UN LIBRARY
JAN 24 1974
UN/SA COLLECTION

UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

COPY:
DO NOT REMOVE
FROM ROOM
U-201 (WWRR)

TWENTY-SIXTH YEAR

1603rd MEETING: 30 NOVEMBER 1971

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1603) 1

Adoption of the agenda 1

Complaint by Guinea:
Report of the Security Council Special Mission to the Republic of Guinea established under resolution 295 (1971) (S/10309) 1

Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia:
(a) Letter dated 24 November 1971 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10396);
(b) Fourth report of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) (S/10229 and Add.1 and 2) 8

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.

SIXTEEN HUNDRED AND THIRD MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 30 November 1971, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. E. KULAGA (Poland).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Argentina, Belgium, Burundi, China, France, Italy, Japan, Nicaragua, Poland, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1603)

1. Adoption of the agenda.

2. Complaint by Guinea:
   Report of the Security Council Special Mission to the Republic of Guinea established under resolution 295 (1971) (S/10309).

3. Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia:
   (a) Letter dated 24 November 1971 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10396);
   (b) Fourth report of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) (S/10229 and Add.1 and 2).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Complaint by Guinea

Report of the Security Council Special Mission to the Republic of Guinea established under resolution 295 (1971) (S/10309)*

1. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from French):* On 3 August 1971, at its 1573rd meeting, devoted to consideration of the present item on its agenda, the Security Council decided to invite the representative of Guinea to participate without the right to vote in the debates of the Security Council. In accordance with that decision, I now invite the representative of Guinea to take a seat at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Abdoulaye Touré (Guinea) took a place at the Security Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from French):* In its resolution 295 (1971) the Security Council decided to dispatch a Special Mission to the Republic of Guinea to consult the authorities of Guinea and to submit an immediate report on the situation.

3. At its 1576th meeting, on 26 August 1971, the Council adopted a consensus in accordance with which the Special Mission was to consist of two members of the Council. In a note issued on the same day *[S/10299]*, the President of the Security Council and the Secretary-General indicated that the Special Mission would be composed of the representatives of Argentina and Syria.

4. The Special Mission, consisting of Ambassador George J. Tomeh of Syria and Minister Julio César Carasales of Argentina, was in Guinea from 30 August to 2 September 1971. The report of the Special Mission was published in document S/10309.

5. On behalf of the Security Council, and with the authorization of its members, I wish to make the following statement:

"It will be recalled that on 3 August the Security Council decided to dispatch a Special Mission to the Republic of Guinea. The Special Mission, consisting of the representative of Syria, Ambassador George J. Tomeh, and the deputy representative of Argentina, Minister Julio César Carasales, visited Guinea from 30 August to 2 September 1971 and held extensive consultations with officials of the Government of Guinea.

"In those consultations, the Guinean authorities cooperated fully with the Special Mission and extended to it all the facilities necessary for the successful achievement of its task.

"Upon its return to New York, and in accordance with its terms of reference, the Special Mission submitted its report to the Security Council, circulated as document S/10309. The Council began its first examination of the report of the Special Mission at its 1586th meeting on 29 September 1971.

"It is evident from this report that there is continuing concern in Guinea regarding the possibility of renewed acts against that country's territorial integrity and political independence similar to those which led to the events of November 1970. In this respect, the view has been expressed by the Government of Guinea that action should be taken by the Security Council to prevent

* Subsequently issued as *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Special Supplement No. 4* (S/10309/Rev.1).

Portugal from violating the territorial integrity and political independence of Guinea.

"It is also clear that the failure by Portugal to apply the principle of self-determination, including the right to independence, in Guinea (Bissau) is having an unsettling effect on conditions in the area.

"The Security Council, having taken note with appreciation of the report of the Special Mission and of the representations made by the Government of Guinea, reiterates operative paragraph 1 of its resolution 295 (1971), which affirms that the territorial integrity and political independence of the Republic of Guinea must be respected."

6. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): I shall make a very brief statement. My delegation would like to express its appreciation to the members of the Special Mission which visited Guinea and to you, Mr. President, for your successful efforts in drawing up the consensus which has been unanimously approved. We have taken particular note of the phrase, in the sixth paragraph, which coincides with the United States view that the exercise of self-determination can result in various alternatives, including independence.

7. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) *(interpretation from Spanish):* The delegation of Argentina wishes first to emphasize its satisfaction at the speed with which this Council acted on the complaint of the Government of Guinea. It is fitting to recall that on the very day on which the note on the matter was received from the permanent representative of the Republic of Guinea, Ambassador Touré, the President of the Security Council convened a meeting, which was held in the afternoon of that day, 3 August.

8. We wish to extend special thanks to the then President of the Security Council, Ambassador Piero Vinci of Italy, for his prompt action and effectiveness in guiding the debate on the matter. We hope that that precedent will not be forgotten in future practices of the Council.

9. Secondly, we wish to express our appreciation for the cordial and efficient manner in which the Government of Guinea received this Council's Mission, of which Minister Julio Cesar Carasales, deputy representative of Argentina, had the special honour of being a member.

10. We are pleased to see that the work of the Mission, which was presided over so brilliantly by the permanent representative of Syria, Ambassador George Tomeh, has not been in vain and that the spirit of the report is reflected in the consensus the Council has just adopted.

11. Let this experience provide an opportunity to reaffirm once again here and now the inalienable right of all States to full respect for their sovereignty and independence. Let this be a vivid example of what the representatives of Argentina have so many times stated: that the survival of colonial situations will always be likely to engender anachronistic conflicts given the present situation of mankind.

12. In conclusion I should like to express my happiness at seeing among us once again my friend Ambassador Tomeh, after the illness that has kept him away from the Council. We clearly recall that the last time he attended a Council meeting was when he introduced the report of the Mission that this body sent to Guinea and that at that time, in a lengthy statement and with that special eloquence characteristic of all his statements, Ambassador Tomeh brought out everything the Mission had done. We are pleased to see him among us again, and we wish him a complete recovery.

13. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) *(translated from Chinese):* In November 1970 the Portuguese colonialists flagrantly sent mercenaries to launch a sudden attack on the Republic of Guinea by piratical means in a vain attempt to subvert the Government of the Republic of Guinea, headed by President Sékou Touré and throw the Guinean people back into the dark days of colonial rule. The Chinese Government and people express utmost indignation at that naked act of aggression and strongly condemn it.

14. Under the command of President Sékou Touré the heroic Guinean people, filled with indignation against the enemy, dealt heavy blows to the invaders and victoriously defended their State's sovereignty and national independence. The Chinese Government and people warmly praise the Guinean people for their revolutionary spirit in defying brutal force, upholding unity and resisting the enemy with concerted efforts, and hail the victories achieved by the Guinean people in its struggle against aggression.

15. It is particularly worth mentioning that when the Guinean people was subjected to aggression the great majority of African countries and peoples, united as one, gave powerful support to the Guinean people, thus setting an example for mutual support and assistance among the oppressed peoples and nations in their struggle against colonialism and neo-colonialism.

16. Although the Portuguese colonial authorities ignominiously failed in their armed invasion, the nature of the colonialists and neo-colonialists will not change. They will continue to conduct their last-ditch struggles. The facts prove that they have never for a moment ceased to plot aggression against the Republic of Guinea and recently they have been contriving a new scheme to invade Guinea again. That has been irrefutably proved, with abundant evidence, by the Government of the Republic of Guinea, which has called the attention of the Security Council to that scheme, requesting it to take the measures necessary to prevent the recurrence of large-scale invasion. That request of the Guinean Government is just, and we firmly support it. Countless facts prove that the colonialist policies pursued by the Portuguese authorities constitute a threat to the sovereignty and security of independent African States, a challenge to the African peoples' right to national independence and a grave violation of the spirit of the United Nations Charter. How can the Portuguese colonialists, who are corrupt in the extreme, dare to perpetrate such glaring acts of aggression and now be preparing for military adventures on an even larger scale? Because they have the support and connivance of other imperialists. It is not difficult to see that their aim is not only to subvert the Government of the Republic of Guinea but also to suppress

the national liberation movement, vigorously developing in Africa. Therefore the significance of the Guinean people's struggle far exceeds the limits of Guinea. The Guinean people are fighting not only for the independence and sovereignty of their motherland but also for the independence and sovereignty of other African States, and they are giving support to all the countries of the world that treasure their own independence and sovereignty.

17. The Guinean people is by no means isolated in its struggle. All the peoples of the world that uphold justice firmly support them; the Chinese people firmly supports it. Victory surely belongs to the Guinean people, who uphold justice, heighten their vigilance and persevere in their fight.

18. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): In his final statement to the Security Council's Special Mission to Guinea, President Sékou Touré summed up the matter before us quite simply when he said: "The purpose of our recourse to the Security Council is to ensure that our right to live in peace will be respected." *[S/10309/Rev.1, p. 41.]* This Council would be failing in its most essential function if it did not respond to President Touré's appeal in a positive manner.

19. The key to peace and security for Guinea, as it is for Senegal and other Territories that border Portuguese-held colonies in Africa, is for Portugal to grant, or be made to grant, to the peoples under its colonial rule their right to self-determination and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). In any event, Portugal must be left in no doubt that it stands condemned in the eyes of the international community as a source of injustice, of unrest and of aggression, and that the Security Council will be keeping close watch on the situation which has given rise to grave apprehension in the Republic of Guinea.

20. President Touré has thrown into bold relief the problem faced by small States which are under direct or indirect threat of aggression and whose only recourse is to a body influenced by other considerations besides a strict regard for accepted international law. He asked, quite legitimately, what the Council's attitude would have been had the Portuguese aggression of November 1970 been successful. With an understandable cynicism he said he believed that the Council would simply have recorded the brutal fact and done nothing about it. Yet, like the Heads of State of many other African countries, he has confidence in the Security Council despite his awareness that its constitution and its method of operating still fall very far short of what he regards as "... the basis for a true international equilibrium for the lasting and effective protection of the legitimate rights of every people" *[ibid.]*.

21. The consensus which this Council has reached on the question of Guinea's complaint does not, in the view of my delegation, go as far as it should, but at least we are in agreement that the people of Guinea are under threat of aggression; that that threat emanates from the Portuguese authorities in Africa; that its basic cause is Portugal's oppression of the African people under its rule; and that the Security Council continues to stand by its affirmation, contained in resolution 295 (1971), that the territorial independence of the Republic of Guinea must be respected.

22. My delegation believes that this Council must take careful note of the fact that the threat to Guinea takes the form of political and military sabotage carried out by mercenary soldiers employed by Portugal. These elements were in evidence in the Portuguese-led attack against Guinea in November 1970, and the Guinean intelligence services are convinced that a similar attack has been planned for the near future.

23. The consensus which this Council has reached does not, in the view of my delegation, go as far as it should. It is the very minimum that can be offered by way of a reply to Guinea. But since it also represents the maximum amount of agreement that can be arrived at in the present circumstance and since it recognizes the main elements of the situation in question, my delegation has given it our approval.

24. Mr. FREELAND (United Kingdom): My delegation in its turn would like to express its gratitude for the contribution made by the Council's Special Mission. We have readily associated ourselves with the consensus statement that you, Mr. President, have made on behalf of the Council this morning.

25. However, with regard to the penultimate paragraph of the consensus we feel bound to reiterate a view which is I am sure familiar to the other members of the Council. Although we fully endorse the principle of self-determination, including the right to independence, for all Non-Self-Governing Territories, we consider that responsibility for the implementation of that principle and its timing rests with the administering Power.

26. Mr. TERENCE (Burundi) *(interpretation from French)*: My delegation is pleased to see that the representative of Syria, who was Chairman of the Special Mission of the Council in Guinea, is here among us again. We are very happy to see him and that he has recovered from the illness that confined him to his bed for some weeks, during which we were unfortunately deprived of his presence. We wish to tell him how very grateful we are to him for the success he achieved during his mission together with his colleague the representative of Argentina.

27. On several occasions, in regard to the problem of security as well as in regard to decolonization, we have made our position known, namely, that for the African countries security is closely tied to complete decolonization. That is why we should briefly like to deal with the substance of the problem. For the events in Guinea and in Senegal reflect an over-all insecurity in the region and this over-all insecurity is due exclusively to the fact that Portuguese domination is being perpetuated in the region. Hence, if we wish to succeed in having the political independence and national sovereignty of every State—particularly Guinea and Senegal—respected, the Security Council must contribute to the extirpation, to the final eradication of the causes which are at the root of the evil, namely, the continued presence of Portugal in Guinea (Bissau).

28. Members of the Security Council realize that Portugal has repeatedly tried to clear itself of the blame for its

attacks against Guinea. But we, for our part, say that if Portugal withdraws from Guinea (Bissau), the situation now prevailing would no longer exist.

29. At any rate, it is for the Security Council to set everything in motion to ensure respect for the right to sovereignty and independence of countries which are already independent. But since the situation is directly related to the fact that Portugal continues to dominate Guinea (Bissau), it is equally indispensable that that country accede to independence and that the entire region finally be protected from the continous threats to which it has been subjected.

30. Mr. TAYLOR-KAMARA (Sierra Leone): My delegation has already expressed thanks and appreciation to the Special Mission which visited the Republic of Guinea for the excellent report it submitted in document S/10309 of 15 September 1971. The report was ably presented to the Security Council by Ambassador George Tomeh of the Syrian Arab Republic, one of the members comprising the Mission, and debated at some length by the Council.

31. A close study of the report and other previous reports on Guinea has disclosed that there have been constant Portuguese armed interventions against Guinea as far back as the year 1961. It apparently follows that all these years the Government of Portugal has constantly been planning, for no just cause or causes, to interfere with and change the lawful Government of the Republic of Guinea by unlawful means.

32. My delegation is of the opinion that those illegal and unconstitutional acts, tantamount to clear acts of aggression, trespass and assault, culminated in interference in the sovereignty, integrity and security of the Republic of Guinea. In circumstances such as these, the Security Council should waste no time in taking appropriate action, as provided for in the United Nations Charter, against Portugal to redress the grievances of the Republic of Guinea and to make it desist forthwith from carrying out any further act or acts which would interfere in the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic.

33. As in the case of Senegal, since Guinea has at no time been at war with Portugal, it seems to my delegation that it is the duty of the Security Council, once a case has been made and proved, to prevent Portugal from attempting further to carry out consistently its illegal and unconstitutional acts against the Republic of Guinea. In this connexion I beg to reiterate what my delegation, through our Prime Minister, has stated before: that there are various ways of changing a government. The world has, however, now developed towards the stage where there are accepted democratic ways, working democratically through the people; not by using money, force and mercenaries in order to induce those who are the leaders lawfully chosen by the people.

34. In the light of these considerations, my delegation agrees to associate itself with the statement of the President of Guinea in the hope that the same will be accepted *in toto* by the members of the Security Council and acted upon.

35. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) *(translated from Russia)*: During the past year the Security Council has frequently been forced to meet to consider acts of aggression by Portugal against independent African States. Only a few days ago the Council considered the situation created by Portugal's policy against the Republic of Senegal. Today the Council has on its agenda an item related to the latest intrigues of the Portuguese colonialists against another African State, the Republic of Guinea.

36. As in the case of Senegal, where a Security Council mission reached a conclusion on Portugal's responsibility for an attack on a sovereign African State, so in this case the Security Council has before it a report from its Special Mission which, as a result of a visit to Guinea, has presented the Council with factual evidence of the intrigues of the imperialist forces, and, above all, of Portugal, against the existing order in the Republic of Guinea and against that country's sovereignty and territorial independence and integrity.

37. In this connexion the Soviet delegation would like to point out that the Security Council's Special Mission to the Republic of Guinea, which was composed of the distinguished Permanent Representative of Syria, Ambassador George Tomeh, whose return today after his illness we welcome and to whom we wish long life and strength, and the distinguished representative of Argentina, Mr. Carasales, honourably discharged the task entrusted to it by the Council.

38. Having studied the material provided by the Mission, it is with great concern that we note that the line taken by Portugal with respect to the Republic of Guinea has not changed in the slightest—I repeat, in the slightest—since the Security Council considered the question of Portugal's open aggression against the Republic of Guinea in November 1970, approximately one year ago. I should like to remind you that on the basis of the information submitted at that time by the Special Mission, the Council adopted resolution 290 (1970), in which it solemnly warned the Government of Portugal that:

> "in the event of any repetition or armed attacks against independent African States, the Security Council shall immediately consider appropriate effective steps or measures in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations".

One would have thought a warning to the Portuguese colonialists from the highest organ of the United Nations, the Security Council, would be sufficient to discourage them from encroaching on the sovereignty of independent African States. However, that was not the case, and, as is shown by the facts submitted by the new Security Council Special Mission to the Republic of Guinea established under resolution 295 (1971) of 3 August 1971, this is still not the case.

