



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-THIRD YEAR

**2065<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 10 MARCH 1978

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2065) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia: Letter dated 1 March 1978 from the <i>Chargé d'Affaires</i> a.i. of the Permanent Mission of the Upper Volta to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12578) .....	1

*S/1547*

## 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.

## 2065th MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 10 March 1978, at 3.30 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Ivor RICHARD  
(United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Bolivia, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, India, Kuwait, Mauritius, Nigeria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2065)

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

Letter dated 1 March 1978 from the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of the Upper Volta to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12578)

*The meeting was called to order at 4.15 p.m.*

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

### Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia:

Letter dated 1 March 1978 from the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of the Upper Volta to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12578)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken by the Council at previous meetings, I invite the representatives of Angola, Benin, Botswana, Kenya, Mozambique, Sierra Leone, the Sudan, the United Republic of Tanzania, the Upper Volta and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Houngavou (Benin), Mr. Tlou (Botswana), Mr. Maina (Kenya), Mrs. Gbujama (Sierra Leone), Mr. Medani (Sudan), Mr. Lobo (Mozambique), Mr. Salim (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Bamba (Upper Volta) and Miss Konie (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to draw the attention of the Council members to the following documents:

S/12588, containing the text of a letter dated 9 March addressed to the President of the Council by the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of the Upper Volta on behalf of the African Group of States, and S/12590, containing the text of a letter dated 9 March from the representative of Liberia to the President of the Council, transmitting the text of a letter from the President of Liberia.

3. The first speaker is the Commissioner for External Affairs of Nigeria, His Excellency Mr. Garba, whom I welcome to the Council and on whom I call.

4. Mr. GARBA (Nigeria): It is with a heavy heart that I come again to New York to address the Security Council on matters affecting southern Africa, the dignity of the African continent and the black people. They also bear on the dignity of my country.

5. Mr. President, I know your personal history and the fight which you put up in your youth and which you still sustain in the quest for dignity, justice and freedom in southern Africa. As a functionary of your Government in the Council, please be reassured that if my remarks appear heavy-handed, they are not directed at you personally, but at the principles involved in the way the Government you represent today and the previous Administrations of the United Kingdom have handled the question of the decolonization of southern Africa.

6. This is another occasion to thank the Secretary-General for his consistent dedication to the promotion of the principles of human values in the execution of his very delicate task. His timely pronouncements on the new dimensions of the problem of independence and self-determination in Rhodesia and on the recent aggression by the Smith régime against Mozambique, Botswana and Zambia were well received by my Government. I am happy that the Secretary-General reiterated what should be clear to every decent human being—namely, that:

“for any solution to be just and lasting, such a solution must have, as its objective, the establishment of majority rule in accordance with the principle of one man, one vote”.

7. When we in Nigeria heard about the questionable actions of Bishop Muzorewa, Reverend Sithole and Chief Chirau in joining the illegal minority racist régime, we brushed the news aside, considering it an exercise in self-deception and futility. We took it for granted that the British Government would immediately reject the so-

called Salisbury settlement and so inform the Security Council and States Members of the United Nations.

8. We have, of course, been aware of the Salisbury talks from the press, as of the Turnhalle talks, over the months. We have treated these talks with the contempt that they deserve. We also regarded the so-called Salisbury internal settlement with utter contempt. We treated it as something contrived by the illegal racist régime with its cohorts in Pretoria in the hope of delaying its doom. We regarded it not as a problem but as a symptom of the malaise of the racist régimes in southern Africa generally, which are desperately trying to formulate fake solutions in a vain attempt to bamboozle world public opinion.

9. I wish to express here the disappointment of my delegation at the fact that this series of meetings of the Security Council was called at the initiative of the African Group rather than by the administering Power in Southern Rhodesia. My disappointment is even greater at the news reports that the British Foreign Secretary ran away from attending this meeting, apparently because of a remark made by the representative of the United States. I wish to associate my delegation with that statement because it is a true description of the behaviour of the United Kingdom, which, for 12 years, has been running away from a just and fair solution to the Rhodesian question. It has, however, always managed to create the impression of taking action when, in reality, all it has done all this time has been to wring its hands helplessly. We had thought that the present Administration in the United States would provide the British with much needed spine. We still hope that the United States will not allow the British Government to run away from its responsibilities to the international community.

10. My delegation does not believe that this series of meetings of the Security Council should be regarded as being convened solely in order to discuss the so-called internal settlement. On the contrary, we believe that these meetings should be used to discuss the deteriorating situation in Southern Rhodesia and the continued aggression by the racist régime against independent African countries.

