

the illegal régime by peaceful means depended to a large extent on the good faith with which States applied the sanctions. In that connexion, Argentina had adopted regulations to supplement Decree Law 19.846, of September 1972, which prohibited sports exchanges with South

Africa and Rhodesia. His delegation would support any proposal designed to bring an end to the situation in which the Zimbabwe people found itself.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.

2041st meeting

Friday, 19 October 1973, at 11.10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Leonardo DIAZ GONZALEZ (Venezuela).

A/C.4/SR.2041

AGENDA ITEM 72

Question of Southern Rhodesia (*continued*) (A/9023/Add.1, A/9061)

GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

1. Mr. ARTEAGA (Venezuela) said that one of the most tragic situations prevailing in the world was the oppression by certain racist minorities of millions of human beings who were denied the full realization of their fundamental rights. That was the calamity with which the courageous people of Zimbabwe had lived for so long. Since the unilateral declaration of independence, the minority group headed by Ian Smith had not hesitated to resort to all kinds of manoeuvres, examples of which, according to reliable reports, were increased oppression, the imprisonment and detention of resistance leaders, the intensification of racial segregation and the application of the so-called programme of "provincialization", which was a copy of the system of *apartheid* applied in South Africa. The Salisbury régime had also resorted to aggression against neighbouring countries. Venezuela expressed its solidarity with the people of Zambia in the light of such frequent outrages, and endorsed the measures adopted on the initiative of the Security Council in its resolution 326 (1973) with a view to neutralizing the adverse consequences of the closing of the frontier and the economic blockade against Zambia by the illegal régime of Ian Smith.

2. The rejection of the so-called "proposals for a settlement" agreed upon between the Government of the United Kingdom and the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia¹ was a clear sign of the unshakable will of the overwhelming majority in the Territory to achieve the full exercise of their inalienable rights. There was no doubt that, in the case of Southern Rhodesia, the fundamental responsibility lay with the United Kingdom, whose duty it was, as administering Power of the Territory, to take the measures necessary to bring down the illegal régime currently in power. Until the people of Zimbabwe fully exercised their right to self-determination, the United Kingdom would be responsible to the international community for their fate.

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971*, document S/10405.

3. On repeated occasions, his delegation had strongly condemned the pseudo-independence proclaimed by the racist minority and had declared its support for a real and genuine independence for Southern Rhodesia, established through consultation with the entire adult population, on the basis of universal suffrage and the introduction of majority rule. It also shared the view that a national constitutional conference should be convened at which the genuine political representatives of the people of Zimbabwe would be able to work out a settlement relating to the future of the Territory for subsequent endorsement by the people through free and democratic processes. In that connexion, Venezuela had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 2945 (XXVII), in which the United Kingdom had been urged to convene such a conference.

4. His delegation would continue its support for all resolutions aimed at putting an end to the régime in Southern Rhodesia and at enabling the African people of Zimbabwe to enjoy the full exercise of their right to self-determination and independence.

5. Mr. ZAKRZEWSKI (Poland) pointed out that for the past 11 years the question of Southern Rhodesia had been discussed in the United Nations and that some Member States still ignored the decisions of the international community.

6. The situation in Southern Rhodesia continued to deteriorate and the representatives of the Zimbabwe African Peoples Union (ZAPU), the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) and the African National Council had provided many examples of the repressive and oppressive measures adopted by the Salisbury régime against the people of Zimbabwe (2038th and 2039th meetings). His delegation thanked them for the information they had provided and expressed its profound satisfaction at the presence of the legitimate representatives of the liberation movements of Zimbabwe at the United Nations.

7. The Smith régime had been able to ride roughshod over the people of Zimbabwe because of the incorrect behaviour of a few States Members of the Organization. The administering Power had not been able to solve with firmness the problem raised by the existence of the Ian Smith régime and continued to violate the mandatory sanctions first imposed against Southern Rhodesia by the Security Council

in its resolution 253 (1968), thereby contravening the provisions of Article 25 of the United Nations Charter. There were other Member States which also violated the mandatory sanctions: on the one hand, South Africa and Portugal, which had formed an alliance with the illegal Smith régime to suppress the liberation movements, and, on the other, the United States, whose imports of chrome ore were directly contrary to the decisions of the United Nations. Some Member States, too, permitted their citizens to serve the régime as mercenaries.

