



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-THIRD YEAR

1400th MEETING: 20 MARCH 1968

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda 1400)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia: letters dated 2 and 30 August 1963 addressed to the President of the Security Council on behalf of the representatives of thirty-two Member States (S/5382 and S/5409): Letter dated 12 March 1968 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Algeria, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta and Zambia (S/8454)	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 HUNDREDTH MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 20 March 1968, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Ousmane Socé DIOP (Senegal).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Algeria, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, Hungary, India, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1400)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia: letters dated 2 and 30 August 1963 addressed to the President of the Security Council on behalf of the representatives of thirty-two Member States (S/5382 and S/5409):

Letter dated 12 March 1968 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Algeria, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta and Zambia (S/8454).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia: letters dated 2 and 30 August 1963 addressed to the President of the Security Council on behalf of the representatives of thirty-two Member States (S/5382 and S/5409):

Letter dated 12 March 1968 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Algeria, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta and Zambia (S/8454)

1. The PRESIDENT: (*translated from French*): In accordance with the decision taken by the Council at its 1399th meeting, and if there is no objection, I shall invite the representatives of Jamaica and Zambia to take places at the

Council table in order to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. K. Johnson (Jamaica) and Mr. J. B. Mwemba (Zambia) took places at the Council table.

2. Mr. PARTHASARATHI (India): The cold-blooded assassination of five African nationalists by the racists of Rhodesia has once again reminded the international community of the extreme gravity of the situation in Southern Rhodesia. The executions have been condemned by Governments and peoples all over the world as an inhuman and savage act, violating the canons of behaviour which govern the conduct of societies in civilized nations.

3. The Prime Minister of India, speaking in Parliament on this subject on 7 March 1968, stated:

"We have learned with inexpressible horror that the Southern Rhodesian régime has perpetrated a heinous crime by executing three Africans. The world has followed their fate with great anxiety in the last few days. This monstrous deed of the white racist clique evokes our wrath and condemnation. I am sure everyone in the House and the country will condemn this barbarous act."

4. While we strongly condemn these murders, my delegation believes that the question of executions is only a symptom of the diseased society into which the Whites of Rhodesia have formed themselves. It is a timely reminder of the futility of attempting to solve the problem by half-hearted measures. It has shown clearly that unless strong, determined and early action is taken, the minority régime will persist in its criminal policy, regardless of the sufferings of the African people of Zimbabwe.

5. It is now almost two and a half years since the white minority in Rhodesia, in the face of grave warnings from the Administering Authority, illegally seized power and declared independence under a new constitution. Many of us at that time expected the Government of the United Kingdom to follow up its earlier warnings by taking strong and effective action to quell the rebellion. The history of the Rhodesian problem since the unilateral declaration of independence is a history of the failure of the United Kingdom Government to restore constitutionality in one of its colonies and to safeguard the legitimate rights of the 4.5 million Africans of the Territory.

6. It is hardly necessary for me to analyse in detail the course of events in Rhodesia since UDI, as this has been done in the past by many delegations, including my own.

We are all aware how, immediately after UDI, a majority of the membership of the United Nations called upon Britain to use force to put down the rebellion. We are all aware of the unwillingness, in the beginning, of the United Kingdom and other Western Powers even to enforce any mandatory sanctions against the Smith régime. We are all aware of the utter ineffectiveness of the so-called voluntary sanctions which were imposed in December 1965. We are all aware of the selective mandatory sanctions which were imposed in December 1966 [resolution 232 (1966)] and of their failure to remedy the situation. And finally, we are all aware of the tragic and deplorable consequences of the lack of effective action on the part of the Government of the United Kingdom and its refusal to heed the advice given by many of us about the most effective manner of dealing with this problem.

7. Despite the clear recommendations of the General Assembly to the British Government not to enter into any negotiations with the representatives of the illegal régime, the British Government made repeated attempts during the past year to arrive at some understanding with the Smith régime. Instead of endeavouring to start talks with the genuine representatives of the people, high dignitaries went to Salisbury on negotiating missions. What was the result of those visits? We understand that the Smith régime proposed amendments to the *Tiger* constitution which would, in effect, further dilute the already inadequate safeguards for the rights of the Africans contained in the original *Tiger* proposals.¹ For example, it was proposed that all African members of the Rhodesian Senate should be chiefs. That proposal would have removed the "blocking third"—namely, elected African representatives in the Rhodesian Parliament who could prevent the adoption of discriminatory legislation. Another measure suggested was the abolition of cross-voting.

8. The strong position taken by the Smith régime and the retrograde measures it suggested during the course of these negotiations clearly proved that the differences between the two positions were unbridgeable. Mr. George Thomson, the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Affairs, stated in the British Parliament:

"I am sorry to have to tell the House that the differences between our position and Mr. Smith's proved even greater than earlier discussion had indicated."

9. It is the sincere hope of my delegation that the Government of the United Kingdom has realized the futility of negotiating with Salisbury, particularly after the latest example of contemptuous disregard by the Smith régime for the authority of the British Crown. The illegal régime in Rhodesia is surely and swiftly following the path of racial discrimination and *apartheid* well trodden by its neighbour to the south.

10. On 4 August 1967 Mr. L. B. Smith, the so-called Deputy Minister of Agriculture in the illegal régime, stated

¹ For the statement and document of the meeting between Prime Minister Harold Wilson and Mr. Ian Smith on board HMS *Tiger*, setting out proposals for an independence constitution, see: *Rhodesia—Proposals for a Settlement, 1966* (London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1966), Cmnd. 3159.

in Pretoria that the régime envisaged development for the non-Whites in Southern Rhodesia along lines similar to the development of the Bantu groups in the Republic of South Africa. A number of bills have been passed in the white-dominated Parliament of Rhodesia giving effect to the now-official policy of separate development of the races—for example, the African (Urban Areas) Accommodation and Registration Act, the Municipal (Amendment) Act, and so forth. The Law and Order (Maintenance) Act of 1963, as amended on 16 November 1967, under which four of the five assassinations have been carried out, bears a striking and ominous resemblance to another odious law with which the world is only too familiar—namely, the Terrorism Act—² of South Africa. The Rhodesian Act, like the South African Terrorism Act, throws the onus of proof on the accused persons, who are presumed to be "terrorists" or "saboteurs" unless they can prove beyond reasonable doubt that they did not intend to use their weapons to endanger the maintenance of law and order in Rhodesia or in a neighbouring territory. But, in an obvious bid to out-Pretoria Pretoria, the Rhodesian Act makes the death penalty the only sentence for those found in possession of "weapons of war", even in cases in which not only no life had been endangered but no damage had in fact been done.

11. Several thousand Africans have been imprisoned under this wide-sweeping Law and Order (Maintenance) Act. In 1964 alone, there were 5,000 convictions for political offences. We have all learned with profound indignation of the brutal hangings last week. There are many more Africans in Rhodesian prisons under sentences of death. Many of the detainees have had no charges framed against them, except a vague belief that they had engaged in subversive activity. And the conditions in the prison cells can only be compared to the conditions in concentration camps.