11. The Council should also be informed by the United Kingdom and by the Secretary-General of what they have done since September, when this matter was last brought before the Council. We should then consider further action in view of the gravity of the situation in Rhodesia and in southern Africa in general and the apparent paralysis and inability, real or feigned, of the United Kingdom to force Ian Smith to surrender. For example, we already have before us the report<sup>1</sup> of the Committee on Sanctions, which the Security Council must now consider and take action on. We hope, therefore, that the United States will not be taken in by the British Government in its present despicable manoeuvres designed to frustrate the genuine interests and aspirations of Africa. We have warned again and again against the belief that any one can replace the true nationalist leaders with

puppets in the name of moderation or can foist on us a new breed of individuals created by the West to foster external interests in southern Africa. This will only postpone the evil day and will merely nurture and bolster the very reactionary forces that should be neutralized. We thought that by now the Western Powers would have learnt their lesson from the failure of their policies in other parts of the world and most recently in Angola. But it appears that the British are again in the process of subordinating human values in Rhodesia to short-sighted political and economic considerations and of trying to find what they think is an easy way out.

12. Nigeria has been consistent in its policies towards southern Africa. I hate to dwell on the past, but looking back to the genesis of the Rhodesian problem and at all the attempts so far made to resolve it, my Government cannot but recall with intense displeasure the British hesitations that have frustrated all meaningful efforts at a just and lasting settlement.

13. My Government is deeply concerned at the manifestly inexorable drift in the situation and refuses to be convinced that Smith can continue to circumvent the issues involved in resolving the problem of Southern Rhodesia. If the United Kingdom in particular and the international community in general resolve to end the crisis, Mr. Smith and his small gang of settlers—who are hardly a hundredth part of the population of the Territory—cannot hold us to ransom.

14. We have been let down too often in this matter. Inaction, particularly on the part of the administering Power, has all along impeded all efforts to achieve a just and lasting peace in Rhodesia. The Council must, on this occasion, take clear, decisive and final action, bearing in mind the interests of the 35 million suffering people—blacks and white—in southern Africa as a whole. We cannot renege on our commitments to those people. We cannot continue to allow the United Kingdom to hold back the very pressures that will bring down Ian Smith and, in the same breath, continue to mystify us about a peaceful solution that amounts to no solution at all. I ask members of this body to bear this in mind in trying to understand the Anglo-American moves for a negotiated settlement in Rhodesia. I also ask members of the Council to remember this in assessing Ian Smith's recent version of a so-called internal settlement one full year after the collapse of the Geneva constitutional talks on the political future of the Territory.

15. The failure of the diplomatic shuttle undertaken last November by the British Resident Commissioner designate, Lord Carver, and Lieutenant-General Prem Chand, the Secretary-General's representative, once again underscores the nagging problem of how to achieve the transition from Rhodesia to Zimbabwe. To the best of our knowledge, Lord Carver's mission ran into trouble over what should be the precise nature and composition of the armed forces of post-independent Zimbabwe. At the same time, the rebel leader—apparently drawing fresh inspiration and support from his political mentors at Pretoria and elsewhere—chose this time once again to display his characteristic arrogance towards the majority African

<sup>1</sup> *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-third Year, Special Supplement No. 2.*

population in Rhodesia and the international community as a whole.

16. The Nigerian Government, like other well-meaning Governments, accepted the Anglo-American package as one that provided a reasonable basis for negotiation, in spite of its many inherent imperfections. In adopting this attitude, we were guided by the overriding consideration and the pragmatic necessity of bringing to a speedy end the current bloodshed in Rhodesia. We believed that, in spite of the Smith régime's ignoble record of suppression, repression and callous brutality, there was still a slight chance of evolving a harmonious multiracial society in Rhodesia, in which all the people could be guaranteed true freedom and equality. We also entertained hopes that, through the Anglo-American initiative, after we had turned a blind eye to Smith's perfidious past, it would still be possible to transform Zimbabwe into a showcase of a multiracial society, devoid of racial rancour and mutual antagonisms, from which the high priests of *apartheid* just across the border would be able to draw a contemporary lesson.

17. But all along we had our misgivings, and voiced them whenever we had the opportunity, to the effect that Ian Smith could not be taken at his word. We stated this here in the Security Council and in the General Assembly. We said again and again that Smith had always adopted a conciliatory posture only when international pressures, as well as military pressures from valiant Zimbabwean freedom fighters, had reached suffocating levels. But once the pressures on Ian Smith were eased, even marginally, and he was armed with renewed assurances of support from the racist régime in South Africa, he once again confronted us defiantly, taunting the entire world, including the Council, to do its damndest.

18. When Lord Carver and Lieutenant-General Prem Chand returned empty-handed, the British and the Americans did nothing about it. Upon inquiry, the British informed us that the mission had not been a failure. We suspected that it was only a question of time before an attempt would be made to forge a fraudulent internal solution in collaboration with so-called moderate black leaders that would ensure the perpetuation of white minority domination. No wonder. The momentum for a just and durable settlement that began with the Anglo-American proposals was lost in the imbroglio of Anglo-American inaction. It is said "between a dream and its realization there must be action". In this case, there has been very little action. The initiative was allowed to slip by default into Smith's hands. And yet the year 1977, which saw the abortive Carver-Chand mission to Rhodesia, was in fact the twelfth anniversary of the unilateral declaration of independence.

