



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

**1477**<sup>th</sup> MEETING: 17 JUNE 1969

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1477) . . . . .	1
Adoption of the agenda . . . . .	1
Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia:	
Letter dated 6 June 1969 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Swaziland, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia (S/9237 and Add.1-2)	
Reports of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) (S/8954 and S/9252) . . . . .	1

## NOTE

*Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.*

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

## FOURTEEN HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 17 June 1969, at 3 p.m.

*President:* Mr. M. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Algeria, China, Colombia, Finland, France, Hungary, Nepal, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Spain, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Zambia.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1477)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia:

Letter dated 6 June 1969 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Swaziland, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia (S/9237 and Add.1-2)

Reports of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) (S/8954 and S/9252).

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

### Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia

Letter dated 6 June 1969 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Swaziland, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia (S/9237 and Add.1-2)

### Reports of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) (S/8954 and S/9252)

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): Since the last Council meeting on this subject, which was held last Friday, I have received requests from the representatives of Mauritania, Tanzania and Guinea to be invited to take part in this debate.

2. In conformity with the usual practice of the Council, and if there are no objections, I shall invite those three representatives to be seated at the Council table so as to participate in the debate without the right to vote.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. S. A. Ould Daddah (Mauritania), Mr. A. B. C. Danieli (United Republic of Tanzania) and Mr. A. Touré (Guinea) took places at the Council table.*

3. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The Security Council will now resume its consideration, suspended on Friday evening for consultations, of the item on the situation in Southern Rhodesia.

4. Before calling on the first speaker, I wish to make a short statement. In the discussions that have taken place so far on this subject, all the members of the Security Council have expressed their views. They have unanimously indicated in their statements that they consider illegal the referendum that the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia plans to hold on 20 June. They have described the so-called constitutional proposals as invalid, and have stated that no constitution promulgated by the racist minority régime would have any legal effect.

5. In view of the constant danger to international peace and security posed by the situation in Southern Rhodesia, the Council will now continue its consideration of this question.

6. The first speaker on my list is the representative of Mauritania, on whom I call.

7. Mr. OULD DADDAH (Mauritania) (*translated from French*): I thank you, Mr. President, and the members of the Council for allowing me, on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania, to take part in this debate on the grave events that are happening in Zimbabwe.

8. Because of its geographical position as a meeting-place where all the currents of African thought mingle and give new life to one another, and because of the composition of

its population, a synthesis of all the races of Africa, my country has looked with horror upon what has been happening in Zimbabwe for now more than three years.

9. From the very beginning, the Mauritanian people and their leaders, like all peace-loving peoples, have regarded the criminal activities of Ian Smith and of the racist minority of European origin that he leads as an affront which the peoples of Africa, opposed to all forms of discrimination and racism, cannot tolerate.

10. Africans have seen the most varied forms of colonialism come and go on their vast continent. They have seen or learnt how certain colonial Powers have reacted to the slightest interference with what they regarded as their interests, ignoring the motives behind it no matter how valid these might be.

11. Accordingly, Africa can only regard with bitterness, suspicion and anger the behaviour of the administering Power responsible for Southern Rhodesia, when confronted with the rash actions of the illegal racist régime which a white minority, with the benefit of outside complicity, has brutally imposed on more than four million Africans.

12. The African members of the Security Council have already unfolded here a whole range of aspects of the Rhodesian problem. The Mauritanian delegation has greatly admired the conviction, composure and earnestness with which they have spoken of the tragic conditions in which Smith and his accomplices are attempting, by the most inhuman means, to keep the people of Zimbabwe. We have also admired the clarity with which the speeches have brought out the inadmissibility and injustice of the fate that the criminal leaders of the racist minority of English origin hold in store for a whole people.

13. My delegation would not wish to repeat the truths that have already been eloquently expounded before this Council. It would, however, desire to indicate briefly to the Council the way in which the Mauritanian people and its leaders view the problem of Rhodesia, and what they think of the attitude of the administering Power responsible for Southern Rhodesia towards this drama.

14. On that subject we share the opinion expressed by the representative of Pakistan on this aspect of the problem at the 1475th meeting of the Council:

“The administering Power... chose to adopt the entirely novel tactic of confronting armed rebellion by argument and persuasion.

“That is how the United Kingdom reacted to the unilateral declaration of independence. That was its position at the *Tiger* talks. It adopted the same attitude at the *Fearless* meeting.

“At each of these critical moments, the United Kingdom was compelled to retreat...” [1475th meeting, paras. 104-106].

15. Speaking in the Fourth Committee debate on Rhodesia during the twenty-third session of the General

Assembly,<sup>1</sup> the Mauritanian delegation had earlier made the following statement:

“If we examine the attitude of the United Kingdom Government closely, we are forced to the conclusion that it is only a manoeuvre to gain time and to bolster the Smith régime. Long before the unilateral declaration of independence on 11 November 1965, the United Kingdom Government was talking of establishing a majority government and ending discrimination but at the same time was careful not to do anything to trouble the mercenaries installed in Rhodesia. The Wilson Government has since stated on numerous occasions that it would not use force to arrive at a settlement in Rhodesia. Yet, in the remote and recent past, the United Kingdom has never hesitated to use force whenever its interests were endangered, whether in Africa, in Asia, in Europe or even here in America.”