12. The selective sanctions imposed by the Security Council in December 1966 have failed. When I say they have failed, I do not mean that they have had no impact at all on the Rhodesian economy. I know that the sanctions have had some effect on certain sectors of the economy in Rhodesia. Tobacco cultivation has suffered fairly serious consequences. Some of the industries, such as the automobile industry, have also been affected. But the fact remains that the sanctions have not produced the promised political results. The Smith régime is still there, very much in power, showing no signs of succumbing to the severe punishment which the sanctions were supposed to inflict on it.

13. Even in the economic field the sanctions have not been particularly effective. To quote from a report in *The Times* of London of 29 December 1967:

"Rhodesia is entering 1968 with its economy in better shape than seemed possible a year ago when the United Nations was in the process of imposing its wide range of mandatory sanctions".

The report further revealed that Rhodesia's export earnings of £127.6 million for 1967, while about one third down

² Act to prohibit terroristic activities and to amend the law relating to criminal procedure; and to provide for other incidental matters, promulgated on 21 June 1967.

from the pre-independence level, was slightly higher than in 1966. Economic activity within Rhodesia in the previous twelve months had been very near to pre-independence levels. The report concluded that from the experience of the past two years it had seemed to become easier, not more difficult to buy and sell goods in the face of sanctions. According to the information given in the Working Paper³ of the Committee of Twenty-Four,⁴ 450 new industrial projects were approved during the last two years, involving an investment of £8.5 million; 380 of those projects are already in operation. In the first nine months of 1967, sales of manufactured goods amounted to £140 million, compared with the total for 1966 of £133 million.

14. According to one report, Rhodesia's mining output last year reached record level to beat the previous best of £32.6 million. As regards oil, apart from an increase in the price of petrol, the Rhodesians do not seem to have experienced any particular shortage. Although rationing of petrol has not been lifted, any amount of "off-ration" fuel can be purchased at a slightly higher price than the rationed petrol. Further, according to a recent report, the extra price of "off-ration" petrol has been brought down from 2 shillings a unit to 6 pence a unit. A most convincing proof of the failure of the sanctions and of the soundness of the Rhodesian economy is to be found in the fact that within a period of seventeen days in October 1967, the régime floated three loans of £16 million all of which were immediately oversubscribed.

15. It has been said that the selective sanctions imposed by the Security Council on 16 December 1966 have failed because of non-compliance by certain Member States, in particular South Africa and Portugal. But even before the Security Council adopted resolution 232 (1966) of 16 December 1966 the Governments of South Africa and Portugal had stated publicly that they would continue to co-operate with the Smith régime in the normal way irrespective of any action which the United Nations might take against Southern Rhodesia. It was, therefore, unrealistic for anyone to expect that South Africa and Portugal, whose record of defiance of the authority of the United Nations is notorious, would respect the decisions of the Security Council.

16. My delegation has always held that the Government of the United Kingdom, in its capacity as the administering Power, is fully entitled to launch a police action in a colony where law and order have completely broken down as was so dramatically and tragically demonstrated by the recent events in Rhodesia. It was unfortunate that Prime Minister Wilson, even before the unilateral declaration of independence, had assured the white community that force would not be used against them. It is yet more unfortunate that the Government of the United Kingdom, even at this stage, found it necessary to repeat its no-use-of-force declaration thus encouraging the Smith régime in its intransigence. In this context I should like to recall a statement made by Prime Minister Wilson in the British

Parliament on 11 November 1965 that the solution of the Southern Rhodesian problem was not one to be dealt with by military intervention unless troops were asked for to avert a tragic action such as subversion, murder, etc. On 12 November 1965 Prime Minister Wilson, in elaboration of his earlier statement, explained that if the legally constituted Government of Southern Rhodesia, that is, the Governor, were to seek help in dealing with law and order, the United Kingdom Government would have to give it the fullest consideration. The murders committed by the Smith régime and the repressive measures taken by it to deal with the unrest among the people of Zimbabwe provide more than the required justification for the administering Power to intervene with force.

17. There has been a persistent call for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. My delegation is prepared to lend its support to such a proposal provided—and I must emphasize this—that effective measures are taken to secure compliance from all States. This is necessary because two Member States of the Organization which are in close and unholy alliance with Southern Rhodesia, in an effort to preserve and perpetuate white supremacy in southern Africa, have openly and unashamedly declared their intention to continue to help the Smith régime in overcoming the effects of sanctions. In other words, the economy of Southern Rhodesia must be put under a siege with effective measures for implementation if the sanctions are to have the necessary political impact. As far as my country is concerned we severed all relations with Southern Rhodesia including trade and commerce even before the United Nations adopted the relevant recommendations.

18. My delegation and my Government fully support the struggle of the people of Zimbabwe to regain their national dignity. Indeed, given the lack of effective action on the part of the Government of the United Kingdom the Africans of Zimbabwe have had no option but to take to arms to achieve their independence. My country has already made a modest contribution to the struggle of the African freedom fighters and I take this opportunity to renew our pledge of full support for their struggle. At the same time, the Council should call upon the Government of the United Kingdom to give up its policy of "too little, too late", and to adopt effective measures, not excluding the use of force, to fulfil its responsibilities. Furthermore, the Council should impose comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions and couple them with a warning that all Member States of the Organization would be bound to comply with the sanctions imposed in terms of their obligations under Article 25 of the United Nations Charter. We believe that such action, if taken now, will forestall a violent racial holocaust which is bound to engulf the whole of southern Africa if freedom and justice are denied much longer to the African peoples of the area.

19. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): As the letter from thirty-six African States requesting this meeting [S/8454] points out, it is over a year since the Security Council last met on the question of Rhodesia. As this is the first occasion on which the Canadian delegation has had the opportunity in the Security Council to speak on the situation in Southern Rhodesia, I should like to outline Canadian views on the

³ Document A/AC.109/L.445 (mimeographed).

⁴ Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

various aspects of the question which have been raised at the United Nations.

20. We all know that the decision to meet at this particular time resulted directly from the reprehensible display of injustice of the Smith régime in executing so far five prisoners. What is particularly outrageous is that these men were held for years under sentence of death with their fate uncertain and with the fundamental right of appeal ultimately denied to them. Three were executed despite the granting of reprieves by Her Majesty the Queen; two had removed from them the remedy of an appeal to the Privy Council. Their executions are indicative of the deplorable conduct of the Rhodesian régime which Canada has denounced more than once.

21. We believe that the Council should certainly condemn these executions and demand, in the name of civilized behaviour and common humanity, that those responsible in Salisbury desist from further inhuman acts and political persecutions. The Security Council should send a clear message that the illegal régime's use of prisoners virtually as pawns in a political conflict is reprehensible to the highest degree. We hope that such a call can be sent out promptly and unanimously.

22. As regards general Canadian policy on Rhodesia, Canada has repeatedly expressed the conviction that Rhodesia must not be granted independence before majority rule is obtained. The Canadian Government has also made it clear that it is inadmissible that a society should be organized on a system of racial discrimination under which a minority of Whites exercises political and economic control over a vast majority of African people. Canada has also faithfully applied the sanctions so far authorized by the Council as is shown by the reports of the Secretary-General⁵ in pursuance of the Council's resolution 232 (1966).

23. In considering the question of sanctions against the illegal régime in Rhodesia, we must take into account the lack of success so far in achieving the aim to which the sanctions resolution of December 1966 [232 (1966)] was addressed, that is, the change of the régime and the return to legality in Rhodesia.