39. Portugal's latest acts, which were investigated by the Security Council Special Mission to Guinea, show that it is unwilling to cease encroaching on the independence of the African countries bordering on its colonies, in which it is

employing barbaric methods to put down the national liberation movement. In other words, Portugal stubbornly continues to pursue its colonialist policy on African soil, 2 million square kilometres of which still lie beneath Lisbon's colonial yoke in flagrant violation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Peoples and Countries. Portugal continues to crush the African peoples and uses the territory of its own colonies as a bridge-head for aggressive attacks against independent African States. It is a well-known fact that it is not only Guinea and Senegal which have frequently been subjected to attacks by Portuguese armed forces, but also other African States including Zambia, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zaire.

40. Portugal's policy of imperialist aggression against Guinea and the other African States clearly shows the urgent need for the speedy and complete elimination of colonial and racist régimes and for the removal of the threat which colonialism represents to the peace and security of the African nations. It is now clearer than ever before that as long as even one colonial régime remains on the African continent and until all armed forces have been removed and all the colonialists' military bases have been dismantled, there will be a continuing threat to the peaceful and free existence and development of the States of Africa.

41. The growing alliance in Africa between international imperialism and Portuguese colonialism and South African and Southern Rhodesian racism is being strengthened by the common goal of the struggle against the national liberation movement in order to preserve the political, economic and strategic interests of imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism. The effects of this co-ordinated action by the imperialists, colonialists and racists are clear to everyone and, above all, to the African States. It is a policy of plots and *coups d'état*, a policy of aggression and shameless interference in the affairs of the independent countries of Africa.

42. The President of the Republic of Guinea, Mr. Sékou Touré, made an absolutely clear and unambiguous statement on the policy of the imperialist countries during his talks with the members of the Special Mission. I shall take the liberty of quoting an extract from this extremely interesting conversation. President Sékou Touré said, and I quote:

> "... these nations would prefer to use brute force to impose the system of their choice and thus to obtain the unrestricted use of Guinea's resources. The root problem is that these nations have not adapted themselves to the exigencies of peace and security, that they are not willing to regard international law and the right of self-determination of every nation as a genuine force. They would still like to impose their will by brute strength. This is the tragic situation which has its impact on Guinea's relations with certain NATO countries." *[S/10309/Rev.1, pp. 40 and 41.]*

43. The Soviet Union consistently supports the struggle of the African and other peoples for national liberation and for the strengthening of the independence of young States in the face of the intrigues of colonialism and neo-colonialism. In the programme of the struggle for peace and international co-operation drawn up by the Twenty-Fourth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, one of the main aims of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union is described as follows, and I quote: "to give an immediate and firm rebuff to any acts of aggression and international arbitrariness. For this, full use must also be made of the possibilities of the United Nations."

44. The complete elimination of the last vestiges of colonialism and of the canker of racism in Africa would be in the interests of the preservation and strengthening of universal peace and the security of all peoples.

45. The First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev, in his report to the Twenty-Fourth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, stressed that "the United Nations decisions on the abolition of the remaining colonial régimes must be fully carried out."

46. The Soviet delegation believes that, in connexion with the matter under discussion, the Security Council should take all possible measures to protect the political independence and the territorial integrity of Guinea, as well as of other African countries, from the aggressive schemes of the Portuguese colonialists.

47. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from French):* I should like to speak briefly now in my capacity as the representative of POLAND.

48. First of all, I should like to extend our congratulations and gratitude to the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, Mr. George Tomeh, whom we welcome back after a long and much regretted absence, and also to the deputy permanent representative of Argentina, Minister César Carasales, for their report on the consultations they held with the representatives of the Government of the Republic of Guinea from 30 August to 2 September of this year.

49. The delegation of Poland had the honour of participating in the Special Mission of the Security Council which, after going to Guinea in November 1970, unanimously concluded that Portugal was responsible for the aggression committed on 22, 23 and 24 November 1970 against the Republic of Guinea.[1] We accordingly paid the most serious attention to the most recent Guinean complaint and treated it with full comprehension.

50. The report now before us clearly indicates that a situation of direct threat to the territorial integrity and the political independence of the Republic of Guinea continues to exist. This report by the members of the Special Mission also concluded that in Guinea there is genuine and completely justified concern over the latent possibility of new acts of aggression.

51. We subscribe, even though we would have preferred firmer language, to the observation in the consensus of the Council which we have just adopted that

[1] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-fifth Year, Special Supplement No. 2*, chap. III.

"the failure by Portugal to apply the principle of self-determination, including the right to independence, in Guinea (Bissau) is having an unsettling effect on conditions in the area".

52. In the opinion of the delegation of Poland the Security Council must bear in mind that the continued existence of Portuguese colonialism in Africa and its colonial wars against the African peoples are a permanent threat and constant source of aggression against the independent African States. Only the final liquidation of colonialism and racism in Africa and the accession to independence of all the colonized peoples can create the necessary conditions for the establishment of security in that region, which is an essential guarantee of the territorial integrity and political independence of the independent African States.

53. At the same time I wish to assure the representative of the Republic of Guinea, Ambassador Touré, and the members of the Security Council that Poland, in accordance with its traditional attitude, will spare no effort to contribute to the complete and prompt attainment of those objectives.

54. As PRESIDENT, I now call on the representative of Guinea.

55. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) *(interpretation from French):* Mr. President, I am very happy to see you presiding over the Security Council for the month of November. The relations of fruitful co-operation which exist between the People's Republic of Poland and the Republic of Guinea are too well known for me to have to refer to them here. I have had the pleasure of knowing you for more than a decade; we met when you and I represented our respective countries in another friendly African country. At that time I became aware of your great human qualities, your competence and your vast knowledge of diplomatic matters, both African and international.

56. As you said a few minutes ago, Mr. President, you were a member of the mission of inquiry of the Security Council which visited my country last November. We remember in this connexion the very important role which you, together with your eminent colleagues, played on that mission.

57. Finally, fate—which arranges things so well—has given us the opportunity today of seeing you in the Chair of the Security Council in this new month of November, one year after the criminal aggression of Portugal against my country, the Republic of Guinea.

58. In the general agreement whose text you read out a few moments ago, Mr. President—an agreement which, as far as the delegation of the Republic of Guinea is concerned, is only the minimum to which many delegations have referred—the Security Council has drawn its conclusions from the report of the Special Mission sent to the Republic of Guinea as a result of its request of 3 August 1971 *[S/10280]*.

59. The Guinean delegation wishes to submit certain observations which it has drawn from your lengthy consultations on a matter which falls exclusively within the subject of the maintenance of international peace and security.

60. The Government of the Republic of Guinea, in agreeing to receive on its territory the special advisory mission of the Security Council, demonstrated once again its great respect for and confidence in the organ of the United Nations entrusted with the maintenance of peace and security throughout the world. However, the reality is that this confidence and respect which we, the African countries, place in the Charter of the United Nations and its most important organ are unfortunately not shared by certain Member States, including Portugal, although those countries have subscribed to the Charter.

61. For that reason we state with conviction that one of the ills that beset the African continent is the stubbornness and obstinacy of Portugal in violating the Charter deliberately and with impunity, by maintaining under its domination millions of Africans in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau).

62. Obstinately, Portugal continues to consider African territories as an extension of its metropolis, the metropolis wherein brave sons and daughters of the Portuguese people, solidly organized within the army of revolutionary and anti-colonialist action, are striking powerful blows at the bases of Portuguese fascism in Lisbon and other Portuguese cities. These brave fighters for freedom have attacked, directly and effectively, various installations and sites from which the Portuguese fascist Government derives its strength and power. The Portuguese fascist Government, through its colonial armies, terrorizes the African populations by sowing death and devastation, by burning our forests and our crops.

63. This is the place to bring to the attention of members of the Security Council the message which the Secretary-General of the Liberation Movement of the African Independence Party of Guinea and the Cape Verde Islands, our brother and friend Amílcar Cabral, addressed to the United Nations Committee on decolonization[2] and to the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly, in connexion with an escalation in the crimes of the Portuguese colonialist army:

"Desperate in the face of the great victories brought by our party during this year, the criminal Portuguese colonialists have launched a wave of savage air bombings since August against the peasant population in our liberated areas. As of the end of October, 38 villages were destroyed, 7 women and 8 children killed and 28 wounded.

"They have not succeeded in terrorizing or demoralizing our people in their determination to pursue the just struggle for liberty, peace and progress. I bring to your attention that the Portuguese colonialists are feverishly preparing to spread toxic chemical products in order

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

to destroy our crops before the next harvest. The goal is clearly to stop our struggle by famine. We face dismal prospects resulting from these preparations.

"We request you to take all measures in your reach to denounce and condemn in advance this monstrous crime against Africa and humanity."

64. The Portuguese Government blindly and obstinately persists in the absurd fiction of trying to transform into Portuguese citizens—despite their own wishes—African populations which possess their own languages and their own culture.