16. During the 1476th meeting of the Council the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Ambassador Malik, pinpointed the question that quite naturally follows when the United Kingdom delegation talks of cavalry and sappers in connexion with Rhodesia. Ambassador Malik said in his statement:

“... who are these sappers and where is their sap leading to? In what direction are they trenching? Everyone knows that sappers' work includes undermining and camouflage... Developments in Southern Rhodesia... create a distinct impression that as regards Southern Rhodesia, British sappers are engaged, not in undermining the Smith régime so as to blow it up, but rather in camouflaging its crimes against the people of Zimbabwe.” [1476th meeting, para. 30.]

17. The United Kingdom Government's dithering and what Mr. Mudenda called its “timidity”, “tepidity” and “duplicity” [1475th meeting, para. 44] are making all Africans share more and more the Soviet Union delegation's impression. In fact, what other impression can one have, if we consider the ineffectiveness and predictable dearth of results of everything the United Kingdom Government has agreed to do in order to give the impression that it opposes the rebellion by the racist minority, which is of British origin, installed in Rhodesia? What other impression could one have, if we consider the complete lack of effective action by the United Kingdom to fulfil its obligations towards the people of Zimbabwe?

18. The referendum that Smith and the racist minority behind him plan to conduct in a few days, in the eyes of the Mauritanian delegation, covers a grave violation of the fundamental rights of the Zimbabwe people. It is also an affront to the dignity of every African, an affront which all who value justice cannot help but condemn.

19. At the 1475th meeting of the Council Mr. Abdellatif Rahal, Secretary-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria, spoke

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, Fourth Committee, 1768th meeting, para. 29.*

of the decision by the so-called government of Rhodesia to put its draft constitution to a referendum and said:

“But the text that Ian Smith proposes to have adopted is of interest because it reveals, if that is still needed, the intentions of the racist minority and the future that they have in store for the Africans in Rhodesia.

“The text has at least the merit of being clear, announcing in forthright terms the most despicable racism in its most brutal form . . .” [1475th meeting, paras. 11-12].

20. Such a referendum is worthy of condemnation both for its form and for its intent. The character of the illegal racist authorities proposing it, the conditions under which it is to be held and the content of its text are such that the international community is duty bound to declare in advance that the result of such a consultation must be null and void.

21. Yet this referendum is only one aspect of the Rhodesian problem. This is an obvious fact that should be stressed. We must not allow some to make this referendum and its condemnation by the international community the trees which distract attention from the forest. It is essential to ensure that the necessary condemnation of the planned referendum in Rhodesia does not take the place of the basic decision that the Council ought to take in response to the illegal and inhuman activities of the white minority in power in Rhodesia, so as to avoid while there is still time, the development of explosive situations full of consequences for the future of peace and security in Africa and in the world as a whole.

22. The administering Power should therefore be induced to gauge more clearly its weighty responsibility in this Rhodesian matter. The United Kingdom must recognize its heavy share of responsibility for the campaign of systematic terror, genocide and political killings, and for the barbarous executions which the illegal racist régime in Salisbury is carrying out.

23. By looking back over its long colonial experience the United Kingdom will, we feel sure, realize that the only way to end the rebellion of the white racist minority in Rhodesia—a country in which the United Kingdom Government represents the only legal authority—is to use force. We hope that the Council will exert every ounce of its strength to convince the United Kingdom of this.

24. In a short statement to the Council at its 1475th meeting the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom spoke of the necessity for the Council to act unanimously. The word “unanimity” in fact recurred more than five times in the same statement by the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom. We are, of course, aware that unanimity girds the Council’s decisions with a significance and an authority that might well be needed to convince the opponents of majority rule in Zimbabwe.

25. The peoples of Africa want to be able to retain their belief in the United Nations. Africans are not bloodthirsty. In place of violence they unquestionably prefer negotiated

settlements based on impartiality and sincere co-operation, thus maintaining friendliness, understanding and harmony in the relations among peoples.

26. But it is not the fault of Africans if others allow a racist minority to continue to trample the resolutions of the Security Council underfoot and to scoff with impunity at the lawful rights of more than four million Africans.

27. In those circumstances, what meaning can there be in the idea of unanimity referred to more than once by the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom?

28. The authority of the United Nations and the Security Council is being greatly weakened by the criminal schemes that the illegal régime and the racist minority of British origin are imposing on Zimbabwe, with the encouragement that is to be found in the resignation and abdication of the administering Power.