24. My delegation does not speak of a "failure" of the sanctions already imposed, because as has already been mentioned, it is clear from the Secretary-General's report [S/7781/Add.4] and from other available reports that these sanctions have had some impact on the economy and the general situation in Rhodesia. But this impact could certainly have been greater if the directives of the Security Council had been carried out by all. It is clear indeed that without full co-operation from every Member State in this Organization the purposes of the United Nations will be frustrated.

25. We are grateful to the Secretary-General for having carefully reported, to the extent possible, on the effect of

⁵ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1967*, document S/7781 and Add.1 and 2; *ibid.*, *Supplement for July, August and September 1967*, document S/7781/Add.3; and *ibid.*, *Supplement for October, November and December 1967*, document S/7781/Add.4.

the measures adopted by the Council in December 1966. His reports have been studied with care and my delegation supports his renewed call to Member States to respond to his earlier requests for reports and statistics; it is indeed difficult to understand why some Member States have not fulfilled their obligations in this regard. They may say that their trade with Rhodesia is either non-existent or negligible, but does this justify failure to report in response to the Secretary-General's request?

26. I know also that there are those who advocate the use of force to bring down the illegal régime in Rhodesia. But this is an approach which, in our view, must be carefully weighed. It seems probable that what would be involved in present circumstances would be a full-scale invasion and war causing bloodshed and widespread damage, and we cannot ignore the human and material cost of such action inside and outside Rhodesia.

27. It is one thing to advocate the use of force; it is another to determine sound and effective means for applying it. A decision to use force must include a decision about who shall be charged with its employment. There seem to be two possibilities: either the use of force by the United Nations in accordance with the Charter in exercise of our collective responsibility to remove threats to the peace or to deal with breaches of the peace or acts of aggression, or, alternatively, the exercise of this responsibility by the United Kingdom alone taking action against a colony in rebellion. If the Council is to decide on the use of force by the United Nations there must be agreement among those members of the Council which would have to carry the main burden of implementing this decision that measures not involving the use of armed force are inadequate and that such force is necessary. Whatever views may be held on the use of force in this situation, I do not believe that a basis exists now for such agreement. As for the use of force by the sovereign Power, it is quite clear that the United Kingdom is not prepared to embark on this approach to a solution at this time. The United Kingdom has taken the firm position that it is not prepared to use force, except as a last resort for restoration of law and order.

28. There is, in our view, another important consideration. We believe that the Security Council should weigh carefully the advantages against the disadvantages before abandoning the course it has embarked on for the first time in the history of the United Nations. It is our view that we must try harder to make the mandatory economic sanctions work. This is a matter involving the isolation of the Rhodesian régime. The objective of the mandatory sanctions programme is not only to bring economic pressure to bear on those who have usurped power in Rhodesia and are now misusing it, but to underline for them the fact that they have no place in the world community of nations so long as they pursue the policies which the overwhelming majority of the representatives of that community have condemned. In some respects this isolation is at least as important as the specific effects of economic sanctions, as it brings to bear the weight of world opinion and makes clear that this régime and what it stands for are unacceptable.

29. We believe that particular attention should be given to the possibility of broadening the mandatory economic sanctions to a comprehensive embargo on Rhodesia's external trade. Acknowledging, as I did earlier, that the sanctions so far applied have only partially achieved our aim, we must remember that the measures adopted were partial only. It is right, therefore, to move from these selective measures to the broader act of a complete trade embargo against Rhodesia. In the light of our experience with selective sanctions, it may be too much to hope that comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions will quickly achieve our purpose, but there is no doubt that this would have an effect on the Rhodesian régime and would enhance the impact the Council's measures have already had.

30. The Canadian delegation will be prepared to support any appropriate moves by the Security Council to impose more stringent additional sanctions with the object of bringing down the illegal régime and is prepared to enter into consultations forthwith to that end.

31. Mr. BERARD (France) (*translated from French*): The deplorable circumstances which have led to the convening of the Security Council have aroused the indignation of the world, and this feeling has been most eloquently expressed by our Secretary-General. They mark a new and tragic stage in the conflict which, within the British framework, sets the United Kingdom, the administering Power, in opposition to its colony of Rhodesia.

32. The nature of this crisis has not changed. As a spokesman for the African Congress of Trade Unions of that Territory stated a few days ago in the Committee of Twenty-Four: "It is unquestionable that Rhodesia is a British colony, and it follows without question that Rhodesia and all its internal problems are the responsibility of Great Britain."⁶ To forget this aspect of the problem would be to play into the hands of Salisbury and to endorse the régime's claims to international recognition. That is a position which France has from the outset refused to adopt.

33. My Government vigorously condemned the so-called declaration of independence of 11 November 1965. It does not recognize the *de facto* authority that has set itself up in Salisbury and has no diplomatic relations with it. It goes without saying that my Government gives that authority no assistance.

34. France is nevertheless fully aware of the extreme gravity of the problem, both political and humanitarian, which the actions of Salisbury are creating for the people of Southern Rhodesia and its neighbours. But France's position of principle on this matter is well known. We do not think it possible to maintain that the Security Council is legally entitled to pronounce judgement on a matter in which a dependent territory is pitted against its own metropolitan Power. That is why the French delegation had to abstain from voting on earlier resolutions; moreover, in our opinion the provisions of those resolutions did not seem fully to accord with the purpose in view—namely, to put an end to the rebellion.

35. These remarks do not by any means imply that France is not concerned to help the responsible British Government to meet its obligations. In December 1965 France prohibited the sale of petroleum and oil products to Rhodesia, suspended the granting of all import licences for Rhodesian sugar and completely halted the purchase of tobacco coming from that Territory.

36. On 25 February 1967, it prohibited the importation into France and the exportation to Rhodesia of all the products listed in resolution 232 (1966) of 16 December 1966. The latest customs statistics, covering the first eleven months of 1967, and the detailed studies which the French authorities have carried out in certain selected cases, show beyond question that those restrictions have been scrupulously observed; I wish to make this point quite clear.

37. Nor is the French delegation indifferent to the lamentable events which have brought about the convening of the Security Council.

38. It deeply deplores the fact that the efforts of the administering Power did not succeed in preventing five criminal executions. It is extremely apprehensive for the future of the hundred or so condemned persons who are now in Rhodesian prisons waiting for their fate to be decided. It was relieved to learn that the sentences of thirty-five of them had been commuted.

39. Moreover, the French delegation to the Commission on Human Rights associated itself with the consensus⁷ in which that Commission expressed its horror at the tragic executions in Salisbury and requested the United Kingdom to restore the human rights and fundamental freedoms of the African people in its colony and to take steps to save the lives of the prisoners who were still living under the threat of capital punishment. In addition, our delegation approved the text of the telegram⁸ addressed to the British Government to that effect. It is our hope that, in response to this appeal, the United Kingdom Government will shortly make known the measures it means to employ to resolve the crisis in Rhodesia, which has already lasted too long.

40. On the basis of its own recent experience, France can state positively that a crisis of this kind is not insoluble. Its solution depends, first, on the decision of the London Government; but if, in its determination to make Salisbury see reason, the United Kingdom were to call on friendly countries for assistance, the latter would certainly not refuse their co-operation.

41. I reserve my right to speak again later in the debate.

42. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call on the representative of Jamaica.

