

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records

FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1614th
MEETING

Friday, 21 October 1966,
at 10.55 a.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 23:</i>	
<i>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)</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	97

Chairman: Mr. FAKHREDDINE Mohamed
(Sudan).

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/6300/Rev.1, chap. III)

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. SY (Senegal) said that the situation in Southern Rhodesia was of increasing concern to his delegation, since there was still no sign of an end to the rebellion. It was time to act before the situation became even more serious. At the Committee's 1606th meeting, the United Kingdom representative had informed the Committee of the five decisions taken at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference, held in London in September 1966, which it was hoped would result in the independence of Southern Rhodesia. There was one obstacle in the way, however, namely, the rebellion of Ian Smith, and the main concern of the Committee was how to put an end to that rebellion. His delegation was fundamentally opposed to the policy so far pursued by the United Kingdom. Even with the best intentions and the greatest goodwill, that country was unable to put an end to the illegal régime.

2. He had two observations to make concerning 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/6300/Rev.1, chap. III). In the first place, paragraph 163 of the report referred to a statement made by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom in January 1966 to the effect that Southern Rhodesia's future course could not be negotiated with the régime which illegally claimed to govern the country. In the light of that statement it was difficult

to understand the reason for the negotiations currently taking place at Salisbury between the United Kingdom Government and Ian Smith, and it was difficult to understand how Ian Smith could have announced the previous day that his régime's independence was about to be recognized by the United Kingdom Government. He would be grateful if the United Kingdom representative could indicate the aim of the negotiations.

3. Secondly, according to the report, the United Kingdom Government, although basically opposed to the use of force in Southern Rhodesia, might have recourse to it in two eventualities. The United Kingdom Prime Minister was reported to have informed Parliament that if the legally constituted Government of Southern Rhodesia, namely the Governor, were to seek help in maintaining law and order, the United Kingdom Government would have to give the matter its fullest consideration (*ibid.*, para. 71). It was inconceivable, however, that the Governor, who was a prisoner, would ask for military intervention against the rebel régime which was led by his friend Ian Smith. The United Kingdom Government might also be prepared to use force in the event of subversion or murder in order to avert a tragedy (*ibid.*, para. 70). Subversion could only be committed by the Africans, who were the only victims of the state of affairs and of the anti-democratic principles established by the Smith régime, and he hoped that the United Kingdom, which had refused to use force against the rebel régime, would not do so against the majority of the population of the Territory who might be guilty of "subversion".

4. His delegation was firmly convinced that only the use of force could put an end to the rebellion and that the United Kingdom had the necessary means, but would not use them. The United Kingdom contended that economic sanctions could achieve the same result, but in fact it lacked the means to enforce them. It had adopted certain economic and financial measures against the Smith régime since the unilateral declaration of independence, but they had failed mainly because of the attitude of the Republic of South Africa and Portugal. If sanctions were to be effective, they must also be extended to South Africa and Portugal, but the United Kingdom could not take any action against South Africa without committing economic suicide. As *The New York Times* of 6 September 1966 had revealed, South Africa was the United Kingdom's third most important trading partner, after the United States and Australia. The United Kingdom and the pound sterling were at the mercy of South Africa and it would therefore be vain to hope for sanctions to be enforced against that country. Furthermore, the United Kingdom would not wish to take effective action against Portugal, partly because the

Beira-Umtali oil pipeline was operated by an Anglo-Portuguese company and partly because, if the United Kingdom did indeed put an end to the rebellion in Southern Rhodesia, it would need to gain access to the sea for the Territory through Mozambique. The United Kingdom, which had once been the financial centre of the world, was obliged to come to terms with South Africa in order to avoid an economic crisis and, because of the weakness of its economy, was unable to take effective action.

5. Only the United Nations, therefore, through the Security Council, could put an end to the rebellion in Southern Rhodesia by taking action under Article 42 of the United Nations Charter. There were some who did not place great hopes in the Security Council, which owing to a number of abstentions had, at its 1285th meeting on 23 May 1966, rejected a draft resolution submitted by Mali, Nigeria and Uganda^{1/} providing for the application of measures under Chapter VII of the Charter. He hoped, however, that the United Kingdom would agree to intervention by the Security Council and would act with the support of that body to free Southern Rhodesia at last.

6. Mr. DASHTSEREN (Mongolia) said that almost a year had elapsed since the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom had announced that the problem of Southern Rhodesia would be settled within a matter of weeks. Yet the racist régime not only had survived but was strengthening its political and economic position behind the farce of economic sanctions and "talks about talks". Economic sanctions had produced neither political nor economic results, as had been foreseen by many Members of the United Nations which had asked the United Kingdom to use stronger measures, including armed force. The United Kingdom had not only failed to listen but had made it clear to Ian Smith in advance that it would not use force.