29. It is our opinion that the Security Council, while reaffirming its condemnation of the régime imposed by the racist minority in Salisbury, must ensure that the sanctions already introduced are strictly applied and extend them to include South Africa and Portugal. The Council must also stress the great responsibility that naturally falls to the administering Power in the Rhodesian question.

30. We believe that the survival of the United Nations as an effective instrument, and hence one of use in maintaining peace and security in the world, hangs on this.

31. Before closing, I think it important to recall the words of an eminent representative of the Organization of African Unity, speaking about Rhodesia during the celebration of that organization’s sixth anniversary. I quote:

“In Rhodesia the flames that the African fighting men have been obliged to light will not die down, for beyond the fire lies freedom. The trading and military partners of the racist minorities in Rhodesia and South Africa, those who support Portuguese colonialism, should learn the lessons of the past and reassess their position while there is still time. They are backing the wrong horse. The future of that part of Africa belongs to the African peoples.”

32. In Africa, as in South-East Asia and elsewhere in the world, the fundamental truth will ultimately prevail—perhaps too late—that force cannot halt a people resolved to fight for the recovery of their independence and dignity.

33. Mr. DANIELI (United Republic of Tanzania): Mr. President, may I first of all take this opportunity to thank you and this august Council for giving my delegation the opportunity to participate in the present debate on Zimbabwe. The purpose of my delegation’s request to participate in the current debate is to join those colleagues, particularly from Africa, Asia, Latin America and Eastern Europe, who have once again voiced their grave concern at the dangerous course of events in the British colony of Zimbabwe.

34. The responsibility of the United Kingdom in this tragic affair is inescapable. The lamentable stages through

which this situation has evolved were clearly seen and marked by the Government of the United Kingdom and all those who had eyes to see. The illegal declaration of independence by Smith in November 1965 was not the beginning of the Rhodesian tragedy; the situation had been deteriorating long before 1965. The African States complained about that situation in the General Assembly long before 1965.

35. How did the British Government, the Administering Authority, answer? It said it was the United Kingdom's internal affair; it sent Edgar Whitehead, the then Prime Minister, to answer the charges of discrimination and violation of human rights before the General Assembly. It sent teams of Members of the British Parliament to appease a General Assembly indignant at the callous and off-hand manner in which the British Government was handling the situation. Vicious racist legislation, such as the Land Apportionment Act, the Industrial Conciliation Act, and the Emergency Powers Act, was passed in Rhodesia, with the consent of the British Government, many, many years before the Unilateral Declaration of Independence by Smith and his clique in 1965. Veneal racial discrimination against the Africans was allowed to be practised by the legal Governments of Rhodesia, under the eyes of the British Government and with its knowledge and consent. The legislation and practice which established a state of *apartheid* employed by the legal Governments of Roy Welensky and Edgar Whitehead ever since the 1940s and 1950s, and the gross violations of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of the Africans of Southern Rhodesia were perpetrated with the knowledge of the succeeding British Governments over the years, and long before UDI in 1965.

36. The Government of the United Kingdom declares itself outraged today about the provisions of the illegal constitution soon to be promulgated by the traitor Ian Smith. But what about the provisions of the 1961 Constitution, the last legal Constitution of Southern Rhodesia? Did it protect the Africans? Was it democratic? That Constitution equally entrenched the rights of the 220,000 white British citizens in Southern Rhodesia and left the 4.5 million Africans of Zimbabwe devoid of their constitutional rights as a clear majority of the inhabitants of that land.

37. The Government of the United Kingdom has consistently failed to protect the rights of the African people of Southern Rhodesia over the years. It seems bent on abdicating its legal and political responsibilities in Rhodesia. Immediately after the illegal declaration of independence in 1965, the present Government of the United Kingdom, by a number of subtle devices, tried to weave a net of protection around the 220,000 white British subjects who illegally seized power in Rhodesia.

38. The British Government knew from the very beginning that sanctions would not work. The British Government knew that neither South Africa nor Portugal would apply sanctions; and that it could never contemplate using sanctions against South Africa, its close friend and substantial trading partner.

39. Has the Government of the United Kingdom ever called upon Portugal and South Africa to apply sanctions? South Africa is the biggest culprit in this nefarious exercise; yet Britain has never once publicly condemned South Africa for its breach of the trade boycott.

40. The Government of the United Kingdom knew from the very outset that force was the only answer to rebellion, and especially the rebellion in Southern Rhodesia. This was well known to the British Government, because it has unparalleled experience and expertise in the art of putting rebellion down by force. We saw it at work best in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. But we have also seen it at work in the twentieth century. Nay, we saw Britain displaying its prowess in putting down rebellions by force of arms only a few weeks ago, and years after the white Britishers in Rhodesia had rebelled. You will recall that only a few weeks ago the British Government dispatched a conquering armada to the small Caribbean island of Anguilla, of only 60,000 inhabitants, mostly black, which was in a state of rebellion against its constitutional authority. Paratroopers came in from the air; military police were put ashore; and British men-of-war stood ready to invade. The men in rebellion on Anguilla were black; the men in rebellion in Southern Rhodesia are white. The black men in Anguilla were not enslaving anybody. They were not firmly establishing the policies and practice of *apartheid*. They had not seized vast economic interests held by Britons, and the only armaments they possessed were the smiles on their friendly faces. But in Rhodesia, the white racists in rebellion have done all these things, and more: they have enslaved the African population; they have embarked upon murder, torture, and all the vices of a detention camp and a police state. They have defied the authority of the British Crown, and they have defiled the British flag, and spurned every entreaty brought them by the Queen's messenger.