43. Mr. JOHNSON (Jamaica): Mr. President, first of all I should like to express to you my thanks for allowing me to speak on behalf of Jamaica on this question.

⁷ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 4*, para. 102.

⁸ *Ibid.*, para. 103.

44. This is the second time that Jamaica has sought to address the Security Council and it is the second time that it has sought to do so on the question of Rhodesia. It is not to deny or minimize the wealth of experience and wisdom which are the Security Council's that we appear here, but rather to express our solidarity with millions of oppressed Africans.

45. We are here because my country cannot but be concerned with the urgent problems of the people of Zimbabwe, who have been and are being subjected to a repression which has made a mockery of the rule of law—repression within the borders of the land which belonged to their forefathers, and in which they now find themselves enslaved.

46. The history of the United Kingdom's and the United Nations reaction to the unilateral declaration of independence by the Ian Smith régime is too well known to be recounted. What has brought us here is specifically the execution of five Africans whose judicial murder symbolizes a situation in a colony characterized by repression, violation of human rights and discrimination. Jamaica has offered assistance to the dependents of the deceased. In my country, tomorrow has been set aside as a day of national mourning for those who have been executed and, in a larger sense, over all those conditions brought about by the Smith régime that are a source of sorrow to Jamaica.

47. If history has any lesson for us, it is that human beings who are subjected to conditions such as these will ultimately rebel against them. Reported incursions into Rhodesia by guerrilla forces during the last few days have demonstrated the inevitability of a violent response to repression. We salute the efforts of these Zimbabwe nationalists. The fight for freedom is as old as man. The lessons of history suggest that the shackles that have been imposed upon the people of Zimbabwe will have no better fate than those imposed upon earlier generations in other lands.

48. The traditions with which Jamaica has developed have left no room for an understanding of the summary rejection of the reprieve granted by Her Majesty the Queen to three of the Rhodesians executed. The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom stated in the House of Commons on 14 March that "in present circumstances there can be no question of resuming contacts with the illegal régime".⁹ These words are to be applauded—and more so if they imply that the United Kingdom Government is now prepared to have discussions with representatives of the majority of the population of Rhodesia, citizens of the United Kingdom and colonies who are still being denied their rights. I appeal to the conscience of those Member States represented on the Security Council who have espoused and championed the maxim, "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity". I appeal to them to demonstrate their commitment to this cause for all peoples, and not only on behalf of themselves and those whom they accept as friends. The application of double standards will always create more problems than it solves.

⁹ *Parliamentary Debates (Hansard), House of Commons, Official Report, Fifth Series, vol. 760* (London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office), col. 1617.

49. On 16 December 1966, the Security Council adopted resolution 232 (1966) which determined that the situation in Rhodesia constituted a threat to international peace and security and decided that all States—Members of the United Nations—should impose a ban on the import of certain commodities from Southern Rhodesia and on the export to that country of oil and oil products, arms and military equipment, aircraft and motor vehicles and equipment or materials for the manufacturing or assembling of them. Those sanctions appear to have failed. It was to be expected that there would be some adverse effect on Southern Rhodesia's economy, but certainly their efficacy had to be judged by their capacity to bring down the Smith régime or to change its nature substantially. Neither has occurred. It was also realized beforehand that certain States—Members of this Organization—would not fully co-operate with these sanctions. It is therefore no use saying either that sanctions have not been given time to work or that they have failed to work because all States have not co-operated. We all knew beforehand who would not co-operate and why.

50. The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom recently stated in the House of Commons:

"Perhaps the Security Council will be well advised to proceed on the basis of what is practicable and what is effective . . . perhaps a little less forcible talk and a little more practical action on the part of all concerned might get the right answer."¹⁰

Could practical action perhaps mean the closing of the borders of Southern Rhodesia to the entry of goods and equipment from South Africa? Could it mean the application of economic sanctions against South Africa and against Portugal? Is there reason to believe that these are likely prospects?

51. Would not an extension of the mandatory economic sanctions by the Security Council or an attempt to tighten the sanctions which already exist founder on the policies of the Governments of Portugal and South Africa? If sanctions are to work, something has to be done about the policies of those Governments. The permissiveness of Governments which support the Smith régime by refusing to enforce sanctions against Rhodesia is, in our view, a grave mistake. What now appears to be of economic advantage to such nations may one day prove to be nothing more than an economic mirage.

52. On the other hand, we cannot continue to rule out the possibility and the likelihood of the use of force. At Jamaica's earlier appearance before this Council, my distinguished predecessor had said:

"If the United Kingdom, for its own reasons, is convinced that it ought not to resort to the use of force, Jamaica would wish to see the Council go further into this question with the Government of the United Kingdom." [1262nd meeting, para. 27.]

We still recognize that the United Nations would most likely call upon a Government to employ military force only following consultations with that Government and having considered the implications of the application of

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, col. 1621.

force. Southern Rhodesia is a colony ruled by an illegal régime whose leaders are guilty of treason and whose actions have violated the sensibilities of all civilized men everywhere.

53. The people of Jamaica, through our Parliament, have taken note of the utter failure of the sanctions so far imposed on Southern Rhodesia. They have recorded a vote of no confidence in the likely success of any sanctions that may be imposed in the future on Southern Rhodesia. They consider that the only effective means of returning Rhodesia to the rule of law is by force. On 13 March 1968 the Jamaican Parliament unanimously adopted a resolution which reads as follows:

"Whereas the Government and people of Jamaica have been shocked and horrified by the latest outrageous action of the illegal racist régime in Rhodesia in executing persons who had been granted a reprieve by Her Majesty the Queen, and

"Whereas these latest actions constitute an intensification of the reprehensible policy of oppression of the black majority in Rhodesia and a suppression of their rights, and

"Whereas the Government of Jamaica has consistently called for the termination of this régime by all measures, including the use of force, and has offered its support in so doing, and

"Whereas the United Kingdom has so far failed in discharging her responsibility in bringing down the illegal rebellious régime, and

"Whereas the Prime Minister of Jamaica has expressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and to the Secretary General of the Commonwealth Secretariat Jamaica's horror at the recent executions, and has re-emphasized Jamaica's views that negotiations with the Smith régime were pointless, and that only the sternest and strongest measures could save Rhodesia and its people from further atrocities, and

"Whereas in a message to the United Nations and to the Organization of African Unity the Prime Minister has asked what assistance could be provided for the bereaved dependents of the deceased,

"*Be it resolved* that this House:

"(a) records its strongest condemnation of the action of the illegal racist régime,

"(b) records its support of the actions already taken by the Prime Minister,

"(c) reaffirms its belief that the use of military force in Rhodesia is the only feasible means of bringing down the illegal régime,

"(d) calls upon the United Kingdom to take the strongest and sternest measures, including the use of force, against the illegal régime,

"(e) calls upon the Security Council of the United Nations to take all urgent and necessary steps to ensure the downfall of the illegal régime,

"(f) calls upon all countries to give maximum support to the Security Council and to the United Kingdom to this end, and to ensure the return of Rhodesia to constitutional rule and the institution of a system of government by the majority,

"(g) authorizes the Government to contribute to any fund which may be organized by the United Nations or any appropriate international agency to provide for the bereaved dependents, and

"(h) authorizes the Government to declare a day of National Mourning in respect of the atrocious acts of the illegal régime."