65. We reaffirm here that there is no quarrel between the African peoples and the Portuguese people.

66. In the light of the lesson that we have learned from the continuously belligerent and aggressive attitude of the fascist colonialist Government of Portugal, it is not naive to believe—taking into account the noble ideals of the Charter—that the maintenance and safeguarding of the peace and security of independent African countries is weighed differently, on the basis of criteria which escape us and always at our cost.

67. The colonialist Portuguese Government, in its hateful determination to block the progress of history, attacks the Republic of Guinea and other independent African States. If the armed aggressions against an African State are designated, in accordance with the miscalculations of our opponents, to delay the date of their eviction, which has become inevitable, from the African territories that they still occupy, they actually are contributing to mobilizing the will of the Africans in their struggle for their freedom and dignity and true independence.

68. The people of Guinea will never forget 22 November 1970. Towards the end of the night of 22 November 1970, Portuguese warships—which were claimed to be pleasure yachts—under cover of thick fog entered our territorial waters and landed military units at Conakry, our capital. Both Portuguese military units and mercenaries recruited by Portugal among *émigrés* and other men of all nationalities ready to serve for money took part in that bandit-like attack against the Republic of Guinea. The immediate purpose of the aggression was to overthrow the progressive régime of Guinea and deal a serious blow against the liberation movement of the independence African party of Guinea and of the islands of Cape Verde led by Amílcar Cabral.

69. The whole world remembers the defeat suffered by the Portuguese aggressors on 22, 23 and 24 November 1970 in Conakry and on 26 and 28 November 1970 at Koundara and Gaoual.

70. We know by experience that the focal point of the undermining activity of imperialism, which supports Portuguese colonialism, is directed first of all against the progressive African States and against all those continuously and resolutely struggling against imperialism. The choice of the Government of the Republic of Guinea for a non-capitalist development has made of it the primary target of imperialism, in view of the riches of the soil and sub-soil of Guinea.

71. In order to cover up the repetition of the aggression of November 1970, all means are being mobilized by imperialism to discredit the Republic of Guinea and its democratic and popular institutions. In order to try to have the criminal Portuguese aggression of November 1970 forgotten, the imperialist press will publish its various poisonous and untrue reports. But 22 November 1970 was a call to vigilance for the African peoples and all progressive peoples.

72. The African continent, long subjected to the systematic exploitation of its human and material resources, needs total peace and full security in order to rebuild itself through its various entities carved up by colonialism. We need security on our borders and peace in our villages to catch up on the technical delay imposed upon us by colonialism and which imperialist exploitation wishes to maintain and perpetuate. The peace and security indispensable for the development of our potential are denied to us by mediaeval Portugal, supported by its allies.

73. We are obliged today to note with frustration that the United Nations and, in addition, the Security Council seem as the years go by to be more and more powerless to impose on the fascist and colonialist Portuguese Government the recognition of the right to self-determination and independence of colonial countries and peoples.

74. As we did so at the twenty-fourth, twenty-fifth and the current sessions of the General Assembly, we reaffirm today before the Security Council that the colonialist Government of Portugal is feverishly and actively preparing a new armed aggression against the Republic of Guinea. The criminal Portuguese aggression of November 1970 against Guinea took place despite our justified warnings—warnings that were given in time to alert international public opinion.

75. We provided the Special Mission of the Security Council with proof of the machinations that are now under way on the territory of Guinea (Bissau), which is under Portugal's control. It is unnecessary to repeat them today before the members of the Council. The report of the Special Mission has made them sufficiently clear.

76. What we can add in this connexion is that on 10 November 1971, between 10.30 and 11.05 GMT, six Portuguese military aircraft violated our air space in the frontier areas of Boké, Gaoual and Koundara, in the north-west of Guinea. Moreover, a white mercenary calling himself Chayeux, a citizen of a Western European country captured on our borders on 8 November 1971, told us that he wished to reach the territory of Guinea (Bissau), where, according to him, commando units to which he belonged were actively preparing to launch within a few days an armed action against the Republic of Guinea from the territory of Guinea (Bissau), which is controlled by Portugal.

77. What my Government requests and demands of the Security Council is the protection of our independence by

the Council and respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Guinea by Portugal.

78. The Government of the Republic of Guinea hopes that concrete measures will be adopted to prevent Portugal from once again flouting the provisons of the Charter by violating the independence and territorial integrity of Guinea and to ensure that Portugal shall not again undertake a complex, hostile operation against Guinea and shall no longer make use of military means and open aggression against Guinea from a territory under Portugal's control.

79. If the statements we have made to the Special Mission and reiterated before the Council are challenged, it is up to the Security Council—which is charged with the maintenance of peace and security throughout the world—to carry out an inquiry in Guinea (Bissau) and to bring pressure to bear by all possible means on Portugal in order that Portugal shall commit itself not to use a territory controlled by it for the preparation and the carrying out of a new aggression against the Republic of Guinea such as the one perpetrated on 22 November 1970.

80. It is out of our desire to maintain peace throughout the world that we make this appeal to the members of the Security Council, the organ of the United Nations entrusted with the preservation of peace and the maintenance of the security of all States, small or large.

81. In its latest undertakings Portuguese colonialism has continued to exercise its policy of hate against the population of Guinea (Bissau). In its barbaric repression of the legitimate struggle of the popular masses of Guinea (Bissau), the Portuguese colonialist army has perpetrated the worst of tortures against the people of that country.

82. The Secretary-General of PAIGC has just sent two persons to the United Nations, here in New York, who have suffered criminal acts at the hands of the Portuguese colonialists. One of them—Sambe Fono, 25 years of age—after having his throat slit and being left for dead, suffered the loss of both ears, which the Portuguese cut off as trophies for their Bissau trophy museum. The second—Sambe Zambale, 24 years of age—bears horrible scars from burns caused by Portuguese napalm. Those two victims, whom everyone will be able to see, will soon be meeting with the international press here in New York.

83. In conclusion, I would stress the philosophy of the Guinean Government by quoting Comrade Ahmed Sékou Touré, Chief of State and supreme leader of the Guinean revolution:

> "Any valid historical enterprise, to be solid and durable, must of necessity be based upon the will and just aspirations of the people. The fact that the Guinean people is at the centre of all the essential activities of our régime convinces us that the régime will remain invulnerable, despite the permanent plot directed against it by imperialism and its vile instruments".

84. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from French):* I thank the representative of the Republic of Guinea for the kind words he addressed to me.

85. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic) *(interpretation from French):* Very briefly, Mr. President, I should like to thank you, personally, as well as my eminent colleagues and friends the representatives of Argentina, Burundi, Sierra Leone and the Soviet Union, for the congratulations and kind words addressed to me on the occasion of my resumption of my duties.

86. As regards the congratulations on the work of the Special Mission which was made up of the Deputy Permanent Representative of Argentina and myself, it goes without saying that both of us share whatever success may have been achieved.

87. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from French):* There are no more names on the speakers' list. With the adoption of the consensus which I had the honour to read out at the beginning of the meeting, and having heard the statements of various delegations, including the statement of the representative of the Republic of Guinea, the Council has completed its consideration of the second item on its agenda.

Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia:

(a) **Letter dated 24 November 1971 from the Permanent Representative of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10396);**

(b) **Fourth report of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) (S/10229 and Add.1 and 2)***

88. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from French):* The representatives of the United Republic of Tanzania and Kenya have addressed letters *[S/10399 and S/10400]* to me requesting that they be allowed to participate, without the right to vote, in the Council's debate on the present item. If there is no objection, I shall invite the representatives of those two countries to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber in order to participate in the debate without the right to vote.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. S. A. Salim (United Republic of Tanzania) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

89. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from French):* Before calling on the first speaker I should like to inform members of the Council that, as will be recalled, at the 1602nd meeting the representative of the Soviet Union, supported by the delegation of Somalia, proposed that we invite Mr. Nkomo of ZAPU and Mr. Sithole of ZANU to address the Council in regard to the question on the agenda. At the same meeting I indicated that I would undertake the customary negotiations in that connexion and would inform members of the Council of the results. I have carried out consultations on the subject, but have not been able to complete them. Some delegations have indicated that they agree, while other delegations are not yet able to give a final reply. The consultations will therefore continue, and Council members will, of course, be informed of the results.