41. Yet the leader of the United Kingdom Government, who has branded Ian Smith a traitorous and notorious rebel repeatedly insulting the majesty of the British Crown, sits from time to time in splendour and formal consultation with the traitorous Ian Smith on British warships—sometimes the *Tiger* and sometimes the *Fearless*. No attempt is ever made to arrest this traitorous rebel as is the British custom. Why not? Under the pretext of taking him to talks away from the troubled island, the British-led Government kidnapped Archbishop Makarios and detained him in the Seychelles until it had put down the rebellion on Cyprus. Throughout what was once known as the British Empire—in India, Singapore, Malaya, Guyana, Kenya, Ghana, the Central African Federation, Ireland, Tanganyika—succeeding British Governments have imprisoned leaders who were not even in rebellion but who sought freedom and independence for their people. Can it be said that Britain is incapable of seizing Smith and his band of traitors or of putting down their rebellion by force? Is Britain afraid of defeat even if it takes only limited police action against the white Rhodesians? If Britain nourishes any such fear, it should be frank and say so. It should let this Council and the Assembly know that it sincerely wants to put an end to this rebellion, that it realizes now that force is the only answer and that it invites all States imbued with the spirit of justice and fair play to assist it in this expedition.

42. We know that Britain could then count on the active help of the majority of Member States and certainly the African States. Britain must say exactly what it wants to do, for the rebellion must not continue any longer. Britain has a duty to be honest and straightforward on the Rhodesian question particularly to this Council. We should be prepared for our part to assist Britain in discharging its responsibilities as the administering Power in Rhodesia. The prime responsibility is unmistakably that of the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom has created this situation, which has been festering, with its knowledge, for many, many years. The unilateral declaration of independence in 1965 was the climax. Britain has clearly failed in its responsibility as the administering Power. Yet all is not lost. The United Kingdom must act now, by using force, to dislodge Smith and return constitutional government and British authority to the colony. When all is at peace again and law and order re-established, then independence based on majority rule should be given to the colony in consonance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 1960. The Council would be failing in its duty if it did not call upon the United Kingdom to discharge its responsibilities in Rhodesia.

43. My delegation is bemused when in the current debate the United Kingdom delegation, with great audacity, even at this late hour tries to bluff the Council about some fictitious consultations between the British Government and African Governments—and, alas, these consultations are to be conducted after the projected referendum. Why, we ask, after the referendum? We are further told that, according to Scripture, “the Lord was not in the great and strong wind, nor in the earthquake nor in the fire, but in a still small voice” [1475th meeting, para. 65]. However, the same Scripture reminds us that the Lord of the manor was angry and reprimanded his servants when they failed to discharge their duties. Like the Bible, we call upon the British Government to give full account of its stewardship.

44. I should like to comment briefly on the constitutional changes which the rebel Ian Smith intends to put to a referendum on 20 June. As has been pointed out in the present debate, Ian Smith’s aim is to block for ever any chance or hope of giving the four-and-a-half million Africans in Zimbabwe the opportunity to share in the affairs of the colony. From now on the Africans in Zimbabwe can hope for no better position than that of slaves, with the minority whites as perpetual masters.

45. The so-called White Paper issued in Salisbury on 20 May, giving details of the new constitutional changes, indicates that the new constitution provides for the establishment of a house of assembly with sixty-six members. Fifty of these will be whites elected by white voters only. Sixteen will be Africans of whom eight will be elected on an African roll and the remaining eight will be elected by tribal chiefs—who, we know, are all paid employees and stooges of the Smith Government. In other words, 220,000 whites will have fifty representatives, against the sixteen members for more than four million Africans. That is Smith’s democracy in practice. The outside world has been told that African representation will be increased, but the condition for the increase is that it is pegged to an increase to a predetermined level in the

African contribution to the total assessed income tax in Rhodesia. The Africans will never reach this level set for them by Ian Smith—not because they are incapable of reaching it but because the white Rhodesians will always make it a national policy to keep African incomes down by denying to them their fair share of the profits of the Rhodesian economy. Ian Smith’s constitution further provides for the establishment of a senate to be composed of twenty-three members. Ten of these will be African chiefs—I make no comment on their status—ten will be Europeans, and three are to be appointed by Smith. The three will no doubt be white, thus ensuring a permanent white majority in the senate. There will be a senate legal committee and a declaration of rights purporting to entrench certain rights in the constitution. However, no court in Rhodesia will have the right or power to challenge any legislation on the ground that it is inconsistent with the so-called declaration of rights.