8. The United Nations had the necessary machinery to provide for the creation of conditions to enable the people of Zimbabwe to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. Moreover, at the International Conference of Experts for the Support of Victims of Colonialism and *Apartheid* in Southern Africa, held at Oslo in April 1973, a concrete programme of action had been drawn up (see A/9061, annex, sect. IV) but the will to implement it was lacking on the part of those Member States most immediately involved in the question. The United Kingdom Government had failed to take effective measures to put an end to the illegal régime and to discharge the responsibilities incumbent upon it as administering Power. His delegation was alarmed at the reports that, despite the negative response given by the people of Zimbabwe to the proposals submitted by the Pearce Commission,² the proposals were still the subject of negotiations and had not been withdrawn.

9. Internally, the Ian Smith régime was moving ahead towards the establishment of a system of *apartheid* and, externally, it did not shrink from attacking Zambia, which bravely withstood the economic pressures applied by the Salisbury régime.

10. It was right, therefore, that the oppressed people of Zimbabwe should resort to armed struggle to achieve their goal of self-determination and independence and to counter the violence unleashed by the white racists.

11. The people and Government of Poland had always supported, and would continue to support, the legitimate struggle of the liberation movements in Africa, including the struggle of the brave people of Zimbabwe. They also expressed their solidarity with the people of Zambia, who were exposed to pressures and attacks from the colonialists and racists.

12. His delegation also wished to reaffirm that it maintained no relations of any kind with the illegal régime of Ian Smith and was pleased to hear the new declarations of States that were enacting legislation with a view to complying with the decisions of the United Nations regarding Southern Rhodesia. Similarly, his delegation supported the position taken by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in the resolutions contained in chapter VII, paragraphs 21 and 22, of its report (A/9023/Add.1) and the statement of its Chairman in paragraph 23

of the same document, and it would support any legitimate proposal designed to bring about an early solution to the thorny problem of Southern Rhodesia.

Mr. Heidweiller (Netherlands), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

13. Mr. BEMBOY (Zaire) greeted the representatives of the liberation movements present in the conference room and expressed his desire to see them occupy their rightful places as representatives of an independent country in order to make their valuable contribution to the work of the United Nations.

14. The questions of the Territories under Portuguese domination, Southern Rhodesia and Namibia were not new to the Fourth Committee. As at earlier sessions, on the conclusion of its work the Committee would have to adopt various draft resolutions condemning Lisbon, Salisbury and Pretoria, as well as their allies or accomplices, and inviting them to reconsider their disastrous policy, but those drafts, like all the previous ones, would never achieve the desired results.

15. The situation in Southern Rhodesia was as scandalous and humiliating as that which prevailed in South Africa and in the Territories under Portuguese domination. The same anachronistic and retrograde policy was applied there, the aim of which was the alienation of the black man and his domination by the white man. The Republic of Zaire could not tolerate such a policy and vigorously denounced colonialism and racism, which now existed only in the African continent.

16. In the light of the revelations made by the representatives of ZAPU, ZANU and the African National Council at the 2038th and 2039th meetings, it was clear that the campaign of terror was constantly being intensified in Southern Rhodesia and that the situation there was becoming intolerable and explosive. The Ian Smith régime did not hesitate to approve legislation and regulations which rivalled the procedures of *apartheid* as it was practised in South Africa. Yet, despite the persecutions and other measures adopted to intimidate and enslave them, the courageous people of Zimbabwe would not let the cry for freedom and dignity be extinguished, as was shown by the rejection, pure and simple, of the famous "proposals for a settlement", which Ian Smith had tried to impose on them.

17. Legally, Southern Rhodesia was still a Territory under British administration, for which the United Kingdom, in its capacity as administering Power, must assume the responsibility incumbent upon it. The metropolitan country had not granted independence to the Ian Smith régime and the latter had not managed to break with the metropolitan country; it could therefore not be recognized as a *de facto* government. Southern Rhodesia had never fought against the metropolitan country, but rather against the indigenous population, whose aspirations for self-determination and independence it had disregarded. The United Kingdom Government had a moral commitment and a legal obligation to ensure respect for the provisions of its own Constitution, to put down the rebellion and to establish a democratic régime in Zimbabwe. It had a duty to do so, and it also had the means and the strength to do

² 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).

so. The only thing which it lacked was the determination. Using great violence, it had crushed innumerable rebel and independence movements in its colonies, except in Southern Rhodesia. Instead of discouraging the British secessionists in Southern Rhodesia, it was helping them to consolidate and reinforce their positions. Backed by such complicity on the part of the metropolitan country and by the considerable amount of war material placed at its disposal by South Africa, Ian Smith had decided not only to disregard the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, but also to embark on acts of provocation against other States. In January 1973, it had closed the frontier with Zambia, in an act of indirect aggression aimed at choking the economy of that sovereign State, which was bound to Zaire by destiny, by history and by geography. In the face of that measure by the Salisbury régime, the Republic of Zaire had not hesitated to offer its economic, political and military assistance to the fraternal State of Zambia.