The Senate likewise unanimously endorsed this resolution.

54. The Government of Jamaica supports the use of force to overthrow the illegal régime of Ian Smith. It does so because we see no other way of bringing about this desirable end quickly and with a minimum of further economic dislocation of the neighbouring State of Zambia, whose economy has suffered because of the sanctions already imposed. Our support for this measure is not merely that of a spectator on the sidelines. We are ready to contribute, within our capacity, to any force so organized directly under the authority of the United Nations.

55. This is Jamaica's stand. It is a stand based not only on principle but also on what we consider to be a realistic assessment of the situation confronting us.

56. Mr. BORCH (Denmark): The continued existence of the illegal minority régime in Salisbury is not only a disgrace, it is a challenge to all of us. As we see it, we have all a clear duty to assist in a determined effort to bring that régime to an end. Our meeting today, however, has a specific and tragic background. We meet in the awareness that the Smith régime does not refrain from even the most serious and ruthless actions, that it is prepared illegally to execute citizens deprived of their human and constitutional rights. The cruelty thus demonstrated by the régime in Salisbury has rightly been condemned by unanimous world opinion.

57. The Government and the people of Denmark share the anger and disgust aroused by these executions. There can be no doubt that the road upon which the Smith régime has now embarked may well lead towards disaster. Therefore, when we express our abhorrence at the executions we are at the same time deeply concerned about the consequences that those criminal acts may entail. If reason is not allowed to prevail in Southern Rhodesia it is indeed only proper to ask whether the ultimate result may not be a racial war with unpredictable consequences.

58. Denmark today adds its voice to the voices of those who protest against the illegal acts of the régime in Salisbury, and we feel that the Council must find ways of expressing its condemnation of the illegal executions and demand that no more illegal hangings be carried out.

59. It is the unanimous wish of the Council that the rebellion in Southern Rhodesia be brought to an end. We have in particular taken note of the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom to the effect that this continues to be the determined attitude of his Government. This basic fact that there is agreement about the goal before us must be taken into consideration and to it must be ascribed great importance in the further actions of this Council.

60. Since this is the first time I have spoken about this matter in the Security Council, I wish to reiterate that my country has complied fully with Security Council resolutions 216 (1965) of 12 November and 217 (1965) of 20 November 1965, and that we have, of course, fully implemented the mandatory sanctions imposed by the Security Council in its resolution 232 (1966) of 16 December 1966.

61. We have indeed gone considerably further by prohibiting exportation of all goods from Denmark to Southern Rhodesia, direct as well as via third countries, and by prohibiting importation into Denmark of all goods of Rhodesian origin. Furthermore, representatives of my country, on more than one occasion during the twenty-second session of the General Assembly, declared that Denmark, on the basis of adequate information, would be prepared to support a move in the Council to extend and tighten up the economic sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

62. On that basis I wish to pledge the full co-operation of my delegation in the consultations which in our opinion must now follow in order to enable members of the Council to assess the possibilities and the potentials of the situation so that the Council may act in the most effective manner possible with a view to bringing an end to the rebellion in Southern Rhodesia and an end to the illegal minority régime and its persecution of the people of Southern Rhodesia.

63. Mr. BUFFUM (United States of America): The dismaying events of the past two weeks in Southern Rhodesia have brought us together here once again to consider the tragic situation in that Territory. Three condemned African prisoners appealed in vain from an execution order issued by an illegal régime. Reprieves were then granted to those prisoners by Her Majesty the Queen, acting fully within her rights as the acknowledged sovereign of Southern Rhodesia. But thereupon the Smith régime, in deliberate defiance of her authority, proceeded to hang them, along with two other condemned prisoners. Public opinion throughout the world, including my own country, has responded to these events with a sense of outrage.

64. As long ago as August 1967, an official spokesman in Salisbury stated that the régime there had reached a decision to proceed with such executions on what he termed, ironically, "humanitarian grounds". He also said that there were eighty-two "remaining cases" in which death sentences were pending and that they would be "dealt with systematically and decisions taken on each case as soon as it is possible to do so". Since that time, we regret to say, the number awaiting execution has increased to over 100. Five condemned prisoners, including the three reprieved by the Queen, have already been put to death. Forty-seven have had their sentences commuted by the régime for reasons unknown to us.

65. But what of those scores who remain under sentence of death? Presumably, they are still to be "dealt with systematically". We know that several of them have been sentenced under a recent amendment to Southern Rhodesia's Law and Order (Maintenance) Act, which now

bears a most disconcerting resemblance to legislation we are accustomed to find wherever oppressive and arbitrary government exists. That amendment, which the illegal régime put into force last November over the objections of the Constitutional Council, prescribes a mandatory death penalty for persons who, "with intent to endanger the maintenance of law and order", possess "any arms of war". Like South Africa's Terrorism Act the new Rhodesian amendment violates the essence of civilized justice by placing upon the accused, and not the accuser, the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that he did not intend to "endanger the maintenance of law and order". And, like South Africa's Terrorism Act, the Southern Rhodesian Law and Order (Maintenance) Amendment Act carries a broad and ambiguous definition of "terrorism", conviction on which can itself carry the death penalty.

66. The United States condemns as an outrage the hanging of the five condemned men by the Smith régime—hangings which, in the opinion of the sovereign authority for Southern Rhodesia, were illegal. Moreover, we share the world-wide sense of alarm at the prospect that more hangings may follow, pursuant to legislation which violates the most elementary standards of human justice.

67. But these developments, however grim in themselves, must concern the Council in a much wider sense, for they do give confirmation to our long-held forebodings about the entire policy on which the régime in Salisbury embarked over two years ago. Step by step, ever since its unilateral and illegal declaration of independence in 1965, the Smith régime has maintained and reinforced the Draconian powers by which it deprives the Rhodesian people of rights to which they are entitled as citizens under the 1961 Constitution, and as human beings under the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and international law. It has even moved to embrace the odious racial policies of South Africa, particularly in regard to living accommodations, property ownership and the use of public facilities. In Southern Rhodesia today this is referred to as "separate development", and this is a term, of course, which we have all come to know as a euphemism for *apartheid*.

68. In all these policies the authorities in Salisbury have acted in flagrant defiance of the authority of the United Kingdom and in flagrant defiance of the resolutions of the Security Council.

69. Knowing all this, we dare not close our ears to the banging of the gallows trap in Salisbury. That sound must end any lingering doubts about the nature of the Smith régime, its intentions towards the future, and its contemptuous disregard for the rights of those who constitute the overwhelming majority of the population. There is ample evidence that in its determination to perpetuate minority rule in Southern Rhodesia the régime there is making ever more remote the possibility of human understanding among the races in Southern Rhodesia.

70. Now more than ever the United States looks upon the situation in Southern Rhodesia with shock and grave concern. We are dismayed by the régime's inhumanity and by its defiance of sovereign authority in its dealings with

the prisoners. And we are gravely concerned about the future. For while my Government has made every effort to ensure full compliance on the part of our own country with the selective mandatory sanctions which the Council imposed against Southern Rhodesia by its resolution 232 (1966) of December 1966, we share the recognition already expressed around this table that the sanctions applied thus far have simply not achieved their desired goal.