7. As The New York Times of 22 September 1966 had reported, the Southern Rhodesians had not really suffered from the sanctions and had expected to be called upon to make much greater sacrifices than they had made. Economic relations between Southern Rhodesia and some Western countries had even expanded, the embargo on strategic goods was not being implemented and large quantities of oil were being received from South Africa and the Territories under Portuguese administration. In violation of the decisions of the Security Council, the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany and other Western States were continuing to buy copper, asbestos, iron ore, tobacco and other goods which were among Southern Rhodesia's main exports. The United Kingdom and the United States, in particular, had strong economic and financial interests both in Southern Rhodesia and in the neighbouring territories, especially the Republic of South Africa, and it was in their interests to maintain the illegal régime in power, as the leaders of that régime well knew. The so-called economic sanctions had therefore made it possible for the illegal régime to strengthen the economy of the Territory. At the same time, it claimed that, thanks to arms received from the United States, the United Kingdom, Portugal and Western Germany, it could withstand attack from

any quarter. The Republic of South Africa was also giving military aid to Southern Rhodesia, was helping to train Southern Rhodesian units in punitive operations and was allowing Southern Rhodesian military aircraft to use South African airfields. In addition, there were secret military agreements between Southern Rhodesia, the Republic of South Africa and Portugal concerning their joint struggle against the African national liberation movements.

8. Events in Southern Rhodesia were a serious threat to the peace and security not only of southern Africa but of the whole world. The main responsibility for the situation lay with the United Kingdom Government, which had laid the foundations of yet another racist régime on the African continent. When Southern Rhodesia had first been given the status of a self-governing colony, power had been handed over to the white minority, and the 1961 Constitution, which had been drawn up by the United Kingdom, had only consolidated their position. The present régime in Salisbury was taking advantage of the ambiguous policy of the United Kingdom's Labour Government in order to follow still further in the footsteps of the South African racists, while the 4 million Africans in the Territory were deprived of their elementary rights. A police régime had been set up in the Territory and freedom of speech and of the Press and freedom to engage in political activity were denied to the Africans, in flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

9. His own country's position with regard to the problem was that it condemned the actions of the racist régime and would not recognize the independence which had illegally been declared by the racist dictatorship of the white minority against the interests of the people of Zimbabwe. The Mongolian Government and people strongly supported the struggle of the people of Zimbabwe for their legitimate right to decide the future of their own country and considered that all States should offer them the fullest moral and material support in their fight for freedom and independence. The United Kingdom should take effective measures, including the use of force, to overthrow the illegal régime without delay and the Security Council should be asked to adopt measures calling on all States to sever economic, trade and any other relations with the Smith régime. Effective action should also be taken against States which supported the illegal régime. His delegation would support any measures directed towards the overthrow of that régime and towards securing the freedom and independence of the people of Zimbabwe.

10. Miss IMRU (Ethiopia) said that racial oppression in the southern part of Africa was a threat to all Africa and an insult to human dignity. She recalled that the Ethiopian delegation, along with many others, had expressed serious misgivings when the United Kingdom had systematically transferred the instruments of effective power to the minority in Southern Rhodesia, placing control of the armed forces in the hands of the settler minority, while repeatedly assuring the United Nations that the rights of the indigenous majority would not be jeopardized. To most Member States it had been no surprise when Ian Smith had carried out his threat of declaring independence

^{1/} Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-first Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1966, document S/7285/Add.1.

unilaterally, thus nullifying the United Kingdom's assurances.

11. It was true that all the countries of the world, except South Africa and Portugal, had spoken against the illegal régime now established in Southern Rhodesia. The relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter had been appealed to. A partial economic boycott had been instituted and the United Kingdom Government had declared that the rebel régime would be forced to surrender in a matter of weeks. Almost a year had passed, however, and the Smith régime remained in power. The measures recommended in Security Council resolution 217 (1965) had been circumvented by the rebel régime with the assistance of the racist Governments of South Africa and Portugal. The United Kingdom Government continued to vacillate, engaging in negotiations with Smith while endeavouring to absolve itself before world public opinion of any responsibility for the situation and to convince the world that everything was being done to restore constitutional rule; meanwhile, the Smith régime consolidated its position.

12. Ethiopia's views regarding the communiqué issued at the end of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference in London on 14 September 1966 had been presented by the Ethiopian Foreign Minister at the 1423rd plenary meeting of the General Assembly, when he had said that Ethiopia would be satisfied to the extent that the statements in the communiqué of the United Kingdom's determination to end the rebellion, to release the nationalist leaders, to apply the principle of "one man, one vote" and to repeal repressive laws were given practical effect.