18. The Republic of Zaire reaffirmed once again its determination to support and implement all resolutions condemning the Salisbury régime and asking that all States make available to the patriots of Zimbabwe their moral and material assistance.

19. He reiterated the position of his Government, which was that it would regard Southern Rhodesia as a British colony as long as it was not ruled by the majority of the people of Zimbabwe. The United Kingdom must shoulder its responsibility and, if necessary, resort to the use of force to put down Ian Smith's rebellion.

20. Mr. AL SAID (Oman) said he believed that, in the case of Southern Rhodesia, the United Nations and each and every one of its Members must take action in accordance with the principles of the Charter. That was not a matter of choice, but a moral obligation, which must be discharged in order to avoid setting a precedent that might have tragic implications.

21. The case of Zimbabwe was a clear-cut example of racism at its worst, perpetrated, as usual by a minority régime which could count on the support of some Members of the United Nations. The white minority régime believed it had a right to dominate the indigenous population and to deprive it of all its rights; what was worse, in order to maintain itself in power, it did not hesitate to resort to any measures, even murder. Like the Zionists and the inventors of *apartheid*, it used vile means to justify its even viler ends.

22. The United Nations and each and every one of its Members must understand that the forces of racism, zionism and *apartheid* were a challenge to the overwhelming majority of Member States and, even worse, to the very principles of the United Nations. Hence the only possible course, short of intervention by the administering Power, was to sever all relations, of whatever kind, with the racist régime in Salisbury. The world community must employ any means available to it, including sanctions, to impose majority rule in Zimbabwe.

23. The obligation to confront racism and white fanaticism in Africa and in Palestine fell not only upon the United Nations; it fell also upon the United Kingdom, which, as administering Power, was responsible for the

situation prevailing in Zimbabwe, for, despite its assertions to the contrary, over the years it had quietly relaxed its attitude towards the racist régime in Southern Rhodesia. The responsibility fell also upon the United States, which, as a world Power, should be careful to retain its moral integrity. The smaller nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America could not fail to note that a small group of fanatical Zionists could, by the use of violence, money and electoral blackmail, influence the United States to interfere in the Middle East on the side of injustice, aggression and expansionism, whereas the majority of the people of that country, which had itself once struggled for freedom and tolerance, had not been able to prevent the United States Government from violating the sanctions imposed by the Security Council against the minority régime in Salisbury.

24. With regard to the attitude of the racist régimes of Portugal and South Africa with regard to Zimbabwe, condemnation of those régimes had proved totally inadequate. The time had come to take concrete and effective action against those régimes, which were aiding and abetting the racist régime in Salisbury and were even sending troops to Zimbabwe to crush the African resistance movement.

25. Mr. VLASCEANU (Romania) welcomed the representatives of the liberation movements and availed himself of the opportunity to reaffirm the support of the Romanian people for the just struggle of the Zimbabwe people for independence. Experience had shown the importance and usefulness of the participation of the representatives of liberation movements in the debates on colonial problems. He himself considered that it should be stated in the resolutions to be adopted at the current session that those liberation movements were entitled to receive all the political, material and humanitarian assistance necessary from States and international organizations.

26. The action taken by the United Nations with regard to Southern Rhodesia showed an increasing concern for the solution of the problem, but that action had not been sufficient and the situation in the Territory continued to deteriorate. An analysis of the reasons for the non-implementation of the measures adopted by the United Nations led to the conclusion that new measures were required in order to accelerate the process of the attainment of independence by the people of Zimbabwe. The obstacles in the way of a solution of the problem were still the same: the refusal of the United Kingdom to take steps to eliminate the illegal régime and to fulfil its responsibility as administering Power; the violation by certain Member States of the Security Council resolutions imposing sanctions against Southern Rhodesia; the presence of South African troops in Southern Rhodesia and the co-operation of the colonialist and racist régimes of Salisbury, Pretoria and Lisbon.