71. Accordingly, while my Government will continue to comply fully with the mandatory sanctions under resolution 232 (1966), we earnestly hope that the Council can and will, quickly and unanimously, find ways to achieve what I believe is the common objective, shared by us all. We were very pleased to hear yesterday from the representative of the United Kingdom, Lord Caradon, that his Government, as the sovereign authority, is willing to enter immediately into consultations to this end, and I should like now to pledge to him and the Council the full and constructive co-operation of the United States in such discussions.

72. The régime in Southern Rhodesia must change its present unlawful and disastrous policies. That régime, representing only a small minority, cannot be allowed to continue to impose upon the majority of the population a system which defies the sovereign authority and flagrantly violates the rights and interests of the people and the fundamental moral law recognized by all mankind.

73. In closing, I would briefly draw attention to the performance of those countries which have experienced special problems in carrying out the will of the Council to the best of their ability. In this connexion I feel we should express our sympathy with regard to the difficulties faced by countries such as Zambia, whose non-racial policy contrasts so sharply with the deplorable policies now being followed in Southern Rhodesia.

74. Let us now, as members of this Council, find ways to unite on action that will meet this new and more odious phase of the Southern Rhodesian tragedy and bring the people of that Territory the relief, the tranquillity and indeed the justice which they deserve.

75. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I should like first of all to express my sincere thanks to the representatives of two friendly African countries, Algeria and Ethiopia, for their kind words of welcome addressed to me at the last meeting. In this connexion, we are very happy to note the successful development, during the past ten years, of broad political, diplomatic, economic and social relations between the Soviet Union and the countries of Africa. The Soviet Union has always supported the African peoples in their anti-imperialist struggle to consolidate their unity, to achieve progressive development and to eradicate colonialism and racism from African soil.

76. The attention of the Security Council is now directed again, on the initiative of all the thirty-six States of independent Africa, to the fate of the Zimbabwe people and to the explosive situation in Southern Rhodesia, which is a threat to peace—and not only on the African continent.

The representatives of Algeria, Ethiopia and India, in their reasoned and convincing statements to the Council, have already shown the tragic situation in which the long-suffering people of Zimbabwe are living and have pointed to the serious consequences which will result from the criminal and inhuman policy of the racist clique in Salisbury. The Soviet delegation, for its part, declares its resolute support for the views expressed by the representatives of those countries.

77. The situation in Southern Rhodesia is growing worse. What course are the events there, in fact, taking? Instead of the abolition of the racist régime, as called for so often by the Security Council and the General Assembly, that régime is achieving some form of stabilization. Instead of attaining freedom and independence, the people of Zimbabwe are being subjected to ever more cruel oppression and bloody terror. The racists and colonialists who have usurped power in Southern Rhodesia have recently turned to new and even bloodier crimes. They have turned to physical violence against the patriots of the Zimbabwe nation who are struggling for their national independence. As we know, at the beginning of March three political prisoners, who had been fighting for the freedom of their homeland, were executed in Salisbury.

78. This evil act in Southern Rhodesia aroused the deep indignation and strong protests throughout the world. These protests have been reflected in recent decisions of two United Nations bodies—the Committee of Twenty-Four and the Commission on Human Rights—which resolutely condemned the wicked assassination of the three Africans which was carried out by the illegal régime of the racist minority. However, that did not put a stop to the criminal actions of the racists. Several days later they foully executed two more African patriots. As has already been noted here, hundreds of Africans struggling for the freedom of the Zimbabwe people are now threatened with the death penalty.

79. The evil acts of the racists are aimed at suppressing the movement, which is growing among the indigenous population of Zimbabwe, for freedom from colonialist oppression. The racists are attempting, by terror and force, to remain in power and to consolidate their régime.

80. The appearance and presence of the racist régime in Southern Rhodesia is unquestionably part of the large-scale and sinister designs of the forces of imperialism against the freedom-loving peoples of Africa. The designs include plans not only to create obstacles to the progress towards the complete liberation of Africa, but to turn Southern Rhodesia, as well as South Africa and the Portuguese African colonies, into a stronghold of colonialism and racism. For this reason, events in Southern Rhodesia are becoming increasingly significant not only as far as the Zimbabwe people's struggle for their legitimate rights and national liberation is concerned, but in the general context of the development of the national liberation struggle of African people as a whole. It goes without saying that this is of extreme significance for the entire international situation.

81. The reason for the creation of a situation which is so dangerous for peace in Southern Rhodesia is well known to

everyone. During debates on the question of Southern Rhodesia in the various United Nations bodies, the delegations of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, as well as those of African and Asian countries, have irrefutably shown that the crimes and disgraceful acts now being committed by the racists in Southern Rhodesia are the logical consequence and the direct result of colonialist policy. The United Kingdom Government's refusal to grant independence to the people of Zimbabwe, and its actual complicity with the racist minority in that country, led, two and a half years ago, to the emergence in southern Africa of yet another hotbed of racism which threatens the freedom and independence of the peoples of that region.

82. Yet, at that time, London would only have had to lift a finger to prevent further reinforcement of the racists' domination in Southern Rhodesia and their usurpation of power. Instead, the United Kingdom embarked on a path of connivance with the Salisbury régime, and engaged in negotiations with it, thus in effect taking that régime under its protection. In the Security Council and other United Nations bodies, United Kingdom diplomacy has striven to create the impression that half-hearted economic sanctions and partial trade restrictions could put an end to that racist régime.

83. Already in 1966, however, the whole world became aware of the entirely ineffectual nature of the limited economic sanctions defended at the time by the United Kingdom, the United States and other Western Powers, which were portraying those half-hearted measures almost as a kind of panacea for all ills. The United Kingdom representatives at that time opposed decisive action against countries violating United Nations resolutions concerning the economic boycott of Southern Rhodesia—first and foremost against Portugal and the South African Republic. The United Kingdom Government had no wish to use other means at its disposal against the racist régime, despite the fact that the demands of the African countries for such action were supported by a majority of States Members of the United Nations.

84. The Soviet delegation pointed out at that time, in December 1966 [1340th meeting], that the measures proposed in the draft resolution submitted at that time were clearly inadequate. It was particularly stressed that, unless the basic demands of the African States were taken into account, that resolution would serve merely as a cover for the sinister manoeuvres of the colonialists and racists. Events have fully borne out the Soviet delegation's warnings that the adoption of such a resolution by the Security Council could be taken advantage of by the colonialist countries to protect the interests of monopoly capital, which profits from the exploitation of the indigenous African population of that country.

85. The Governments of the United Kingdom, the United States and some other Western countries did not even carry out the inadequate measures provided for in the Council resolution. Those governments turn a blind eye to all sorts of wiles and stratagems by means of which the monopolies in those countries are evading the formal prohibitions.

86. Quite recently, Russell, one of Smith's assistants, stated that from January to July 1967 only the cost of

British goods imported into Rhodesia had amounted to £5.9 million. This figure includes machines and transport equipment to a value of £3.4 million, various manufactured articles to a value of £1.7 million, and chemical products to a value of £480,000.

87. In connexion with the attempts of Mr. Thomson, the United Kingdom Secretary of State for Commonwealth Affairs, to refute the fact of the United Kingdom's violation of the economic sanctions, this Southern Rhodesian racist stressed that the United Kingdom Government had either distorted its figures, in order to hoodwink its African friends, or did not even know what was going on in its own backyard.