13. She hoped that, once the United Kingdom Government came to accept the necessity for mandatory economic sanctions against the rebel régime, the sanctions imposed would be total; they could not succeed if selective preferences were attached to them as an appendix. She would also urge that the competent organs of the United Nations should take appropriate action under Chapter VII of the Charter. She was aware of the resistance which was bound to come from certain quarters, but she held that the economic interests of a few should not be allowed to endanger the general interest or hinder the United Nations in the performance of its functions.

14. Mr. SHEVEL (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the results achieved during the year that had elapsed since the declaration of so-called independence by the Southern Rhodesian racists were hardly reassuring. Members would remember the angry accusations that had been made in the Fourth Committee in November 1965 against the United Kingdom authorities, with whose connivance power had been transferred to the racists in Southern Rhodesia. The United Kingdom had pretended to be willing to take steps to put an end to the Smith régime and had assured the Organization that it would bring the rebels to their knees. With the passage of time, however, its ardour had cooled and it was now clear that those promises had been made to deceive world opinion.

15. The United Kingdom representatives were now repeating the same old story; they had referred to a

communiqué of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference and had said that since talks were being held there was no need to study the matter at the present stage. The United Kingdom was now trying to protect the racist Southern Rhodesian régime, which it had systematically enabled to come to power and to declare so-called independence. All those facts showed that the Smith régime was a creation of the colonial policy of the United Kingdom and had come into being as a result of the conspiracy of colonialist forces.

16. Since 1923, when the United Kingdom had transferred power to the white minority in Southern Rhodesia, thus betraying the interests of the indigenous people of Zimbabwe, a series of ever more reactionary and colonialist régimes had come to power in the Territory. The United Kingdom had drawn up and given Southern Rhodesia the notorious racist Constitution of 1961, which had strengthened the racist system, laid the foundation for the present régime of colonialist oppression and freed the hands of leaders such as Ian Smith. Ignoring the requests of the majority of States Members of the United Nations, the United Kingdom Government had transferred the armed forces from the former Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland to Southern Rhodesia and provided the racists with up-to-date weapons which were now being used against the people of Zimbabwe.

17. Having obtained the 1961 Constitution and weapons from the United Kingdom, the Southern Rhodesian racists had become even more arrogant: they were imposing harsh discriminatory laws, intensifying the oppression of the indigenous inhabitants and openly pursuing a policy of terror against patriots struggling for the freedom and independence of their homeland. The white minority was able to carry out that policy because of its conviction that the United Kingdom Government would never use the political, economic and military means at its disposal in order to bring pressure to bear on the Smith Government.

18. Reference had already been made to the obvious failure of the so-called sanctions which the United Kingdom had applied against Southern Rhodesia. As could have been expected, those measures had had very little effect on the Smith régime, which had made effective use of the time in order to reorganize its economic relations. The Salisbury authorities received full support not only from their fellow racists in the Republic of South Africa and Portugal but also from influential circles in the United States of America and other Western countries.

19. It was obvious from the actions of the members of the present Labour Government that that Government included a number of influential persons who protected the Southern Rhodesian racists and who were more concerned about the interests of British and foreign monopolies than about the oppressed majority of African workers.

20. Although it was clear that the so-called sanctions could have been effective only if they had been accompanied by enforcement measures, the United Kingdom Government had refused to use such measures. That Government was now resorting to a new tactic and was holding talks about so-called

selective mandatory measures which would apparently be taken through the United Nations. In his delegation's opinion, such selective sanctions were nothing more than a smoke-screen under cover of which the fellow conspirators were seeking to gain time in order to strengthen the illegal racist régime. An article in The New York Times of 21 October 1966 had reported Ian Smith as saying that the Governments of the United Kingdom and Southern Rhodesia had agreed upon the six principles laid down by Mr. Wilson for settlement of the Southern Rhodesian dispute. The Ukrainian delegation would like to know whether the United Kingdom was in fact entering into an agreement with the illegal racist Government in Southern Rhodesia. The Fourth Committee should request the United Kingdom representative to shed some light on the matter.

21. The Ukrainian delegation was convinced that the time had come for action and that mankind could no longer tolerate the existence of a situation in Southern Rhodesia that was a serious threat to international peace and security. Southern Rhodesia and South Africa constituted a beachhead of colonialism in southern Africa by means of which the colonialists intended to create a constant military threat to the independent African countries and to paralyse their efforts in the struggle against colonialism. That was the essential goal of the appeasement policy of the United Kingdom colonialists towards the racist leaders of Southern Rhodesia.