* Subsequently issued as *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Special Supplement Nos. 2 and Corrigendum and 2A.*

90. I now invite the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

91. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): Mr. President, in thanking you and the members of the Council for giving my delegation an opportunity to address you on this important question, allow me very briefly to express our satisfaction at seeing you preside over the Security Council's deliberations as it begins consideration of a matter so vital to the African continent. Your credentials as a friend and supporter of those of our brethren fighting against alien domination for freedom and independence need no further elaboration; and the role of your country, the Polish People's Republic, in support of decolonization is appreciated by us all. We have particularly valued the co-operation between your delegation and ours in the Committee of decolonization in pursuit of our common objective, namely, the implementation of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

92. The Security Council is dealing with a very grave matter. Indeed, it would not be exaggerating to state that the Council and the international community as a whole are faced with one of their greatest challenges. The Home-Smith Agreement, which was simultaneously presented on Thursday, 25 November, to the British Parliament by the British Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary, and to this Council by Sir Colin Crowe, the British Permanent Representative, is a tragic and shocking culmination of the British Government's long record of betrayal of the African peoples of Zimbabwe. To understand this unmistakable sell-out of the African interests one must not fail to trace the ignominious history of inconsistency, inaction and double-talk on the part of Her Majesty's Government towards the British colony of Southern Rhodesia.

93. It is therefore small wonder that we listened with great attention to the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom explaining the deal made by Sir Alec with Ian Smith. If we lamented the scenario of the Security Council being specially convened to hear the United Kingdom representative more or less repeat what his Foreign Secretary was informing the British Parliament of, we nevertheless paid undivided attention, since the issue involved is a matter of the gravest concern to my Government. We have also studied the document circulated containing the so-called proposals for settlement.[3]

94. In carefully examining the explanation of events given by the representative of the United Kingdom leading to the present situation, one is struck by one outstanding feature: the United Kingdom's interpretation of these events is at best an apologia for British inaction and, at worst, a clumsy justification for its treachery, double standards and perhaps pre-planned impotence. Let us not confuse the issue. It is an exercise in sheer futility to attempt to exonerate the British Government from the acts perpetrated by the minority authorities in Salisbury. Addressing the Tanzanian National Assembly on Tuesday, 14 December 1965, my President, Mwalimu Nyerere, *inter alia* made the following pertinent remarks on Britain's responsibilities:

> "Southern Rhodesia is a British colony; its Constitution is subject to the will of the British Parliament. As an international entity Southern Rhodesia does not exist. Internationally, by both law and custom, there exist only Britain and its colony. The colony of Southern Rhodesia has been self-governing since 1923; for 43 years, increasing *de facto* power has been exerted by a Government based in Salisbury.
>
> "But the Constitution under which that Government operated reserved certain powers to the British Government and Parliament in London. The fact that successive British Governments did not use their powers to prevent acts which were contrary to the interests of the African people does not alter the existence of these 'reserve powers', nor the ultimate responsibility of the British Government for the actions of the Southern Rhodesian Government".

95. Britain allowed the white Rhodesians substantially to run their own show in 1923 when it gave the colony self-government. This was the beginning of what was to prove to be an evolution of systematic betrayal of the Africans in Southern Rhodesia. It was the British Government that was responsible for the imposition of the much-hated Central African Federation in 1953, comprising Southern Rhodesia, the then Nyasaland, now Malawi, and present-day Zambia, then Northern Rhodesia. When the efforts to perpetuate white-settler domination in the three territories finally crumbled in 1963, thanks to the undiminishing struggle of the African peoples of the so-called Federation, what did Britain do? It handed over the effective war machine—the military equipment, the airplanes, the administration of the land forces and the air force—to the white Rhodesians. And members of this Council will remember that, following the dissolution of the Federation, the United Kingdom effectively blocked the proposal by the delegation of Ghana in the Security Council *[1069th meeting]* which, if adopted, would have prevented the Southern Rhodesian Government from taking over the air force built by the defunct Central African Federation. Thus, Britain conveniently transferred this important instrument of power to the Southern Rhodesian racists. Yet we now hear proclamations of how limited British capability has been to act in the Rhodesian problem.

96. The history of the British Government's appeasement of the white settlers is ingloriously long. Even after Prime Minister Macmillan had made his famous speech in South Africa on the winds of change sweeping throughout the continent, the Colonial Office in London was still making more concessions to the racists in Salisbury. Thus, while the Central African Federation was on the verge of its inevitable collapse, the white settlers secured from the British the 1961 Constitution, which essentially provided for the entrenchment of minority rule in Southern Rhodesia while giving a superficial impression of taking into account some African interests. For the provisions of the 1961 Constitution were not democratic and provided no protection to the constitutional rights of the African

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

people. But the saga of unfailing accommodation to the demands of the 250,000 whites in Southern Rhodesia in contrast to callous indifference to the legitimate rights and aspirations of the 5 million blacks highlights the whole conduct of British irresponsibility in Zimbabwe.

97. Britain's application of double standards, its alarming inconsistencies, became more apparent with the events leading to and following the unilateral declaration of independence.

98. Thus, even when Mr. Smith was making noisy rumblings demanding independence and threatening illegal action, Her Majesty's Government's reaction was far from meeting the requirements of the situation. Of course, there was plenty of talk. For example, on 27 October 1964, the then British Prime Minister stated quite appropriately that a unilateral "declaration of independence would be an open act of defiance and rebellion, and it would be treasonable to take steps to give effect to it". Yet, as history proved, these were mere words. For even when the British Prime Minister had made such a valid declaration, on a number of occasions British Ministers, referring to the prospect of a unilateral declaration of independence, timidly declared, "We shall not use force to impose a constitutional solution" to the Rhodesian situation. If Ian Smith and his fellow racists needed any green light to go ahead with their complete usurpation of power, this was certainly it; for the attitude of the British authorities was like telling a would-be murderer: "Murder is a serious crime, but even if you should commit one, no effective punitive action is contemplated against you".

99. I do not really need to repeat here what happened after the unilateral declaration of independence. We are all familiar with the assurances given by the British Prime Minister that the rebellion would be crushed within weeks. And when weeks became months and months became years, we know of the unprecedented and, to say the least, despicable exercises in attempting to woo the rebels. Gone were the legal principles; forgotten were the descriptions so adequately applied to Mr. Smith and his henchmen as "rebels" and "traitors" to the British Crown. The world witnessed the incredible spectacle of a British Prime Minister negotiating with a traitorous element from Her Majesty's own colony. We had the *Tiger* and the *Fearless* talks; we had a series of British Ministers visiting Salisbury for the same purpose, namely, to find a formula which, though a sell-out in essence, would at least retain a semblance of honour and respectability. This task has now been attempted by the Conservative Government through Sir Alec Douglas-Home.

100. That then, very briefly, is the summary of events leading to the present situation in which the British Government has decided on legalizing the usurpation of power by the Smith régime in Southern Rhodesia.

101. It is therefore a cruel joke for the delegation of the United Kingdom to try to rationalize the sell-out by such irrelevant escapism as: "Enough is known of the history of British decolonization to show that we are here dealing with an exceptional and not a typical case" *[1602nd meeting, para. 19]*. The only thing, we submit, which is particularly unique in the Southern Rhodesian tragedy is that here we have independence being given to a minority, that is to say, to the 250,000 whites, to lord it over the majority, namely the 5 million blacks. The feelings of affinity and solidarity with their kith and kin have prevented the British authorities from taking the usual measures for leading one of the British colonies towards democratic independence.

102. Much has already been said about the British failure to quell the rebellion and to restore legality under conditions which would lead the people of Rhodesia to exercise their right to self-determination and independence based on majority rule through universal adult franchise. The African States and indeed the great majority of the Members of this Organization have repeatedly called on the British Government to use force. This course of action was consistently refused. In this connexion we again note that in his address to the Security Council the British chief delegate made use of the occasion to rationalize his Government's inaction by the rhetorical assertion that the application of force was neither feasible nor desirable.

103. We are indeed overwhelmed by such assertions. Is it really credible that Great Britain would not be in a position to bring back law and order in its colony simply because a few white settlers were earlier armed, trained and equipped by the British themselves? That is all right as a fairy tale. We do not wish here to mention examples of the British Government having had to use sheer force in more complicated and unwarranted situations. But we must ask: "Why this special treatment of the Southern Rhodesian colony?" Lectures on British abhorrence of violence notwithstanding, British colonial history is by no means peaceful. If the British authorities have forgotten Kenya and Aden, to mention two examples, the Afro-Asian world has not. We also have the fresh memory of little Anguilla to remind us that as recently as 1969 the British Government, using paratroopers and military police, invaded a little Caribbean island.

104. Much ado is also made of the fact that Southern Rhodesia was an internally self-governing Territory. Yet self-government did not prevent the action of the Conservative Government of Sir Winston Churchill suspending the Constitution of then British Guyana on October 1953 and expelling the Government then in office. That, incidentally, was only six months after a popularly elected Government was voted into power and swore allegiance to the British Crown, in April 1953.

