregard for the collective will of the international community and their policies should be condemned by the United Nations.

7. A striking contrast was offered by the independent African neighbours of Southern Rhodesia, which were placed in an extremely difficult position. In that con-

nexion, she paid a tribute to the Government and people of Zambia, who had suffered greatly through their faithful implementation of the sanctions programme. It was only right that ways and means should be found to compensate that country for the heavy losses it had to sustain and to help strengthen the position of the other neighbouring States. Speaking in the General Assembly, at the 1563rd plenary meeting on 22 September 1967, the Swedish Foreign Minister had said that economic assistance to African countries, in particular to those in the immediate vicinity of the countries where racial régimes still held sway, should be increased substantially and that if such programmes could be worked out in the United Nations, Sweden would be willing to play its proper part in making them effective.

8. There was general agreement that stronger measures should be adopted in order to hasten the overthrow of the Smith régime. In her delegation's view, the mandatory sanctions should be extended and tightened; they must be applied by all Member States, completely and consistently. The Smith régime must be made to understand that the international community would not abandon its efforts to isolate Southern Rhodesia from the outside world. It was essential not only for the people of Rhodesia but for the United Nations itself that the sanctions should succeed. To abandon them at that stage might do the United Nations irreparable harm and prevent it from ever again using a weapon that was being tried out for the first time in its history.

9. Those who had lost all faith in the success of economic sanctions seemed to want to rely exclusively on the use of force as the only means left to free Southern Rhodesia. The draft resolution accepted that view, a view to which her delegation could not subscribe. It was inconsistent with her Government's ideas to call for the use of violence in order to solve a difficult problem of international significance. Rather did it favour a strong recommendation to the Security Council to take a decision on the use of comprehensive mandatory sanctions.

10. For the reasons she had stated, the Swedish delegation would oppose those parts of the draft resolution which called for the use of force. If those paragraphs were retained, her delegation would have no choice but to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole, although it fully agreed with its general purpose and many of its provisions.

11. Mr. ALLIMADI (Uganda) said that one common feature of the statements made by various representatives had been the general agreement that the measures which had been requested by the United Kingdom Government had failed. Consequently, the Committee's present task was to recommend the most appropriate and effective means of attaining the common objective. His delegation denounced the refusal of the United Kingdom Government to admit that the sanctions had failed and accused that Government of pursuing a hypocritical policy.

12. During the general debate certain delegations, including those of Algeria and Barbados and his own, had put specific questions to the United Kingdom representative. Those questions had been asked in a

spirit of co-operation and had been aimed at bringing the views of the United Kingdom delegation closer to those of the other delegations in regard to the important question of what the next step should be now that the sanctions had failed. The United Kingdom representative's response had been a mere promise to reply to all questions after the general debate. Yet, it had been quite clear that his replies were urgently required in order to facilitate the preparation of the draft resolution now before the Committee. Several days had elapsed since the end of the general debate and the United Kingdom representative had not kept his promise. That was yet another demonstration of the collusion of the United Kingdom Government with the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia. Indeed, Mr. Thomson, the United Kingdom Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations, had already left for Africa to hold talks with the Smith régime. Members would draw their own conclusions about why the United Kingdom Government confined its consultations to the racist régime and ignored the African leaders. His delegation, for its part, categorically condemned such conduct.

13. Before the unilateral declaration of independence, the United Kingdom Government had gone out of its way to announce that it would never use force to prevent such a declaration. That had of course encouraged Smith and his clansmen. Its conduct had been similar in regard to the sanctions; the United Kingdom Government had said, both in London and in the General Assembly, that it did not intend to take any action against South Africa, the main violator of the sanctions. In making that announcement, the United Kingdom had been well aware that it was extending an open invitation to the culprits to continue to flout world opinion in general and the United Nations decisions in particular.

14. The United Kingdom Government bore sole responsibility for the present situation. It was working hand in glove with the racist régime of Ian Smith and the minority régime of Pretoria. The Reverend Michael Scott, an Englishman, who had appeared before the Committee as a petitioner, had shown that the United Kingdom's financial interests in southern Africa played an important role in its reluctance to settle the Southern Rhodesian question. It was ironical that after telling the United Nations that there could be no going back, the United Kingdom continued to hold talks with Smith and opposed any measures that could be effective. It was evident that the interests of Salisbury and London were identical, and it was the duty of the United Nations to destroy those interests, which were a source of misery to millions in Zimbabwe.

15. In his delegation's view, the only logical next step was what was called for in the draft resolution. Some delegations said that they would support any steps advocated by the United Kingdom. His delegation did not accept such statements. The United Nations was in duty bound to solve the Southern Rhodesian problem and to ensure that the people of the oppressed Territory were given the minimum requirements of human dignity. It was intolerable that, almost two years after the illegal seizure of power by a handful of racists, the Smith régime, which the United Nations

had pledged to destroy, was still in power. It was high time that steps were taken to bring down the illegal régime without further delay. It was lamentable that the United Nations had allowed itself to be misled. The only way to retrieve the situation was for all members to stand solidly behind the draft resolution, which offered the barest minimum that could be recommended by the Committee at the present stage.