22. The Ukrainian delegation shared the view of the delegation of the Soviet Union that the administering Power should take effective action, including the use of force, to overthrow the illegal racist régime in Southern Rhodesia and thus to ensure that the people of Zimbabwe exercised their right to freedom and independence, in accordance with the provisions of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

23. At the same time, it was the duty of the General Assembly to recommend that the Security Council should take a decision which would oblige all States to sever economic, trade and other relations with the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia. The Council should also adopt measures, based on Chapter VII of the Charter, to deal with States which continued to assist the Smith régime in any way whatsoever.

24. The Ukrainian delegation shared the view of many delegations that the General Assembly should call upon all States to provide the fullest possible moral and material support to the people of Zimbabwe in their legitimate struggle against the racist Smith régime.

25. The Ukrainian people, like those of the other socialist countries, stood behind the people of Zimbabwe and were prepared to give them all possible support in their struggle for genuine national independence.

26. Mr. KAYUKWA (Democratic Republic of the Congo) wished first to associate himself with the request made to the United Kingdom representative by the representative of Senegal. He would suggest that the Chairman should ask the United Kingdom representative to provide the Committee with in-

formation on the talks now taking place between his Government and Ian Smith.

27. The behaviour of the United Kingdom in respect to Southern Rhodesia was without precedent in its history as a colonial Power. In the past, the United Kingdom had not hesitated to shed blood in quelling those in its colonies who aspired to freedom or asked for a greater measure of self-government. Leaders of independence movements had languished for years in colonial prisons or had been exiled. The pacifist attitude of the United Kingdom towards Southern Rhodesia was all the more disturbing in that it was a question of dealing with a white minority which it had itself brought to power through the 1923 and 1961 Constitutions. That minority had usurped the rights of the millions of Africans in Southern Rhodesia and had had the effrontery to declare the independence of Southern Rhodesia unilaterally, for their own benefit. It had naturally been expected that the United Kingdom would react in some way against such an insult to the Crown. The United Kingdom had said that the declaration of independence was illegal, that it represented an act of treason and that Ian Smith and his Government were divested of all functions; it had adopted the Southern Rhodesia Act 1965, enabling it to assume the prerogatives of sovereignty in Southern Rhodesia. Economic sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and an oil embargo had been announced. All the hue and cry, however, had been nothing but bluff to deceive men of good faith. He was even tempted to think that Smith had declared independence with the blessing of the United Kingdom and its allies, as part of the plan to preserve southern Africa as the domain of Western monopolies.

28. Since May 1965, the United Kingdom's designs had become clearer. United Kingdom spokesmen had repeatedly visited Salisbury to negotiate with Smith. The future of 4 million Africans was being treated as a matter for negotiation with the representatives of the settler minority. Since the Southern Rhodesia Act gave the United Kingdom Government the power to suspend or amend any provisions of Southern Rhodesia's 1961 Constitution, why did not the United Kingdom, instead of negotiating with Smith, suspend that Constitution, invite the true leaders of Southern Rhodesia to a conference, hold general elections and begin the process of returning sovereign power to the African majority?

29. When the United Kingdom had decreed economic measures against Southern Rhodesia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo had broken off all trade relations with the rebel régime and had prohibited the transit of goods going to or coming from Southern Rhodesia. The Pretoria racists and the Lisbon colonialists, had, however, continued to trade with Southern Rhodesia, as had several other Western Powers. The sacrifice made by the Congo had been great, since its imports from Southern Rhodesia had amounted to 2,000 million Congolese francs a year and the replacement of those imports was costing the Congo 4,000 million francs. Nevertheless, it was continuing to boycott Southern Rhodesian products.

30. Instead of quoting the communiqué of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference, the United Kingdom Government should frankly admit that its

measures so far had failed and should adopt other more effective measures. The Congolese Parliament had recently adopted unanimously a motion requesting the United Kingdom Government to put down Ian Smith's rebellion, by armed force if necessary, to abolish the racist Constitution of 1961, which gave fifteen seats to the 4 million Africans and fifty to the 200,000 Whites, and to hold general elections on the basis of one man, one vote, allowing the Organization of African Unity to send observers. Moreover, the Congolese Government, in a statement made in April 1966, had issued a warning to the countries, led by South Africa and Portugal, which were helping Smith in his rebellion. If certain Powers thought that they could aid the rebel régime with impunity, they should know that they were creating an explosive situation in Africa which would lead, in the end, to a bloody confrontation between the white and black races.

31. The problem of Southern Rhodesia was the problem of all men who believed in racial equality, freedom and human dignity.