27. The perpetuation of that situation was encouraging the Smith régime and contributing to the deterioration of conditions in Southern Rhodesia, as had been confirmed by the representatives of the liberation movements at the 2038th and 2039th meetings. It was enough to note that the Salisbury régime, faithful to the device of "divide and rule", had adopted a policy of "provincialization" of the Territory, with a view to consolidating its power. It was

therefore understandable that the international community was becoming more and more disturbed and was demanding that the United Nations should intervene to ensure that power was transferred to the majority of the population. His country considered that the appeal to the United Kingdom to refrain from granting any prerogative to the illegal régime (General Assembly resolution 2945 (XXVII)) had been a legitimate one.

28. As had already been pointed out, the strength of the United Nations depended upon its ability to ensure compliance with the resolutions it adopted. For that reason his delegation considered that the gravity of the violations of the sanctions imposed by the Security Council should be emphasized, since such violations constituted a defiance of the Organization and encouraged Smith to maintain an illegal international situation, which ran counter to the obligations assumed by Member States under the Charter.

29. In the opinion of his delegation, it was essential that the United Nations should take action to discourage the granting of any assistance to the illegal régime. The adoption of firm measures designed to put an end to the presence of South African troops in the territory of Zimbabwe would correspond to the wishes of the international community and would constitute a substantial contribution to the maintenance of peace and security in that area.

30. Romania vigorously condemned the oppression of the people of Zimbabwe by the illegal minority régime of Ian Smith and felt that the international community could not ignore those acts, since they threatened international peace and security. It declared itself to be opposed to any policy of domination or force, opposed to colonialism and in favour of the elimination of all the remnants of colonialism. It fully supported the right of every people to decide for itself its destiny and, as Mr. Ceaușescu, the President of the State Council of Romania, had stated, it firmly condemned the policy of racial discrimination and *apartheid* carried out by the racist régimes of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia and supported the just cause of the liberation movements of those Territories.

31. Romania did not recognize the so-called Republic of Rhodesia arbitrarily proclaimed by the racist authorities in Salisbury, it did not entertain diplomatic or any other relations with the illegal régime and it had adopted measures for the observance of the resolutions of the United Nations. In addition, it had given the Zimbabwe people bilateral support and had developed relations of co-operation with the national liberation movements of Zimbabwe.

32. In conclusion, he repeated that the resolutions to be adopted at the current session should reflect the new developments in the Territory, take into account the present needs of the liberation struggle, the requirements of the international community and the proposals made during the debate and include new measures designed to eliminate the illegal minority régime by increasing the assistance given to the struggle of the Zimbabwe people for independence.

33. Mr. CAMPBELL (Australia) said that, as a member of the Security Council, Australia had been working for the strict enforcement of sanctions against the régime in power in Zimbabwe, because it regarded the sanctions as a test of the sincerity of Member States to act in accordance with the principles of the Charter. For that reason, it considered that delegations should declare their position on the agenda item under consideration.

34. Apart from the question of sanctions, Australia considered Southern Rhodesia a British colony which was at present subject to a rebel and illegal régime. It deplored that régime's discriminatory policies and supported the United Kingdom Government's five principles for a settlement of the problem, especially the fifth principle, namely, that the United Kingdom Government would need to be satisfied that any basis proposed for independence was acceptable to the people of Zimbabwe.³ Meanwhile, the United Kingdom Government remained responsible for all the people of Zimbabwe.

35. At stake were both justice and peace in Africa, and that required that the Smith rebellion should be brought to an end, for there could be no prospect of stability in a situation characterized by rebellion, racism and repression.

36. The sanctions of the United Nations should have been effective, but they had obviously been violated on a large scale. Those primarily responsible for the violations were South Africa and Portugal, but they were not alone. Those who co-operated with the Smith régime were guilty of betraying the United Nations and if, through prolonging the life of the rebel régime, they left no alternative but its extinction through violence, they would be guilty of the death of many innocent people.

37. Australia would prefer a peaceful solution to the problem but it realized that oppression of the majority could not fail to produce a violent reaction. It was therefore of the greatest importance that the liberation movements should be heard and helped. His delegation valued the contribution that their representatives had made. At the 2038th and 2039th meetings, those representatives had referred to the presence of Western mercenaries in Zimbabwe. He informed the Committee that the Australian Government had reiterated that any Australian citizen who followed or promoted the policies of the rebel régime would be deprived of his passport. Lastly, he recorded once again the Australian Government's dedication to co-operating in any international action by which the rebel régime in Salisbury could be brought down.

38. Mr. ABDUL-LATEEF (United Arab Emirates) said that, in spite of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council condemning the policy of the illegal régime of Ian Smith and applying sanctions against it, the international community had not yet found any effective means to end that régime, which undermined the dignity of man.