16. Even if the United Kingdom representative's claim that the sanctions were having an effect were accepted, it was clear that those sanctions could never destroy the will of a régime which had embarked on a course of fascism. The call for comprehensive mandatory sanctions was a course that many delegations had always advocated. Such sanctions were long overdue and their application should be backed by force. He wished to make it quite clear that those who advocated the use of force against Smith did so with the greatest reluctance and only because they were convinced that that was the only way to achieve the common objective. Considering that Southern Rhodesia had South Africa to the south of it and Mozambique to the east, and given the hostile attitude of Pretoria and Lisbon towards United Nations decisions, it was obvious that comprehensive mandatory sanctions unbacked by force would be ineffective.

17. He therefore appealed to members to consider the inhuman plight of the people of Zimbabwe and to support the draft resolution, which it was hoped would help them to attain freedom very soon.

18. Mr. COLLAS (Greece) said that his delegation could not fail to view with the utmost sympathy any draft resolution aimed at reasserting the inalienable rights of the people of Zimbabwe to self-determination, freedom and independence and stressing the legitimacy of their struggle. In his delegation's view, no effort should be spared to put a speedy end to the shameful subjugation of the indigenous inhabitants of Southern Rhodesia by the white racist minority régime of Ian Smith. That régime must be brought down, not only because it was illegal and morally abhorrent, but also because it constituted a constant threat to the tranquillity of the area and the peace of the world. Nothing could justify the inhuman and humiliating servitude of millions of Africans, that lay heavily on the conscience of the international community. His delegation therefore had no difficulty in associating itself with those who advocated the prompt restoration of the elementary rules of civilized law in Southern Rhodesia.

19. His country had been one of the first to state that it would not recognize the unilateral declaration of independence, and one of the first to ban the export of arms to Southern Rhodesia and to prohibit commercial relations with that Territory. His delegation had voted in favour of all General Assembly resolutions condemning the Salisbury rebellion and his country had strictly adhered to the mandatory sanctions prescribed in Security Council resolution 232 (1966).

20. On the whole, the Greek delegation welcomed a draft resolution that expressed the concern felt by all members at the failure of the attempts made to

dislodge the rebellious régime. That concern had become even greater in recent weeks as a result of reports in the international Press that plans were being made to promote, on a long-term basis, the economic development of Southern Rhodesia outside the United Kingdom orbit and that the Salisbury authorities had begun to introduce the policy of apartheid into the Territory. His delegation agreed with the objectives and principles of the draft resolution and would vote in favour of it. He wished to point out, however, that if paragraphs 4 to 7 and paragraph 11 were voted on separately, his delegation would be obliged to abstain, in accordance with its past policy. That did not mean that it did not understand the feelings of those who advocated the use of force; on the contrary, it was well aware that United Nations resolutions on Southern Rhodesia had not had the expected results. It still hoped, however, that a solution other than the use of force could be found. While it was true that the mandatory sanctions had not brought down the white minority régime, it was pointed out in the introduction to the Secretary-General's annual report (A/6701/Add.1, para. 123) that there had been a significant decline in trade between Southern Rhodesia and many of its trading partners in most of the commodities listed in the relevant Security Council resolution. It might be well for the United Nations to intensify its sanctions programme. If the tragic plight of the people of Zimbabwe could be brought to a prompt end without bloodshed, every effort should be made to do so, in the interests of the people of Zimbabwe, of Africa and of the international community.

21. Mr. MATTHEWS (Botswana) congratulated the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.870/Rev.1 on having drawn up a comprehensive document. The Southern Rhodesian question was a serious one and it was appropriate that the draft resolution should endeavour to make clear to those responsible for the situation the international community's views regarding the situation in that Territory.

22. Like the representative of Greece, his delegation was somewhat concerned at paragraphs 4 to 7 of the draft resolution, in which the use of force was advocated. His delegation had already said that it considered that law and order must be restored in Southern Rhodesia. The United Kingdom Government had characterized the unilateral declaration of independence as an act of rebellion, a situation which would normally require action to restore law and order. In certain circumstances, that could be done only through the use of force. His delegation was not satisfied, however, that all alternatives had been exhausted and it therefore agreed with the suggestion that the sanctions applied thus far should be extended and made more comprehensive. With regard to paragraph 7, as the administering Power had stated clearly that it did not intend to use force, it seemed futile to continue to call on that Power to use force. His delegation was aware that the use of force might ultimately be necessary, but such a course would be more acceptable if it was carried out by the international community and not by the administering Power.

The meeting rose at 11.45 a.m.