46. Furthermore, the so-called Senate Legal Committee will have no power to examine legislation on constitutional matters and any amendment to the Smith constitution will require a two-thirds majority in both houses, which the whites are assured under the proposed constitution. Land will be apportioned equally; that is to say the 220,000 whites will own the same amount of land as the 4.5 million Africans. But this is not the end of the sad story: the land allocated to the Africans will be, as it has always been, the most barren, unproductive, and uninhabitable land in the colony.

47. This is, in brief, the nature of the proposed Smith constitution. It is a constitution which will sound the death-knell of majority rule in Rhodesia and divide the colony into two hostile racial groups, one the master and the other the slave. It is a constitution the intention of which is to refine Rhodesian white racialism so that the colony may be in the same social mould as South Africa. The provision in the constitution for African representation in parliament should not mislead us into believing that Smith intends to keep Africans in parliament. On the contrary, Smith for the time being merely intends to placate his friends in Europe, the United States and elsewhere by pretending that he too favours African representation. The truth is that before long even the present trimmings of African representation will be swept away just as was done in South Africa.

48. The Security Council, as well as the entire world community, has therefore the duty to take appropriate measures to meet this open challenge. Apart from calling upon the United Kingdom to use force to end the rebellion in Rhodesia, the Council at this present session must impose full economic sanctions, a military blockade of sanction-breaking ports, and the use of United Nations troops to enforce sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. The scope of sanctions against Rhodesia should now be widened to include all measures laid down in Articles 41 and 42 of the Charter, and sanctions should be imposed on South Africa and Portugal. The Council should reaffirm that the régime in Salisbury is illegal and that it will remain so until a democratically elected government has been established in Rhodesia. The present Smith constitution is an illegal document drawn up by an illegal

régime, and it must be made clear to Smith and his rebel group that one act of illegality cannot be legalized by another.

49. Finally, the Council should address an urgent call to all Member States of this Organization, as well as to other parties concerned, to refrain from doing anything that might imply support or recognition of the illegal régime. The report of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968, [S/9252] reveals that there are countries which still maintain consular and trade representation in Rhodesia, contrary to earlier appeals by the Security Council to withdraw such representation. These countries should once again be requested to comply with the decision of this Council.

50. I should like to emphasize once again that failure to act in the present crisis will further increase the danger of a future racial conflict in Rhodesia and, indeed, the entire southern part of the continent of Africa. The Africans in that colony have no longer any alternative but to plan for and use violent means to end their state of slavery and exploitation. We Africans in Africa would like to see justice and honour given peacefully to our brother Africans in Rhodesia. Indeed, Africa's commitment to a peaceful solution of the Rhodesian problem was stressed by the representatives of thirteen East and Central African States, meeting in Lusaka in April 1969. In their manifesto, the Lusaka Manifesto, the States attending that meeting declared:

"We would prefer to negotiate rather than destroy, to talk rather than kill. We do not advocate violence; we advocate an end to the violence against human dignity which is now being perpetrated by the oppressors of Africa."

51. But Africa and the African population in Rhodesia can never commit themselves for ever to a policy of peaceful change while the desire to effect changes peacefully is blocked by those in power in Rhodesia. The course of events in the British colony is therefore headed towards a violent conflict. This can still be avoided and this Council is, I am confident, able—if only it could be willing—to avoid such an unhappy end.

52. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of Guinea, on whom I now call.

53. Mr. TOURÉ (Guinea) (*translated from French*): Allow me first of all, Mr. President, on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Guinea, to express my delegation's sincere thanks to the members of the Security Council for permitting us to take part in the debate on the question of Southern Rhodesia.

54. The delegation of the Republic of Guinea takes this opportunity to emphasize the grave situation existing in Rhodesia, and adds its voice to the voices of so many others in an Africa now self-aware, wounded in its flesh and in its dignity. More than five resolutions of the Security Council, more than six resolutions of the General Assembly, more

than three resolutions of the committee on decolonization,<sup>2</sup> and two Commonwealth conferences, each vying with the others in pertinence and clarity, plus the constant agitation and mobilization of world opinion, a carefully selected range of economic sanctions, meetings on warships off the coast of Africa on the calmest of seas—all that, after nearly eight years, has still not brought down a régime born in illegality and living in illegitimacy.

55. Five years ago the President of the Republic of Guinea, His Excellency Ahmed Sekou Touré, sent the Secretary-General of the United Nations a message from which I should like to quote a few sentences:

"The new situation created in Rhodesia cannot remain a matter of indifference to any African State conscious of its historic duty to defend ceaselessly and vigorously our peoples' freedom and sovereignty—the fundamental pre-condition for their dignity and progress—and conscious also of the dangerous implications of the supremacy of a foreign minority for the legitimate interests and rights of the Rhodesian people. It is imperative for the continent to muster all its forces to answer this challenge to Africa and to the Organization of African Unity."