39. In an endeavour to assess what the United Nations had done to put an end to the illegal white minority régime, he

³ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971*, document S/10405, para. 8.

said that since 1962, when the United Nations had declared that Southern Rhodesia was a Non-Self-Governing Territory (General Assembly resolution 1747 (XVI)), a number of resolutions had been adopted on the subject. In those various resolutions the United Nations had affirmed that the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, was responsible to the United Nations under the Charter and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples for ensuring that the people of Southern Rhodesia could exercise their right to self-determination and independence. The United Kingdom, however, had taken the position that it could not intervene in the internal affairs of Southern Rhodesia since it lacked the constitutional power to do so. In 1964 the United Kingdom had informed the United Nations of an announcement made by the United Kingdom Prime Minister in October of that year, in which he had stated that a mere declaration of independence by the Southern Rhodesian Government would have no constitutional effect and that such a declaration would be “an open act of defiance and rebellion”.⁴ The delegation of the United Arab Emirates could not understand that contradiction in the position of the United Kingdom: either it should assume its powers as administering Power or it should refrain from opposing any action that the United Nations might deem necessary to put an end to the minority régime.

40. The General Assembly had not accepted the position of the United Kingdom and had expressed its regret that the United Kingdom had not implemented the resolutions of the General Assembly. The United Kingdom had stated that its aims were similar to those of other Members of the United Nations. It was therefore impossible to understand the United Kingdom position taken in the Security Council in September 1963, when a draft resolution had been proposed inviting the United Kingdom not to transfer power until a fully representative government had been established and not to transfer armed forces and aircraft to the Territory.⁵ That draft resolution had not been adopted because of the negative vote cast by the United Kingdom.

41. The Security Council had stated in its resolution 314 (1972) that any legislation passed, or act taken, by any State with a view to permitting, directly or indirectly, the importation from Southern Rhodesia of any commodity falling within the scope of the obligations imposed by resolution 253 (1968), including chrome ore, would undermine sanctions and would be contrary to the obligations of States. In its resolution 232 (1966) the Council had reminded Member States that the failure or refusal by any of them to implement that resolution would constitute a violation of Article 25 of the United Nations Charter. It was regrettable that States members of the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968), otherwise known as the Sanctions Committee, were violating those resolutions.

42. In an article published in the July/August/September 1973 issue of *Objective: Justice*, Guy Arnold had pointed

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Nineteenth Session, Annexes, Annex No. 8 (Part I), chap. III, para. 572.*

⁵ *Official Records of the Security Council, Eighteenth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1963, document S/5425/Rev.1.*

out that as a result of the Byrd amendment of November 1971 the United States Government was violating sanctions in so far as it was prepared to import chrome and asbestos from Southern Rhodesia. Since that would inevitably influence other nations that were only lukewarm about sanctions to break them openly, it was most desirable that the Government should reverse its policy.

43. His delegation had already pointed out that the list of Southern Rhodesia's main trading partners should be regarded as an indictment of those countries and their obstructive attitude towards the campaign against racism and colonialism. His country's Minister for Foreign Affairs had stated at the 2135th plenary meeting that, even before its independence, the United Arab Emirates had followed with keen interest the struggle waged by other peoples against colonialism. The Arab world had suffered greatly from foreign domination and consequently gave its unstinted support to the struggle to eradicate the last vestiges of colonialism, in Africa and elsewhere. At the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Algiers in September 1973, his country had pledged to make a modest contribution to the liberation movements in Africa, as a token of its solidarity with the African people, and it was ready to continue to give them moral and material support until they obtained freedom and independence for their people in Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Angola, Guinea-Bissau and Namibia.

44. His delegation urged that stronger measures should be taken against Southern Rhodesia and it supported all proposals aimed at the speediest annihilation of the white minority régime in Southern Rhodesia.

45. Mr. LESSING (German Democratic Republic) said that, despite the present fighting caused by Israel's permanent aggression in the Middle East, the international situation as a whole was marked by an increasing trend towards *détente* and negotiation. In the light of that stabilization of international peace and security the anachronism of the unsolved problem of Southern Rhodesia was becoming increasingly obvious. The continued rule of the Smith régime—a threat to international peace and security, as stated in Security Council resolution 277 (1970)—was a serious obstacle to normalizing the situation in southern Africa.

46. The position of the German Democratic Republic on that question was well known and was in conformity with its character as a socialist State. His Government had broken once and for all with the colonialist and racist policy of the Third Reich. The roots of imperialism had been replaced by the principles of solidarity with the oppressed peoples and races and by active support for their just struggle against their oppressors. In conformity with that policy his Government had refused to recognize the régime of Southern Rhodesia immediately after the coup d'état of 1965 and had broken off all trade relations with Salisbury. Subsequently, it had strictly observed the sanctions decided by the Security Council and had recently cut off postal services and telecommunications with Southern Rhodesia.