105. Yet it is not just the refusal of the United Kingdom to bring down the rebellion by force that has made the British authorities a target for constant condemnation. It is the whole negative attitude of the British Government towards meeting its responsibilities and obligations that has infuriated international public opinion and has particularly disturbed African States. For while pretending that recourse to force is anathema to British tradition, the United Kingdom has not taken serious alternative measures to achieve the objective of bringing down Ian Smith. In his address on 25 November Sir Colin Crowe rightly stated that sanctions have not been without their effect, as was recognized when the sanctions Committee produced its last

report. They have severely hampered the expansion of the Rhodesian economy and, as Mr. Smith has himself admitted, they have compelled Rhodesia to buy at a premium and sell at a discount.

106. Admittedly, the sanctions have not bitten so deep, but we all know that the fault lies not in the sanctions but in violations of them. Yet when the General Assembly repeatedly demanded that the principal sanction-busters—South Africa and Portugal—must adhere to the decision of the Council or face the consequences it has always been the British Government that has been in the forefront in defence of those sanction-busters. Furthermore, we all recall how, subsequent to the assumption of so-called republican status by the Smith régime on 2 March 1970, the British Government frustrated the efforts of the Security Council to adopt more meaningful mandatory sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. Instead of co-operating, as an administering Power should were it genuinely interested in securing a return to normalcy in its own colony, the United Kingdom, finding that the majority of the members of the Security Council would adopt appropriate measures against the tyrants in Salisbury, exercised its veto. And to our regret it was joined in that negativism by the United States. It is therefore the sincerity and credibility of the United Kingdom Government that have been constantly questioned.

107. May I at this juncture point out that it is the height of absurdity, typical of the approach maintained by Britain in its mishandling of the Southern Rhodesian problem, for the British representative to make a submission quoting the reported recent statement of Sir Alec Douglas-Home in the British Parliament that "the only reason we are in this business at all is that we want to help the Africans towards a better future than they are otherwise likely to have" *[ibid., para. 52]*. The world knows better than to accept such a dramatic oversimplification of the issue. No, sir: the reason the United Kingdom is in this business is that it is responsible for the whole mess. It was the British Government which gradually but surely sanctioned the evolution of the minority régime to its present position. It is the British Government which has callously disregarded the rights of the African people of Zimbabwe. It is Her Majesty's Government which bears the primary responsibility for the plight of the Africans in that unhappy land. It is the British Government which has jealously protected the interests, privileges and even the wild dreams of the racist minority in Southern Rhodesia. It is this very Government which without a semblance of shame capitulated to the forces of racism and fascism in Southern Rhodesia and thereby charted a collision course against the African people of Zimbabwe. The masses of Zimbabwe and the liberation movement cannot, certainly, be expected to provide the chorus while Lord Home and the racist Smith jointly sing a song of joy over the deal reached behind the backs of the Africans. Indeed, it is that Government which has embarked on a confrontation with free Africa.

108. The agreement that Ambassador Malik of the USSR has rightly called a racist-imperialist deal has been described by its principal architect, Sir Alec Douglas-Home, as fair and honourable. Such sentiments of satisfaction were echoed by the United Kingdom representative in the Council when he presented the proposals. But the world, and indeed this Council, is entitled to ask what is so honourable about these proposals. What has honour to do with an outright sell-out? What is so fair in this unabashed betrayal of the Africans of Zimbabwe by the British conservative authorities and their capitulation to the forces of oppression and racial bigotry? To the British Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary, fairness and honour are apparently measured by how satisfied his Rhodesian racist friends are. For definitely there is nothing honourable or fair in the proposals in so far as the future and interests of the 5 million Africans of Zimbabwe are concerned, while Mr. Smith was reported to bubble over with joy at the outcome of the talks. Smith is indeed a happy man. And from the short-term point of view he has every reason to rejoice, for, after all, he has recruited to his cause the support of the United Kingdom Government.

109. The British Foreign Secretary will definitely have a special place in the history of Anglo-African relations. He will be remembered by present and future generations as a distinguished British leader who unscrupulously stuck to his principles and negotiated an ugly deal behind the backs of the African populations, and he will be remembered as a man who perhaps more than anyone in post Second World War British history left no stone unturned to alienate African understanding for and friendship with Britain.

110. The Africans in Zimbabwe through their liberation movement have denounced in advance any settlement outside the principle of No Independence Before Majority Rule (NIBMAR). The African States have clearly supported this legitimate position of our suffering African brethren in Zimbabwe and the international community has equally endorsed, without equivocation, the principle of NIBMAR as the indispensable element for any settlement on Southern Rhodesia. Indeed it is significant to recall here that as recently as 22 November of this year the General Assembly in its resolution 2769 (XXVI), expressing the great concern of the overwhelming majority of its Members at the talks which were then under way between the British Foreign Secretary and the Smith régime, reaffirmed "that there should be no independence before majority rule in Southern Rhodesia". The voting on this resolution was overwhelming: 102 States voted for, while only 3 voted against. The 3 were Portugal, South Africa and the United Kingdom. But in spite of this preponderant international concern, the British authorities went ahead and made a deal outside the principle of NIBMAR.

111. In insisting on the principle of no independence before majority rule, the Zimbabweans, Africa and the international community were stressing an imperative prerequisite to ensure democratic independence in Southern Rhodesia. There was and is also the obvious concern that once independence is accorded to a minority régime it is sheer fantasy to anticipate that régime's voluntary relinquishing of power to the black majority. If there was any doubt as to the validity of this concern, one has to recall simply the utterances of Mr. Smith following the announcement of the proposals for a settlement. The leader of the racist clique in Salisbury is reported to have assured the white community not to worry, for Southern Rhodesia will continue to be ruled under civilized hands. And this

Council certainly needs no elaboration of Mr. Smith's concept of civilization. Incidentally, perhaps, Sir Alec has forgotten the gloating remark made by Ian Smith some time ago to the effect that for as long as he, Smith, lived there would be no majority rule. What Mr. Smith can now satisfactorily add is that for as long as he lives there will be no parity of representation either.

112. However, the representative of the United Kingdom invited the Council to judge his Government's recent agreement with the leader of the rebel settlers on the basis of the so-called "five principles" which the present British Government committed themselves to uphold.

113. It is clear that the so-called new settlement contains nothing new. It is old clichés dressed in complex terms. The only new element is the drama which we have witnessed here in New York, repeated in London as well as in Salisbury, on 25 November—incidentally, hardly a fortnight after the sixth anniversary of UDI. This Council is not being called upon to deliberate on a set of proposals for a settlement but to deliberate on a sell-out. It is indeed ironical that in the document which the British delegation circulated to members of the Security Council we read towards its conclusion: "The above proposals are acceptable to the British and Rhodesian Governments". The Security Council cannot fail to see the dangerous consequences, the threat to peace and security in the African continent by the creation and legalization of another *apartheid* State inherent in what Mr. Smith and Home have accepted. The administering Power must not be allowed to abdicate its responsibilities and thereby render the international community liable to future regrets. We in Tanzania never accepted that any such settlement with the rebels should be based on the so-called "five principles"; nor did Africa or the rest of the international community. But, since the British Ambassador invites us to judge the agreement on that basis, let us assess how well his Government has fulfilled its promises.

114. The first commitment was that the principle of unimpeded progress to majority rule should be maintained and guaranteed. How does the settlement ensure this? It is provided for in a labyrinth of figures and hypotheses. The starting point is the present lower legislative chamber, the African composition of which is to be gradually transformed from the present minority of slightly less than a third, into a majority. No doubt this complexity was for a very good reason. However, we may try to thread our way through the arithmetic labyrinth and reach certain clear conclusions.

115. The first step towards the goal of majority rule will be taken when the number of African voters on the new "higher roll" to be created equals 6 per cent of the European voters on the roll. Now this time will most probably not be too soon because of the qualifications for the "higher roll". These qualifications will be: income of $2,700 a year or property worth $5,400—or, if they are secondary school graduates, $1,800 in income or $3,600 in property. We all know the present level of African income in Zimbabwe and the state of educational facilities, so it requires no great stretch of the imagination to see how long it will be before the number of qualified African voters reaches 5,280, which is 6 per cent of the present registered European voters. Of course, it should be presumed that as the levels of African income and education rise, so will those of the Europeans, perhaps in geometric proportion. Hence, it will probably be not 5,280, but double that figure that the African "higher roll" voters must reach before the African membership in the House of the Assembly gets its first increase. And how big will be that increase when it is eventually given? Two seats. The first step to majority rule will therefore result in an increase in the size and composition of the membership from 50 Europeans and 16 Africans to 18 of the latter.