56. This challenge to Africa and its organization is also a challenge to the conscience of the world.

57. His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie recently stated in Addis Ababa:

"The United Kingdom Government is still constitutionally responsible for Rhodesia and it has the duty and the responsibility to crush the rebellion and grant independence to the Zimbabwe people. Force is the only language that colonial and racist régimes understand. African nationalists are now compelled to resort to force and armed struggle in order to obtain their freedom and independence."

58. The decision by the Ian Smith clique to put its draft constitution to a referendum was not really the main reason which prompted the Afro-Asian countries to call the Council meeting. The announcement of the so-called Referendum Act in fact came as no surprise to any of us so far as it bore on the scope of the reactionary policy pursued by Salisbury up to then; on the contrary, it only strengthened our conviction that the racists of Southern Rhodesia are more determined than ever to make official the system of apartheid that has infested the country unofficially for eight years.

59. The fact cannot be over-emphasized that there exists in Southern Rhodesia an explosive situation created by the racial neurosis of a minority of white settlers who are attempting, against every rule of morality and law, to establish an anti-democratic supremacy the like of which has never been seen.

60. We have been asked by the representative of the United Kingdom not to go back over the long and unhappy

<sup>2</sup> Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.



history of illegal actions in Rhodesia and to eschew the violence of accusations among ourselves. That would be sound advice if the United Kingdom had not patently renounced the very great responsibility it has in Southern Rhodesia; for we must not lose sight of the colonial duplicity which is at the root of the Rhodesian situation. The United Kingdom, as the administering Power, cannot stand by while a gang of rebels openly seizes a colony for which it is responsible and rest content with preaching that the rebellion is illegal and that partial economic sanctions are the only appropriate way of quelling it.

61. The colonial history of the United Kingdom is too long and too rich in precedent for us not to realize that this attitude is at odds with the normal principles of its colonial policy and with its usual practice in similar circumstances. Just recently the case of Anquilla, a little island under United Kingdom domination, filled several columns of the world press. The United Kingdom did not hesitate for a moment to land men on the island to suppress and take in hand, according to the usual phraseology, the so-called rebellion in Anquilla.

62. In South Africa, in the Portuguese colonies, in Angola, in Mozambique, and in Rhodesia, a new colonial policy is beginning, virulent and relentless, the aim of which is to take the place of the old colonial systems that the peoples of Africa have managed to extirpate. For some time now there has been increasingly clear evidence of a movement in Africa south of the Zambesi to establish a colonial system run by the white minority which would apply a policy of *apartheid* throughout that part of the African continent, thus replacing the former colonial structures already condemned by international opinion and by history.

63. It should be noted that these white settlers have fundamental ties of race, of culture and of economic and commercial interests with the United Kingdom, and hence they are nothing more nor less than an extension of that country. That is the crux of the matter.

64. The intention is to replace the old system of colonization by a system based essentially on the take-over of allegedly liberated colonies by a minority of white settlers wielding a Nazi dictatorship over a majority of blacks oppressed, spurned, humiliated, deprived, used and abused at will. These so-called States would be a choice area for big private interests, better than any colony has been since the epic days of British colonial trade in India.

65. It is a great pity, however, that the representative of the United Kingdom went no further than proposing that we merely reiterate our well-known disapproval of the rebel racist clique in Southern Rhodesia. He asked us to condemn it; we have done so and we are still doing so this very day. The meeting of the Council at this time, and our words, provide eloquent testimony. He also suggests that we decry a referendum which in fact is only the obvious outcome of the United Kingdom policy I just mentioned. Have we not already done so in calling this urgent Council meeting?

66. We have the impression, therefore, that an attempt is being made to steal a march on us by appealing to us to make a concerted reiteration of a platonic condemnation of

the minority racists in Southern Rhodesia. It is clear to all and sundry that the partial sanctions advocated against the racists in Southern Rhodesia have been a failure because they were inadequate and ill-suited to subdue a rebellion of that magnitude.

67. In this drama through which Africa's flesh and Africa's dignity is living today, we firmly believe that the primary responsibility lies with the United Kingdom, which by its attitude of passivity and complicity has long directly or indirectly aided and even encouraged the activities of the Rhodesian settlers, those constables who have been given the task of taking over command and forming a bridge with the inhuman system of *apartheid* in South Africa and with the Portuguese colonial régime that infests Angola and Mozambique.

68. That is why, despite the attempts organized by the United Kingdom to sidetrack the debate, the Council should not for one moment forget the need to remind that country of its very great responsibility. The Council must also bear in mind that this problem is above all a colonial problem. In keeping with the spirit of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), it is therefore entitled to consider not only the symptoms but also the substance of the problem of Southern Rhodesia, that British colony illegally grabbed by a neurotic racist minority which enjoys the subtle complicity of the parent administering Power and is bent on imposing an illegal *de facto* situation on international opinion, morality and law.