47. Clearly, the Ian Smith régime would have fallen long since but for the complicity of other States, principally

Portugal and South Africa. Both countries ignored with unprecedented cynicism the sanctions established by the Security Council. Furthermore, the three régimes gave each other military assistance in order to maintain their rule, which was contrary to international law. For instance, it was known that the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia had actively supported Portugal's cruel policy by sending military units to Mozambique and that South African soldiers were still in action in Zimbabwe. His Government joined the increasing number of States that were demanding the extension of sanctions to South Africa and Portugal.

48. The continued existence of the Ian Smith régime was not due only to the Lisbon-Salisbury-Pretoria alliance; a number of States members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) shared the responsibility because they had failed to observe the Security Council resolutions.

49. The United States refusal to observe the economic sanctions by importing chrome, nickel and asbestos from Southern Rhodesia was a defiance of international law, of the authority of the United Nations and of the position of the majority of States, as reiterated recently at the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries at Algiers. Between February and December 1972 alone the United States had disregarded the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia at least 30 times.

50. The chief responsibility for the present state of affairs in Southern Rhodesia lay with the United Kingdom, as the administering Power. The latter should comply with its obligations under Chapter XI of the Charter, put an end to the illegal minority régime and make it possible for the people of Zimbabwe to exercise their right to self-determination and independence. The German Democratic Republic, like most members of the Committee, had disapproved of the refusal of the United Kingdom representative (2039th meeting) to comply with the majority request that he should make a statement on the question of Southern Rhodesia at the beginning of the debate and inform the Committee how his Government intended to fulfil its obligations.

51. The United Nations had recently adopted a number of decisions against the Salisbury régime, all of which had met with his Government's approval, although the stipulations could have been more sweeping. That applied to General Assembly resolutions 2945 (XXVII) and 2946 (XXVII) and to the various Security Council decisions reaffirming *inter alia* the obligations of States to prosecute firms that did not comply with the sanctions.

52. The results of the International Conference of Experts for the Support of Victims of Colonialism and *Apartheid* in Southern Africa, held at Oslo in April 1973 (see A/9061), had been received with great interest and approval by his Government. His delegation was pleased to see that the recommendations of the Conference had been taken into account in resolutions of the Special Committee (see A/9023/Add.1, paras. 21 and 22). His Government had also followed with great attention the conference of non-aligned countries held in September at Algiers and it had been pleased to note that the States represented there had disapproved of the illegal Ian Smith régime and had called for more effective steps to end it.

53. His country would never directly or indirectly recognize the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia and would continue to have no trade relations with it. It would continue to give moral, political and material support to the liberation movements of Zimbabwe and was ready to comply with all decisions of the Committee and other United Nations organs, in particular the Security Council, and to support such new decisions as aimed at the earliest possible end of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia. The policy of that régime was merely an extension of the policy of *apartheid*.

54. Mr. DASHTSEREN (Mongolia) said that, in dealing with the question of Southern Rhodesia, the United Nations had always urged the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, to take effective steps to bring down the racist régime in Salisbury and to ensure the necessary conditions for the people of Zimbabwe to exercise their right to self-determination and independence. However, the economic sanctions advocated by the United Kingdom and the so-called proposals for a settlement had not worked.

55. South Africa and Portugal, which had made an unholy alliance with Southern Rhodesia, and certain Powers whose monopolies had great economic and financial interests in the Territory, had systematically violated the United Nations sanctions and continued to supply the racist régime with the necessary means for its survival and for the consolidation of its position. Consequently his delegation considered that the Security Council should be asked to expand the mandatory sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and to take steps to ensure compliance with those sanctions by all States. In view of the persistent refusal of South Africa and Portugal to carry out the mandatory decision of the Security Council, sanctions should be applied against those régimes also.

56. The illegal régime at Salisbury had intensified racial segregation along the lines of the system of *apartheid*, which had been repeatedly condemned by the world community as a crime against humanity. The provincialization programme, like the system of Bantustans and "homelands", was designed to prevent the African population from participating in the affairs of the so-called Central Government. In order to promote their policy, the racist authorities were adopting legislative and other measures and were committing every kind of atrocity against the African population.