88. Another of Smith's henchmen, D. Young, declared on 21 September 1967 that Southern Rhodesia was able to import sufficient quantities of oil, armaments and ammunition, aircraft, machines and equipment. Where then are the sanctions? It is also known that in 1967 there was a significant expansion of production, for example in the Southern Rhodesian mining industry, with the co-operation and participation of Western monopolies. A further seventy-four mines and pits were brought into operation.

89. In the statement of the Chairman of the Committee of Twenty-Four—the representative of Tunisia, Ambassador Mestiri—which was transmitted on 19 March 1968 to the Security Council pursuant to a decision of that Committee, we read that: "Despite sanctions, new foreign investments are still being made in Southern Rhodesia and the level of imports during the first half of 1967 was nearly 20 per cent higher than during the same period in 1966". [S/8474.]

90. South Africa and Portugal are playing a special role in the deliberate sabotage of the Security Council resolutions concerning economic sanctions. As the Secretary-General rightly pointed out in the Introduction to his annual report to the twenty-second session of the General Assembly:

"... the policies pursued by the Governments of South Africa and Portugal, controlling as they do the trade routes of land-locked Southern Rhodesia, have strengthened the economic position of the illegal régime and have fortified it in its defiance of the international community."¹¹

91. The facts show that the so-called "alliance of three" or, as Africans call it, "the unholy alliance", namely, the South African racists, the Smith clique and the Portuguese colonists, becomes more and more overt in form and aggressive in nature. From joint action to oppress and suppress the indigenous African population, the racists are passing on to the organization and commission of aggressive acts against independent African States.

92. The centre for planning such operations, according to a recent issue of *The Times* of London, is the military council of these three racist régimes. One of this alliance's aggressive acts, as is well known, was the recent invasion of the Congo by Belgian mercenaries with the direct connivance of the Portuguese colonialists in Angola. At the

¹¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Supplement No. 1A*, para. 124.

present time, the racists and colonialists are making active preparations for aggressive moves against another African State—Zambia. In South West Africa, annexed by the racist régime of Pretoria, and in the immediate vicinity of the Zambian frontier, a military air base has been constructed which, again according to *The Times*, cannot be anything but a base for offensive acts against Zambia. Indeed, from there and from the territory of Southern Rhodesia the armed forces of the racist régime of South Africa have already perpetrated a number of provocative acts against Zambia. Arms supplied by Portugal play an important role in the hostile acts committed by the racists against African States. Everyone knows that behind Portugal stands the NATO military bloc which offers wide military assistance to Portugal.

93. The British philosopher Bertrand Russell recently wrote in the *New Statesman*: "An important part of NATO activity is the support of the remnants of European colonialism. The success or failure of Portugal's attempts to preserve its African empire depends entirely on American aid supplied to it through NATO." These are the words and testimony of an eminent and world-famous English philosopher and scholar.

94. The Western Powers, taking advantage of the Lisbon and Pretoria authorities' services, are supplying the Southern Rhodesian régime with such important strategic materials as oil. This is further proof of the fact that they are directly violating even the limited sanctions provided for in the Security Council resolution.

95. The President of Zambia, Mr. Kaunda, declared at a press conference in Lusaka on 15 February of this year that, between January 1966 and August 1967, over 700,000 tons of oil and petroleum products had been sent to Mozambique for trans-shipment to Southern Rhodesia. Who supplied this oil and these petroleum products? It is clear from the documents mentioned by the President that the oil supplies for Southern Rhodesia were dispatched in British, Greek, Norwegian and other Western countries' ships. In thirty-six trips, British vessels delivered over 125,000 tons of petroleum products. Oil is delivered to the illegal racist régime of Smith by the most important international imperialist monopolies, foremost among which are American and British oil companies such as Mobil, Caltex and Shell. The leading role played by British and American companies in violating the Security Council sanctions was acknowledged by the Portuguese Minister for Foreign Affairs in his statement of 19 December 1967. Such are the facts.

96. As a result of the deliberate sabotage by several Western Powers of the Security Council decisions, the Southern Rhodesian racists have accumulated such large strategic reserves of oil that they have been able to make a significant increase in the sales levels of this commodity, as if international sanctions against that régime did not exist at all.

97. Thus, this policy of protection for the racist minority in Southern Rhodesia has behind it the deep financial and economic interests of British and American monopoly capital as well as of monopolies in Western Germany, the

South African Republic and several other countries operating in Southern Rhodesia. United Nations documents contain abundant facts and data showing that foreign capital plays a decisive role in the Southern Rhodesian economy, especially in the mining and the tobacco industries.

98. It is not by chance, therefore, that the twenty-second session of the General Assembly, in resolution 2262 (XXII) concerning Southern Rhodesia, condemned the activities of those foreign monopolies and other interests which, by supporting and assisting the illegal racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia, and by their exploitation of the human and material resources of that country, are undermining the effective implementation of sanctions and are impeding the people of Zimbabwe from attaining freedom and independence. The General Assembly called upon the Governments of the countries concerned to take all necessary measures to end such activities on the part of Western monopolies. The Assembly also resolutely condemned the policies of the South African Republic and of Portugal in giving further support to the racist régime in Salisbury, thus grossly violating the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. The Council must give the most serious attention to these appeals by the General Assembly, which for its part has taken all due measures.

99. It is obvious that if Britain, the United States, Western Germany and several other Western countries ceased entirely to give economic and other assistance to the racist régime in Southern Rhodesia, and severed all economic and other relations with it, as called for in the Security Council resolution, the foundation of the Smith racist clique's existence would be undermined. Attention must also be drawn to the fact that some Western Powers are not inclined to sever their connexions with the Salisbury régime in the political and diplomatic field either. In Security Council resolution 217 (1965) of 20 November 1965, it was proposed and recommended that all States should refuse to recognize the illegal racist authorities in Salisbury and to maintain any form of diplomatic or other relations with it. However, a study of official publications of the State Department of the United States for January 1968 shows that in Salisbury there was a United States Consulate-General with six officials. How can this fact, this attitude of the United States, be in keeping with the Security Council demand to sever all diplomatic and other relations with the Smith régime?

100. We cannot fail, furthermore, to be alerted by the statement which the United Kingdom representative made yesterday [1399th meeting]. He spoke to the effect that this was no time for arguments and accusations, but for action. The question naturally arises, who and what prevented or prevents Britain from acting? It is Britain which, as administering authority over Southern Rhodesia, has all the means required to take effective measures against the racists in Salisbury; it is the British Government which holds all the cards, so to speak.

101. However, all these pious appeals, and all this verbal thunder and lightning, against the racist Smith clique, are at variance with the real line taken by the United Kingdom, a line which has been justly criticized by the African

representatives in the Security Council. It is easy to see that if things go in this way, the racist régime in Salisbury will not be abolished but, on the contrary, with the assistance of its high protectors, will pursue its criminal activities.

102. The maintenance of the present situation in Southern Rhodesia, a situation which constitutes a serious threat to the peace and security of the African peoples and to international peace, cannot be tolerated. The continuance in power of the Southern Rhodesian racists brings, with each new day, further suffering for millions of Africans.