69. If the United Kingdom refuses to shoulder its responsibilities, it is only right for the international community to shoulder its own. The conscience of the world cannot remain deaf, far less blind, to this explosive situation, and the Security Council must focus its attention on all the practical aspects of the Rhodesian drama, reminding the administering Power plainly of its responsibilities and condemning this masquerade of a referendum which is the direct result of the administering Power's irresponsibility.

70. The fact remains that in a few days Ian Smith, who is no novice at the game, will be dealing democracy and justice another blow. Vigilant Africa therefore appeals earnestly to all the Powers that have so far maintained consular services and other attributes of sovereignty with the administering Power in Southern Rhodesia, to regard the maintenance of such consulates henceforth as undisguised support for the situation that would emanate from the notorious Constitution Act of Ian Smith and his racist followers.

71. We reiterate our appeal to all the Powers to sever all their relations of every kind with that part of Africa, where unauthorized seizure and injustice constitute the sole basis for government. No economic sanction against the illegal and illegitimate régime spawned by the British colony of Rhodesia can be effective unless it is directly applied to the *apartheid* régime of South Africa and the colonialist régime of Portugal. It is well known that these two régimes, which have been sentenced to economic boycott more than once by the world Organization for violating the principles of the Charter, aid and abet their accomplices the Rhodesian racists.

72. The fears that we have continually expressed about a racial war in southern Africa are about to be confirmed. Should the United Kingdom fail in its quest for a just settlement of the Rhodesian problem, we shall shortly witness an intensification of the struggle already started in that part of the world by the people of Zimbabwe and other long-subjugated peoples of southern Africa, who have already prepared other means of showing the neurotics of Southern Rhodesia and the upholders of *apartheid* that from now on no people can accept the crushing humiliation and the wretched conditions of life under colonial rule. Freedom-loving people will never agree to be idle spectators of this heroic struggle by the freedom fighters in that part of the world.

73. The United Nations still has time to act before it is too late.

74. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I should like to inform the Council that I have just received a request from the representative of Somalia to be invited to take part in this debate. Following the usual practice, and if there are no objections, I shall invite him to be seated at the Council table so as to participate in the debate without the right to vote.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. A. Farah (Somalia) took a seat at the Council table.*

75. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of Somalia, on whom I call.

76. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): I should like to thank the Council for allowing me to participate in the debate on this vital question.

77. In the view of my delegation, there are three things which this meeting of the Council should accomplish. First of all, it should serve to reaffirm the determination of the United Nations to defend with all the resources at its command the political, social and economic rights of peoples when those rights are in jeopardy. Second, it should recognize without further quibbling that the steps taken so far to deal with the situation in Southern Rhodesia have been inadequate and need to be reinforced. Third, this meeting should have as its result a decision by the Security Council to take those further measures commensurate with the demands of the situation.

78. There are, of course, few Member States which do not condemn the actions of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia. Few would deny that *apartheid* is a crime against humanity or that the withholding of political and social rights and economic opportunities from the majority by a powerful minority is contrary to the most fundamental principles of democracy, of the United Nations Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. And yet it is quite clear that economic sanctions as so far applied, whether selective or comprehensive, have failed to bring down the Smith régime. They have failed not only because they are openly and avowedly ignored by Rhodesia's two principal accomplices, South Africa and Portugal, but also because they have not been supported by several other

States which associate themselves politically with the condemnation of the illegal régime and, at the same time, collaborate with it for material gains.

79. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Smith régime could claim in April this year that it had succeeded in breaking economic sanctions in 1968 and forecast an even healthier economic outlook for 1969. The régime claimed that, despite sanctions, it had managed to channel about \$178 million worth of exports through the sanctions net in 1968 and had increased the country's gross national product by 5-1/2 per cent.

80. The export figure—about \$2 million less than in 1967—was reached despite a reduction of almost 12 per cent in agricultural production caused by reduced tobacco output. The economy showed a current account deficit of about \$55 million, but that was almost entirely offset by a net capital inflow of about \$51 million.

81. It is also clear that the illegal racist régime has gone from strength to strength, secure in the knowledge that it could extend and intensify its racism and oppression without any fear that the United Kingdom, the administering Power, would resort to force to carry out its responsibilities to the people and restore constitutional rule to the Territory.

82. The Smith régime has today in operation a machinery of political oppression that is very similar to the repressive laws of South Africa, as embodied in the Suppression of Communism Act of 1950 and the Terrorism Act of 1957. In consequence, at the beginning of 1968, almost 100 men were in Rhodesian gaols—all Africans, under sentence of death for political offences. No official figures for the total number of political prisoners, detainees and restrictees have ever been given, but the Zimbabwe African People's Union estimate between 10,000 and 15,000 people have been detained for varying periods of time during the past nine years. The representative of Senegal has described to the Council [*1475th meeting*] in detail the kinds of brutalities to which many of those unfortunate persons have been subjected while under detention.