57. While intensifying the repression of the people of Zimbabwe, the racist authorities, in collusion with South Africa, were committing acts of armed provocation against independent African States. The closure of the frontier with Zambia in January 1973 and the concentration of armed forces along it should be regarded as acts of aggression against an independent State. Use of force, however, could never compel Zambia to stop supporting the struggle of the people of Zimbabwe. On the contrary, with the support of other African States, Zambia would continue to help the liberation movements. Faced with the total denial of their fundamental human rights and with repression on a massive scale, the people of Zimbabwe had no other choice than to rise in arms against the tyranny and wage a just struggle against the racist usurpers. The decision taken by ZANU and ZAPU on 23 March 1972 to unite

their efforts in the struggle against the racist régime was an important event in the expansion of the national liberation movements of the Territory.

58. His country had always supported the legitimate struggle of the people of Zimbabwe against the racist oppressors and had offered all the moral and material support it could.

59. The United Kingdom Government could not escape responsibility for the ever-deteriorating situation in Southern Rhodesia. First, it should take effective steps to establish the necessary conditions for the people of Zimbabwe freely to exercise their right to self-determination and independence. Any attempt to negotiate on the future of Zimbabwe with the illegal régime on the basis of independence before majority rule would be in contravention of the inalienable rights of the people of the Territory and contrary to the provisions of the Charter and of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). Any settlement relating to the future of the country should be worked out with the full participation of the legitimate political leaders and representatives of the national liberation movements, who were the sole and authentic representatives of the true aspirations of the people of Zimbabwe, and must be endorsed freely and fully by those people.

60. The United Kingdom representative in the Security Council had warned the Council against action which might impede the attainment of a so-called long-term political settlement in Southern Rhodesia. The delegation of Mongolia would like to know what that so-called long-term political settlement was that the United Kingdom was contemplating.

61. His delegation endorsed the recommendations of the Special Committee on the question of Southern Rhodesia (*ibid.*) and would support any decisions which would be in the interests of the oppressed people of Zimbabwe.

62. Mr. MULWA (Kenya) affirmed that his delegation's stand on the Southern Rhodesian issue remained unchanged. Southern Rhodesia was a British colony, and the United Kingdom Government had a duty as administering Power to end the rebellion of the white minority régime.

63. The racist authorities in Salisbury were introducing a system of *apartheid* in the Territory to intimidate the Africans and force them to accept the terms of settlement they had refused. The United Kingdom could influence events inside Southern Rhodesia, as could be seen from the widespread protests calling for the release of a British journalist who had been imprisoned there. It was clear that the United Kingdom was helping Ian Smith to consolidate and expand his illegal and oppressive régime to a position comparable to that of South Africa. The tactics of the United Kingdom were well known throughout the world and no words could disguise its policy of continued support of the minority racist régime, which was oppressing the African majority in Southern Rhodesia.

64. Despite the sanctions, the illegal régime had survived, not because the sanctions were ineffective but because some Western countries, like Portugal and South Africa, had continued to flout them. Accordingly, it must be

recognized that the sanctions would never have the desired results if they were applied only to Southern Rhodesia and not to South Africa and Portugal.

65. The United Nations had no means of enforcing its resolutions once they were adopted; consequently, his delegation called on all Member States to extend the sanctions to include Portugal and South Africa.

66. His delegation appealed to the United Kingdom, the United States and France, which not only refused to extend the sanctions but were violating them by trading with the illegal régime, either directly or through South Africa and Portugal.

67. It was an indisputable fact that South African troops were operating in Southern Rhodesia against the freedom fighters. The United Nations should call on the United Kingdom to use its influence to bring about the immediate withdrawal of those troops. His delegation appealed to those countries of the Western world which were supplying arms to South Africa on the ground of promoting security in the Indian Ocean to realize that those same arms were being used in Southern Rhodesia. France and the United Kingdom should stop supplying arms to the Smith régime through South Africa and NATO.

68. In 1966 the United Kingdom Government had admitted that colonialism and racism in southern Africa were a source of international conflict.⁶ Since 1966 the situation in Southern Rhodesia had changed a great deal for the worse because of the flow of arms and investments to that part of Africa. In his view, it was most hypocritical for the Western Governments to assert that their trade laws did not allow them to compel their companies to stop trading with the racist régimes. It was sufficient to recall that until recently those same countries had refused to allow their companies to maintain any kind of commercial relations with China or Cuba. The Western countries must realize that they were not dealing in goods but in human lives. Since the United Kingdom and its Western allies continued to veto Security Council resolutions aimed at widening the sanctions, his delegation thought that the situation in southern Africa could be resolved only by recourse to arms.