32. Mr. APPIAH (Ghana) and Mr. KACOU (Ivory Coast) associated themselves with the Senegalese representative's appeal to the United Kingdom representative to inform the Committee about the talks which were now going on.

33. Mr. DIALLO Seydou (Guinea) said that he personally would not press any representative to speak unless he so wished. If the Western Powers were completely indifferent to the situation in Southern Rhodesia, he did not see why they should be asked to take part in a debate on the matter.

34. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom) said that he would reply towards the end of the debate to points which had been raised by representatives; his delegation had taken careful note of the various points raised, including the request made at the present meeting.

35. The CHAIRMAN said that he took it that the Committee decided to request the United Kingdom to make a statement on the matter raised.

It was so decided.

36. Mr. MENDELEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) welcomed the Committee's decision. His delegation, like others, was extremely disturbed about what was going on at Salisbury, as far as could be gathered from information in the Press. It seemed that something was happening which was dangerous for the people of Zimbabwe, for the whole decolonization process and for the prestige of the United Nations. The United Kingdom representative had spoken of replying to the points raised at the end of the debate. Events moved fast, however, and history provided many examples of cases in which the world had been suddenly faced with a fait accompli. According to reports in the United States Press, Ian Smith had expressed the view that the dispute between Southern Rhodesia and the United Kingdom was reaching a climax and that it was important to continue negotiations. He had also stated that the two Governments had now agreed on the six principles laid down by Mr. Wilson. Apparently, then, only the details remained to be settled. It was highly regrettable that the United Kingdom representative had been unwilling

to meet the general wish and inform the Committee of what was happening, so that it would not suddenly be faced with a settlement which would jeopardize the cause of the Zimbabwe people.

37. Mr. FEZZANI (Tunisia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he wished to explain the basis for the analogy he had drawn between the régime in Southern Rhodesia and that in Israel at the 1612th meeting of that Committee. There had never been any discrimination against Jews in his country and since Tunisia's accession to independence relations between Jews and Moslems had been friendly.

38. Israel had been born of a political act of plunder; the land had been torn apart and the people thrown out of their homes. Most of the inhabitants of Israel were foreigners from other parts of the world who had settled there at the expense of the indigenous people and whose sole claim to the land had lain in the dream of a return to the promised land.

39. Zionism pursued a policy similar to that of nazism, whose principles it had adopted. Hitler had wanted a Germany without Jews and the Zionists wanted a Palestine without Arabs. Israel was a constant threat to the development and stability of neighbouring countries in the Middle East, just as Southern Rhodesia was in Africa.

40. Mr. EL MASRY (United Arab Republic) supported the remarks of the Tunisian representative and pointed out that not only in Tunisia but in the whole of the Arab world there was no discrimination against Jews.

41. The representative of the Zionist régime had denied that there was any similarity between the European settlers in Palestine and those in Southern Rhodesia. The two cases, however, were the result of the same imperialist plotting and betrayal of the hopes of the indigenous people. The representative of the racist régime in occupied Palestine had alleged that the Jews had been there for generations. The fact was, however, that there had been fewer than 50,000 Jews in Palestine before 1917. Even after the Balfour Declaration and the beginning of mass immigration, the Zionists had not constituted a majority. They had only become a majority in part of Palestine after 1947, when terrorist gangs had invaded Arab villages and forced the inhabitants to flee. Owing to the action of the United Kingdom, which had been the Mandatory Power for Palestine, there were now more than a million Palestinian refugees living in camps round the border of their own country.

42. Mr. RAMIN (Israel) said that the preceding speakers had made unfounded accusations against Israel, for the sole purpose of misleading the members of the Committee. He would remind those representatives that the problem of the refugees was the direct result of a war which had been waged against his country in violation of the United Nations Charter.

43. The right of his people to their homeland was confirmed by 4,000 years of history. Many of his people had been scattered throughout the world for generations as a result of imperialism, but others had remained in Israel throughout the ages. His people's attachment to the country had never been broken. They had regained their independence and

he could assure the Committee that they intended to preserve it.

44. Mr. EL HADI (Sudan) associated his delegation with the remarks made by the Tunisian delegation, which represented a sister nation with which his country was united in the common struggle against imperialism in any form, whether Zionism or apartheid. The people of the Sudan would never recognize any authority based on race or on theories of a promised land.

45. There was indeed a similarity between the situation in Southern Rhodesia and that in occupied Palestine. The same tactics had been applied in both instances. It was most regrettable that the United Nations had sanctioned the racist principle applied in Palestine. The United Nations had failed in its duty. His delegation would point out that if justice could not be done within the United Nations, it could always be done outside the Organization.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.