83. The so-called constitution which the racist régime proposes to impose on the people of Zimbabwe should not distract our attention from other repressive racist measures which it has taken to destroy the dignity of the African and to enhance the position of the white minority. Such measures have been introduced in all walks of life and have been used on a pattern similar to that in operation in South Africa.

84. The success achieved by the Smith régime in resisting sanctions and the attitude of the United Kingdom have enabled the régime to adopt a more confident stand. Speaking recently of international recognition, Smith is reported to have said that this might take "a couple of years or five or six". It would be a searing away process that would really start once the new constitution was finally drafted and introduced. It has been said that no State has yet accorded recognition to the Smith régime. But is this really necessary if it can get all the assistance it wants from those who make no secret of where their sympathy lies?

85. The South African Minister for Foreign Affairs has informed the Secretary-General that his Government would not support the resolution on Rhodesia as it did not believe in boycotts, particularly in southern Africa. Portugal, too, has adopted a similar attitude. In February this year its Foreign Minister commented that Portugal's policy towards Southern Rhodesia was one of good-neighbourliness without formal diplomatic recognition.

86. These facts, if they are not self-evident, have been supported by numerous surveys and reports of United Nations committees and agencies. I need go no further than to quote paragraph 48 of the second report of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) of 29 May which is before the Council and which states:

“As a result of the refusal of South Africa and Portugal to take measures and the failure of some other States to fully implement the provisions of resolution 253 (1968), as stated above, the Committee is compelled to observe that the sanctions established by that resolution against the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia have not yet brought about the results desired by the Security Council.” [S/9252.]

And that was evident before the United Nations became seized of the situation posed by the forthcoming referendum on a so-called new constitution for Rhodesia, a constitution which crystallizes the racist policies and the profound injustices implicit in the Unilateral Declaration of Independence. Although it is necessary for us at this time to take grave note of this latest act in the Rhodesian tragedy, we must not allow the immediate situation to obscure our basic goals. In other words, it will not be sufficient to condemn the proposed referendum in a flurry of indignation, and then to continue the present ineffectual policy without any further attempt to strengthen it.

87. My delegation therefore supports the position of the representative of Zambia that if the Security Council wishes to end the present situation in Rhodesia then it must be prepared to apply the provisions of Articles 41 and 42 of Chapter VII of the Charter. A further call should be addressed to South Africa and Portugal to co-operate in the imposition of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and, should they refuse to do so, then appropriate measures should be taken by the Security Council to ensure compliance with its decisions and to secure respect for the authority of the United Nations. At the same time, every effort should be made to bring before the scrutiny of international public opinion the evidence which condemns those other nations which openly or covertly continue to support the illegal régime in Rhodesia by their trade and investments.

88. Finally, my delegation would like to join its voice to those which have pointed out that there are only two alternatives to comprehensive sanctions against the régime in Rhodesia: one of them is the use of force against the régime by the administering Power; the other is armed conflict between the forces of oppression and the people of Zimbabwe. The latter alternative would no doubt be costly in lives and would likely result in a long drawn out struggle involving peoples from many areas and of different races. If some members of the Council find both courses distasteful, surely they will not be slow to recognize the lesser evil.

89. In conclusion, my delegation believes that the problem of Rhodesia—which is a component of the general problem of colonialism and imperialism in southern Africa—challenges many of the basic assumptions that brought the United Nations into being. The continued failure of this Organization to bring about any improvement in the situation is a dangerous indication that the United Nations is indeed at the crossroads. In Rhodesia, as in South Africa, South West Africa, Angola and Mozambique the United Nations is committed to a course of action but has been unable to carry it through to a logical conclusion because of the conflict between its decisions and responsibilities, on the one hand, and the economic and other interests of powerful Member States, on the other hand.

90. The issues which confront the United Nations in Rhodesia are the same as those which confront the Organization in the whole of southern Africa. The issues are these: will the United Nations take decisive and concerted measures in order to forestall the inevitable conflagration in southern Africa or will it stand by helplessly until it is too late for effective measures? Will the United Nations allow black Africans to be deprived in perpetuity of their basic human rights by a white minority on the premise of racial superiority? Will history repeat itself and see the United Nations founder on the conflict between national interests and international morality, as did the League of Nations in 1935? The answers to these questions will be indicative of the future of the United Nations as an effective force for international order and international morality.

91. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): No other representative has expressed a desire to speak during this meeting. If the Council agrees, therefore, I shall close the meeting.

92. In accordance with the informal consultations that have been held, the next meeting of the Security Council to continue discussion of the question we have had before us today will be held tomorrow, Wednesday, 18 June, at 3 p.m.

*The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.*

---

#### **HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS**

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

#### **COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES**

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre librairie ou adressez-vous à: Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

#### **КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ**

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах по всем районам мира. Напишите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

#### **COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS**

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

---