69. The independence of Guinea-Bissau represented a great achievement by the Africans; all peace-loving countries should render material assistance to Guinea-Bissau so that it would be able to expel the Portuguese aggressors from its soil. The time had come when words were no longer enough and it was necessary to put into practice all the noble ideas evolved at the various conferences at which the problem of southern Africa had been discussed.

70. It was a pity that the liberation struggle was still held to concern only the States situated close to the areas of conflict. The problem of southern Africa concerned everyone. Accordingly, his Government suggested, first, that the United Nations should organize a force made up of contingents from Member States to ensure that no more arms reached Lourenço Marques and that South African troops did not cross the frontier into Southern Rhodesia;

⁶ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-first Year, 1331st meeting.*

secondly, the United Kingdom should ensure that the illegal régime repealed its segregationist laws; thirdly, the United Kingdom, as administering Power, should ensure that freedom fighters were treated as prisoners of war, in accordance with the Geneva Conventions; in addition, the United Kingdom should convene a conference of the parties to formulate an acceptable settlement before the situation developed into a bloody war; lastly, publicity should be given to the countries which violated the sanctions imposed by the Security Council.

71. His Government congratulated Zambia on its firm support of the cause of the Africans in Southern Rhodesia, despite the conditions created by Smith. It also welcomed the change of attitude by the Governments of Australia and New Zealand, which had adopted a realistic approach to the question of southern Africa. It hoped that other Western

countries would change their policies with respect to the colonial problem. In addition, it paid a tribute to the progressive countries, such as the Nordic countries, and urged them to continue to seek the expulsion of Portugal from NATO. It also thanked the Netherlands and the socialist countries, which had increased their material assistance to the liberation movements.

72. Finally, his delegation stressed that the United Nations must not allow itself to be paralysed by the extravagant use of the veto by certain Powers. In order to protect the United Nations from that danger, his delegation considered that it would be necessary to examine the Charter with a view to introducing some amendments further defining the use of the veto.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.

2042nd meeting

Friday, 19 October 1973, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Leonardo DIAZ GONZALEZ (Venezuela).

A/C.4/SR.2042

AGENDA ITEM 72

Question of Southern Rhodesia (*continued*) (A/9023/Add.1, A/9061)

GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

1. Mr. SYLLA (Guinea) said that, despite the many resolutions stressing the responsibility of the administering Power for Southern Rhodesia, the United Kingdom refused to convene a constitutional conference on the principle of one man, one vote. Chapter VII of the 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 (A/9023/Add.1) and the statements of the genuine representatives of Zimbabwe at the 2038th and 2039th meetings reflected the view of the whole world, with the exception of the white minorities of Southern Rhodesia and South Africa, which were being compelled by the changing balance of world power to adopt a more reasonable attitude towards developing countries.

2. The problem of Southern Rhodesia epitomized the essence of colonialism wherever it existed, namely, the determination to maintain arbitrary domination by means of violence. The information in the report evoked a feeling of revulsion against the colonialist usurpers, who knew better than anyone that the only reason for their presence in Africa was the lure of profits made possible by their temporary technical superiority.

3. The illegal régime opposed the efforts of the African political parties to find an area of agreement, so that blacks and whites might live together under a system of majority rule. The report described the many undesirable practices

of the régime, painting a gloomy picture of the situation in Southern Rhodesia.

4. At the Ninth Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), held at Rabat in 1972, the African Heads of State had appealed to the United Kingdom to support the accession of Southern Rhodesia to independence under a democratic system of government, in keeping with the wishes of the majority of the population. In order to escape its responsibilities, the United Kingdom took refuge behind the principle of the application of sanctions, but it turned a blind eye to the trade carried on with Southern Rhodesia through South Africa by a number of Western States.

5. The problem of Southern Rhodesia was becoming a matter of conscience for the international community and constituted a permanent threat to neighbouring countries. Faced with the resurgence of violence in Southern Rhodesia and the manoeuvres of the unholy alliance of Portugal, Southern Rhodesia and South Africa, the United Nations must find a solution to the problem. His delegation suggested the following measures: the United Kingdom Government should be induced to shoulder its responsibilities and to take more vigorous action to end the rebellion in Southern Rhodesia; a constitutional conference should be held on the principle of one man, one vote, with adequate representation of the African majority; the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia should be strictly enforced and extended to South Africa and Portugal; and the national liberation movements should be given greater assistance.

6. Mr. RUPIA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that, despite the action taken by the United Nations over many years, the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia had ruthlessly