116. We then look at the next step. This will be taken when there is an additional 6 per cent increase in the number of African qualified voters on the "higher roll". However, in this case, the additional two African members in the House of Assembly will be "indirectly elected under the existing system". And what is the existing system of indirect elections? —through electoral colleges, consisting of chiefs, headmen, and district councillors within the rural area who after all are controlled by the settlers. It is therefore obvious that it would be a better description to describe the proposed next change in the membership and composition of the House of Assembly as a step backward rather than forward.

117. The Council was informed that the composition of the House of Assembly would change from the present base line of 50 whites and 16 Africans to a parity of 50 whites and 50 Africans. The Senate will not change. That is not too crucial, for the House of Assembly is the most important legislative body in the country. The question arises: when will that parity be reached? Will it be reached in accordance with an agreed time-table of, say, 10, 20, 30 or 100 years? Or will it be reached at the deliberate speed and pleasure of Ian Smith and his white minority followers? The truth of the matter is that the step to parity will be a long and arduous one. That is, assuming that Smith and his successors allow such a step to be taken at all.

118. Parity of Africans with Europeans in the House of Assembly is supposed to be achieved when there have been 17 progressive 6 per cent increases in African income and education. This would represent a 102 per cent requisite increase, but, for reasons which I have set out previously, the requisite increase will probably be about 10 times that amount. Assuming, nevertheless, that that increase is achieved, it should be borne in mind that the resultant parity will consist of 50 directly elected Europeans, 8 elected by African "lower roll" voters, 18 directly elected by African "higher roll" voters and 24 Africans indirectly elected. One may surmise without the slightest fear of contradiction that the 50 Europeans will retain control of the House of Assembly, since the 24 indirectly appointed Africans will be individuals who are approved by the racist minority régime.

119. However, what is the next stage? Will there then be another progressive change of African membership and composition of the House of Assembly if there is a corresponding increase in the levels of African income and education? Not so. There must be held at such time an

inquiry by an "independent commission", to determine whether the creation of seats is acceptable to the Rhodesian people and, if not, what alternative arrangements would command support. It is to be noted that the commission will not determine whether the 5 million Africans want additional seats. A separate referendum will be held among the African voters to determine the future of the 24 indirectly elected African seats. What the commission will determine is whether "the Rhodesian people"—that is to say, the Europeans as well as the Africans—agree to have additional seats in the House of Assembly. This is not considered sufficiently democratic. There is, apparently, a further requirement that the legislature should approve the proposed increase by a two-thirds majority vote. That, surely, gives the whites an effective veto.

120. Where, then, is the unimpeded progress to majority rule promised by the present British leaders? May not the required 17 increases of levels of African income and education be described as hurdles? May not the prescribed inquiry as to whether the European voters agree to the post-parity creation of 10 common-roll seats be called an impediment? And what term can one use to describe the requirement of a majority approval in a Parliament of which Europeans constitute half of the membership except "a white veto"?

121. It is clear that this complex franchise and electoral arrangement can never bring about unimpeded progress towards majority rule. My Government believes that the whole agreement is objectionable and calls into question the very humanity of our 5 million African brothers of Zimbabwe. It is, above all, contrary to the very tenets of the system of elections which the British authorities claim to champion.

122. The right to vote cannot be qualified in terms of property or education. The history of England, which now seeks to impose this system on the people of Zimbabwe, has recorded a systematic struggle on the part of the British masses against the confinement of the franchise to the propertied class. Britain prides itself in such lofty terms as universal franchise. Not all British voters have a four-year secondary education, nor property of any description. The representative of the United Kingdom knows full well that any citizen of a country should have a right to vote. The qualification has never been property or education, but whether a citizen has matured at the age of 18 or 21.

123. The British Government, in accepting that arrangement, is seriously compromising the principles which time and again England claims to uphold. In this regard the only way to give expression to unimpeded progress towards majority rule for the people of Zimbabwe is to ensure for its 5.5 million Rhodesians one man one vote. Any clumsy manoeuvre such as the one Lord Home and Smith have agreed upon will clearly impede and prevent the application of that so-called principle.

124. I turn now very briefly to the second of the five principles, which was that there would be guarantees against retrogressive amendment of the Constitution. Are there any such guarantees? They will, we are told, be found in a new and strengthened Declaration of Rights "affording protection to the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual and conferring a right of access to the High Court for the purpose of obtaining redress on any person who alleges that its provisions have been contravened in relation to him". The new Constitution, we are told further, will also contain "specially entrenched provisions", which will not be susceptible to amendment until after the creation of the first two directly elected African "higher roll" seats or until three years have elapsed, whichever is the sooner. The "especially entrenched" provisions will include certain key provisions of the Electoral Act. Naturally, no one here could be so naive as not to expect that the lapse of three years will be the sooner. At such time the specially entrenched clauses may be amended with the approval of a majority of the African representatives in the House of Assembly—the so-called "blocking mechanism".

125. It is to be noted that considerable emphasis is being laid on the possibilities of seeking redress from the High Court of the Territory. None, having witnessed the acquiescence of the European judiciary to the rebel régime of Ian Smith during the years since the unilateral declaration of independence, will have any confidence in the ability of such a High Court to defend the fundamental rights and freedoms of the Africans.

126. But the greatest defect behind even those clearly unsatisfactory provisions is that their implementation relies mainly on the reliability and dependability of Ian Smith and his collaborators. There is no guarantee that all or any of those electoral provisions and the Bill of Rights will be followed once the British Government has conferred legal independence on Rhodesia. As Ambassador Farah, the representative of Somalia, pertinently asked the Security Council on 25 November, "Who is going to guarantee those guarantees? " *[1602nd meeting, para. 141.]*

127. When a country becomes independent it can then do whatever it likes with the independence constitution. Countries have changed their constitution several times. The right to amend or abrogate a constitution is the sovereign right of a nation and the affairs of a nation are within the exclusive jurisdiction of that nation. That, after all, is what independence is all about. That is the concept of sovereignty, as understood by all of us—not excluding, I believe, the British delegation.

128. That brings me to the third of the five principles: that there would have to be immediate improvement in the political status of the African population. Such improvement, according to the permanent representative of the United Kingdom, is to be found in the proposed extension in the franchise qualifications for the African lower roll. This proposed extension may result in a larger number of Africans being permitted to vote for African Members of Parliament. But since it is not proposed in the new Constitution to make any increase in the number of Members of Parliament elected on the African lower roll, how can this be regarded by anyone as an improvement in the political status of the African population, immediate or otherwise?

129. I now turn to the fourth principle: that there would have to be progress towards ending racial discrimination.

How is such progress to be ensured? By the "new and strengthened Declaration of Rights which will be enforceable in the Courts", we are told. I have already shown how illusory such protection is. Also, we are told, by the setting up of an independent commission which will be required:

"to consider existing legislation and to make recommendations to the Rhodesian Government on ways of making progress towards ending racial discrimination. There will be included in the functions of the commission a special duty to scrutinize the provisions of the Land Tenure Act and to consider the possible creation of an independent and permanent land board to preside over the long-term resolution of the problem involved" *[ibid., para. 45]*.

130. Here are a lot of nice words and lofty promises regarding the ending of racial discrimination. But what does it all boil down to? A commission whose recommendations the rebel régime is not even bound to carry out. The phrase "except where there are considerations which any Government would regard as overriding" *[ibid.]* gives the rebel leaders a loophole, of which men as unscrupulous as they have shown themselves to be will not hesitate to take advantage.

131. Are we seriously being asked to believe that men who, when they had the unremitting focus of world opinion directed on them, blinked not at steadily imposing upon the African majority a series of measures increasingly undistinguishable from the ignoble system of *apartheid* will not, once that world scrutiny is diverted, hide behind the respectable facade of "interference in domestic affairs" in passing unmistakably and unashamedly into a full *apartheid* system?

132. The very least one would have expected was a gesture of good intention, a commitment to the repeal of the notorious Land Tenure Act, criticized by the churches of every denomination. But all we have included in the agreement is that the commission will scrutinize the provisons of the Land Tenure Act; that the rebel régime will make additional land available to Africans as the need arises; and a lot of fanfare that the Rhodesian minority régime will not for the time being proceed with its plan to evict Africans from Epworth and Cheishawasha. But the proposals are completely silent on the present unsatisfactory discriminatory and unjust state of affairs where the white settlers, who are outnumbered by the black population by 20 to 1, control 50 per cent of the land, and most of the best land at that. What about the thousands of Africans who have been evicted from their lands following the promulgation of this *apartheid* legislation? The proposals are silent on this. What about the case of Chief Nangwena and his tribe who have been living in caves since their expulsion from their land? Again silence.