103. The Soviet Union is ready to continue its co-operation with the African countries and other peace-loving States in rendering the utmost assistance to the Zimbabwe people in its just and lawful struggle. The Soviet Union, true to its policy of support for the national liberation struggle of colonial peoples, has taken the necessary measures to carry out in full all the provisions of the Security Council resolutions on the question of Southern Rhodesia. It speaks out in favour of the adoption by the Security Council of such decisions and measures as would really lead to the speedy abolition of racism in that part of Africa.

104. Reflecting the will and demands of the peoples of our country, the Soviet Committee of Solidarity with the Countries of Asia and Africa published the following statement in connexion with the execution of the Zimbabwe patriots:

"The Soviet people are deeply shocked at the news of the new crime by the demented racists in Rhodesia. The executioners of the Zimbabwe African people have committed yet another bloody crime, in executing the Zimbabwe patriots Victor Mlambo, James Dhlamini and Duly Shadreck, together with 110 of their comrades who were also condemned to death and were fighting for the happiness and freedom of their people.

"Having committed this crime, the ruling circles of Rhodesia have once again proved the essentially racist nature of their régime and have flung an open challenge to world public opinion.

"This orgy of tyranny and lawlessness in the country is a direct result of the policy of assistance to the Smith régime pursued by the United Kingdom authorities.

"The Soviet people, together with all progressive humanity, holds the assassins up to shame, and demands stern retribution on all those responsible for the bloody terror which in Rhodesia has become part of the Government policy, following the example of its fascist mentors in Pretoria".

105. We know that this is the attitude taken also by other Socialist countries. For example, Mr. Kiesewetter, the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the German Democratic Republic, in a telegram addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations,¹² declared that the German Democratic Republic shared the indignation and horror of democratic world public opinion at these infamous

murders. It was at one with all those African countries which demanded more stringent and decisive measures to abolish the cruel régime of racist terror in Southern Rhodesia, and called on the United Kingdom Government finally to play its part in settling the Southern Rhodesian problem in a manner consonant with the interests of the African peoples and the decisions of the United Nations.

106. That attitude of the government of the German Democratic Republic, decisively condemning the racist Smith régime, is radically different from the policy of Western Germany, which is collaborating with and protecting the Southern Rhodesian racists on an ever-increasing scale.

107. The Soviet delegation deems it the duty of the Security Council to demand fulfilment of the Zimbabwe people's inalienable right to freedom and independence, and to confirm once again the legality of their just struggle to achieve that right. The Council must call upon all States to give the utmost moral and material help and support to the Zimbabwe people in its just struggle, against the illegal racist régime, for the freedom and independence of its homeland.

108. It is essential to speak out decisively against the policy of connivance with the racist clique in Salisbury and to put an end to collaboration with the clique of racist imperialist monopolies which are enriching themselves by exploiting the Zimbabwe people and the natural wealth which belongs to it. We also deem it essential for the Security Council to take appropriate measures against those States, including the South African Republic and Portugal, which continue to have economic and other relations with the Southern Rhodesian racist régime.

109. The United Kingdom must take active measures against the minority racist régime in Southern Rhodesia. Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples must be unconditionally guaranteed by the holding of general elections in Southern Rhodesia, on the basis of "one man, one vote", and the immediate transfer of power to a majority government expressing the will of the Zimbabwe people.

110. The Security Council can and must adopt, in accordance with the United Nations Charter, the comprehensive and effective sanctions, against the racist régime in Southern Rhodesia, which the existing situation demands and which are necessary in order to eradicate this hotbed of racism and neo-colonialism.

111. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I had very much hoped that during this debate, in which I knew that strong feelings would be expressed, we could avoid a negative and unconstructive controversy and I still hope that that may be the case. Nevertheless, having listened very carefully to the speech which has just been made by the representative of the Soviet Union, I feel that I cannot let what he has said pass without a brief comment in reply.

112. I set myself during this important discussion, as I indicated yesterday, to put forward practical and effective

¹² See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-third Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1968*, document S/8504.

propositions for the consideration of this Council. This readiness to adopt a forward policy of constructive consultation, I am glad to say, has been well received by other members of this Council and the consultations have already begun. I trust that they can be pursued to effective co-operation and agreement. Therefore I much regret that the representative of the Soviet Union should have thought fit at this time not to move towards co-operation and agreement but, by the use of serious accusation amounting to insult, to reduce the level of the debate on which we are engaged. I very much hope that when he has been longer with us he will be able to moderate the mischief which is done by the information and the text presented to him.

113. He made two most serious accusations against my Government. The first was that, if I remember his words exactly, my Government had not lifted a finger to deal with the illegal declaration of independence in Rhodesia. I do not propose to go over all the ground now, but he must know that from the very first day of the illegal declaration, when my Foreign Minister came to this Council, we declared what action we would take at considerable economic sacrifice, and we called on others to do the same.

114. I shall repeat again what I said yesterday—that no country has done more than my country to give effect to the purposes which we then declared and to the decisions which were subsequently taken by the Council.

115. But an even more grave accusation was then made—the accusation that my Government had specifically abetted the illegal régime. Those were the words used. The strength of the accusation is not increased by the fact that the evidence was provided from those described, rightly enough, as Southern Rhodesian racists and, in the words of the Soviet Union representative, the “acolytes of Smith”. That was the evidence he produced to us and relied upon in making this grave accusation against my country. I shall not attempt to enter into statistics this evening, but I should like to assure him that the information provided to him is wholly unreliable—unreliable to the extent that a figure which he quoted of nearly £6 million as the total value of imports from Britain into Rhodesia, as reported to him, is in fact much nearer £600,000 and is made up of certain categories that are well known, particularly of drugs and medical supplies, books, newspapers and other cultural material, and certain spare parts, especially for machinery which is of value not directly or only to Rhodesia but to neighbouring countries too.

116. When figures are quoted to us, we have a right to expect that they have been checked and authenticated.

117. As to the equally misleading information concerning supplies of oil through the ports of Mozambique, I shall again not enter into details except to point out that, of the tankers carrying oil to Mozambique to which the representative of the Soviet Union referred, a considerable number were carrying crude oil, which cannot be refined in Rhodesia except at the Umtali refinery, which is closed. To suggest, therefore, as I think was done today, that the oil supplied in British ships to Mozambique was destined for or directed to Rhodesia is not substantiated. Again I think that when the representative of the Soviet Union brings statistics to us, he should make sure that they are more reliable.

118. I would further say that there are those who call for sacrifice with the comforting knowledge that no cost or loss or hurt will fall on them. They sound the trumpet for the charge knowing that the trumpeter will not be expected to do more than trumpet. I would urge the representative of the Soviet Union not to put himself in that category.

119. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I shall confine myself to one or two observations. First, what I presented were facts, and I have the sources. Were those facts and sources authenticated? If the United Kingdom representative has doubts about them, let him check them.

120. Secondly, I drew attention to the statement, made yesterday by the United Kingdom representative in which he said that “we must act”. Well, go ahead and act. You hold all the cards. The more active you are, the sooner will the problem be solved.

121. That is all I have to say. If it does not please, it is a pity, and I am sorry.

122. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I have no further speakers on my list. Before adjourning this meeting, I have to inform the Council that in the course of consultations a number of members of the Council have expressed the wish that our next meeting be held tomorrow at three o'clock, in order to allow time for further consultations. Since there seems to be no objection, we shall meet again at that time.

The meeting rose at 5.25 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 во всех районах мира. Наводите 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.