133. Finally, let us turn to the fifth principle, that the basis proposed for independence should be acceptable to the people of Rhodesia as a whole. The British permanent representative in a remarkable concluding sentence said:

"Their participation"—that is, the participation of the people of Rhodesia—"in every respect is essential to the success of the proposals. It therefore follows that their acceptance of the proposals is a *sine qua non* of the whole exercise which cannot begin until this is ascertained" *[ibid., para. 52]*.

134. But if that assertion of the British Government is to have any credible results, then certain conditions have to be fulfilled in Rhodesia before a real test of opinion can be held. First the rebellion has to end and a British or international administration effectively established. That administration must control the army, the police and the security machine.

135. Conditions permitting freedom of association and expression are a "must" if the test of acceptability is not to be a mere facade. The detained leaders, including Joshua Nkomo and Ndabamingi Sithole, must be liberated and allowed to lead their people. In this connexion my delegation wishes to endorse fully the proposal made by the representative of the Soviet Union to the effect that those two leaders should be invited to take part in the debate in the Security Council on this vital question. The prescribed political organizations, the Zimbabwe African People's Union and the Zimbabwe African National Union, must be allowed to operate freely. The state of emergency must be lifted and all Rhodesians, regardless of the pigment of their skin, race, or creed, and free from intimidation and persecution, should be in a position to pronounce themselves on this vital question affecting their future and their destiny.

136. In this connexion, in common with the international community we were shocked to note that the legitimate liberation of all political detainees has been made conditional upon the conclusion of the so-called test of acceptability. Indeed the proposals have never spoken of a total release but of a review. The least that Sir Alec Douglas-Home could have achieved, we submit, was the unconditional and immediate release of all men and women who have been illegally detained through repressive legislation.

137. Such are the proposals which the United Kingdom has submitted for the information of the Security Council. And, lest we forget, they are termed honourable and fair. Not only that, the British permanent representative, in his enthusiasm to demonstrate how honourable these proposals are, tried to rationalize that somehow they conform with paragraph 2 of Security Council resolution 288 (1970). This particular paragraph, as the representative of the United Kingdom correctly pointed out, calls upon Britain as the administering Power to take effective measures to end the rebellion in Southern Rhodesia "and enable the people to exercise their right to self-determination, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and in conformity with the objectives of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960". Anyone who speaks of the Smith-Home proposals, which not only deprive the African majority of their inalienable rights but also, to the best of our understanding, entrench permanently minority rule in Southern Rhodesia, and then refers either to the Charter provisions or to the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples for justification, can only be compared with a person who, having committed one of the most condemnable sins, resorts to scripts from the Bible or the Koran to justify his actions.

138. To sum up, the so-called settlement is a settlement in favour of white oppression and domination in Southern Rhodesia. The proposals are in flagrant negation of the principles of freedom, human equality, justice and democracy. They suit perfectly the interests of the privileged minority.

139. Britain is about to complete the ugly process it initiated 48 years ago, when it handed self-government to the white settlers of Southern Rhodesia. That Britain should now not only openly sanction racism but indeed connive at the creation of another *apartheid* State in the heart of Africa demonstrates the indignities and prejudices which an African has to fight against. Yet it would be an inexcusable error to underestimate the determination of the African people of Zimbabwe to fight for their rights, to fight for their freedom and to fight for their humanity and to liberate themselves and their land from the shackles of the tyrannical white minority oppression.

140. No doubt the struggle will be a difficult one; but the road to freedom and human dignity has never been an easy one. In this perilous path confronting the combatants of Zimbabwe, the one thing they do not need is hypocritical expressions of sympathy for their plight. For the British Government to give an impression that it is concerned at the alternative facing a Zimbabwean—"unless it is to sacrifice his life in violent protest"—is tantamount to shedding crocodile tears. In the light of the whole sad history of British mishandling of the Rhodesian situation, the Zimbabweans are at least entitled to request that they not be subjected to paternalistic feelings of concern from the very authorities who are responsible for the present sufferings of the masses of the African people.

141. But what of the role of the international community, and more particularly the Security Council, in this whole episode? The Council must not only reiterate firmly its previous decisions on Southern Rhodesia: it must also, and above all, strive to strengthen the enforcement measures against the racist régime. That régime, with or without the support of the British Government, must continue to be isolated and all pressure must be brought to bear on it until the legitimate interests of the African people are fully realized and this racial tyranny, expressions and repressions are finally eradicated. The Council must also resolve to call for further assistance to the liberation movement in Zimbabwe until its objective which is our common goal—freedom and independence in full justice—has been realized.

142. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from French)*: I thank the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania for the remarks which he addressed to me personally.

143. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): My delegation had hoped to make a formal statement of its position on the terms of settlement announced by the British Government, but in view of the lateness of the hour it will reserve its right to make the statement at the next meeting. However, at the last meeting my delegation did ask the representative of the United Kingdom a number of questions and it had hoped that at this meeting he would have been in a position to provide some of the information requested. In addition to the questions it asked at that meeting, my delegation wishes to ask a number of other questions, in the hope of eliciting as much information as possible so as to enable us to have a full idea of what the terms of settlement are all about.

144. First, is it the intention of the United Kingdom Government to make available or publish the record of the representations made by African political leaders to Sir Alec Douglas-Home while he was in Southern Rhodesia? It has come to our attention that several of the main political parties submitted very important memoranda, and in view of the importance of those memoranda it would certainly be most pertinent for this Council to have them before it.

145. Second, my delegation would like to have it affirmed by the representative of the United Kingdom that, despite all that is said in this Council, it is the firm intention of the United Kingdom Government to go ahead with the test of acceptability. If that is the firm intention, then, naturally, the direction of our debate will have to be charted accordingly. But in connexion with the so-called test of acceptability my delegation would like to know what would be the position of the British Government if the people of Rhodesia rejected the terms. Would it then revert to its current position—that is, that it will maintain strict political and economic hostility towards the rebel régime in Southern Rhodesia, or what?

146. Third, is it the intention of the British Government to dispatch the commission to conduct the test of acceptability in the near future and, if so, has it decided upon the period which it feels should be allowed in the Territory before such a test is conducted? In other words, I am thinking about the preparatory period.

147. I noted from the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom that he said that such ascertainment would be "full, free, and fair" and that it would be "under the direct control of the British Government, not of the Rhodesians" *[ibid., para. 24]*. In such conditions, is it the intention of the United Kingdom Government to arrange for the removal of the apparatus of the police State that currently exists in the Territory and which, as we all know, tyrannizes the African people and deprives them of their liberty and freedom? Is it the intention of the British Government to arrange to take control of public order during this important and crucial period?

148. There is one proposal which my delegation would like to make. Yesterday we received a copy of the bill of rights which is to accompany the terms of settlement. In view of its importance, my delegation believes that a document of this nature should be examined by the legal experts of the United Nations and assessed and evaluated so that we can see whether the provisions of the bill of rights compare favourably with what this Organization has been attempting to promote ever since it came into existence.

149. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): Those are very important and very relevant questions that the representative of Somalia has asked, as indeed were the other questions that were put previously in the Council. I have not yet received all the answers from my Government, and these, of course, are a new set of points. It will be realized that some of them are not things I can answer "off the

cuff". But I do assure you, Mr. President, that it is my intention to answer the questions that have been put as fully as possible. I thought of doing so a little later on in the debate, rather depending upon how many other questions were asked and so as to try to pull some of them together. I can assure the Council that I will do my best to answer the questions as soon as possible.

150. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) *(translated from Russian):* At the last meeting devoted to this matter the Soviet delegation proposed that the leaders of two African parties in Southern Rhodesia should be invited to participate in meetings of the Security Council, in order that we might hear their opinion on the Home-Smith agreement. I was unfortunately absent, but I have been informed that at the beginning of the meeting you notified the Council that consultations were continuing. It seems to me that the consultations are dragging somewhat. I would, therefore, request you and the next President of the Council, who, from 1 December, will be our distinguished colleague, the representative of Sierra Leone, to speed up these consultations so that at the next meeting of the Council on the subject of Rhodesia a vote may be taken to determine who is in favour of and who is against this proposal, since, if the consultations are dragged out, the only solution will be to take a vote.

151. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from French):* I can assure the representative of the Soviet Union that until the end of my term as President—and I am certain that I am speaking also for my successor, the representative of Sierra Leone who will assume this office on 1 December—the consultations that were begun after the last meeting of the Council will be continued until success has been achieved.

The meeting rose at 1.25 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.

Litho in United Nations, New York Price: $U.S. 1.00 (or equivalent in other currencies) 82190—October 1973—2,050