19. We refuse to accept that a simpleton like Smith should continue to defy the world and be allowed to commit this most heinous crime, the worst since the United Kingdom turned over power, in political and material terms, to racist minorities in southern Africa. We still say categorically, for the umpteenth time, that the United Kingdom, as the colonial Power, has the primary responsibility to end the Smith rebellion. But it would

appear that it has decided, for reasons other than those of acceptable moral standards and legality, not to discharge its duty in the matter in accordance with international law and practice and the recorded decisions of successive British Governments. Last January, during Nigeria's presidency of the Council, we expressed our reservations about involving Smith in any serious negotiation [*2056th meeting*]. We tried to persuade the Council and the British to declare categorically that any settlement brought about under the auspices of the illegal minority racist régime should not be accorded any recognition by this august body. But the talks held in Malta with the Patriotic Front were then used as an excuse to block any such action by the Council. It has been one full month since Malta, and it would now appear that the Anglo-American initiative has slipped, by accident or design, into the deep-freeze. My delegation views with great concern the inaction that has followed the Malta talks between the British Foreign Secretary and the leaders of the Patriotic Front. Mr. Nkomo also underlined this when he addressed the Council yesterday [*2064th meeting*].

20. The talks were by no means a failure because of the far-reaching concessions that were made by the Patriotic Front vis-à-vis the Anglo-American proposals. There is hardly a precedent in the history of liberation struggles of freedom fighters having taken the tremendous risk of agreeing to lay down their arms in favour of the political process of free and fair elections, as envisaged for the transformation of Rhodesia into Zimbabwe. This was the crux of the problem. The Patriotic Front conceded this in Malta. We did not take advantage of the good tide. Probably the British were overwhelmed by this concession.

21. We all watched with concern while Smith proceeded at full steam towards his own brand of internal settlement. As it turned out, and as if to justify the scepticism which we have maintained all along, the net result of the political charade stage-managed by Smith at Salisbury was a diabolical manoeuvre. With the full support of the racists in South Africa and the active connivance of certain vested interests, Smith intends to install a government which will remain in power under his firm grips and which is, in fact, a "black-washed" racist régime composed of the same coterie of racist politicians who declared independence unilaterally in 1965. What Smith has done this time is merely to harness to a discredited government a shadow of black participation, in the vain hope of gaining international acceptability.

22. This blatant fraud of an agreement reportedly signed at Salisbury last Friday is nothing but Smith's charter for the preservation of minority interests and the perpetuation of white control in a supposedly black-majority-oriented government. No one can fail to see that this fraudulent agreement is the worst contrivance in modern constitutional history. It is hardly surprising that the Patriotic Front, as well as the Organization of African Unity, has rejected it. My delegation calls on the Council not only to reject the so-called internal settlement but to condemn it.

23. My delegation has serious doubts as to the credibility of the recent press statement ascribed to the British

Foreign Secretary, Mr. David Owen, to the effect that Smith's fraudulent experiment would amount to "a significant step towards majority rule". If this is true, it is a contradiction and an outright attempt to legitimize an illegality. It is in contradiction not only with the Anglo-American proposals but also with paragraph 14 of the Final Communiqué of the June 1977 Conference of Commonwealth Heads of Government, which reads as follows:

"Heads of Government reiterated that the independence of Zimbabwe must be achieved on the basis of majority rule. They recognised therefore that it is necessary to mobilise and exert maximum pressure on the illegal Smith regime. In this connection they noted that the armed struggle has become complementary to other efforts including a negotiated settlement and agreed that its maintenance was inevitable. . . . Heads of Government recognised that a genuine settlement must involve agreement not only on appropriate constitutional changes but also on practical measures to ensure the transfer of effective power to a majority government. In this connection they expressed their deep conviction that a negotiated settlement must entail not only the removal of the illegal Smith regime but also the dismantling of its apparatus of repression, in order to pave the way for the creation of police and armed forces which would be responsive to the needs of the people of Zimbabwe and ensure the orderly and effective transfer of power."

24. The United Kingdom was indeed a party to that communiqué and was, in fact, the host to the Commonwealth Conference that issued it. The communiqué is the strongest indictment by the Commonwealth not only of the illegal régime but I believe also of the levity with which the British have treated this problem.

25. It is becoming clearer to us that the administering Power does not intend to accept its colonial responsibilities and obligations. We would be more comfortable if the United Kingdom would make it clear to the world that it is unable to discharge its responsibility genuinely to decolonize Rhodesia. We are similarly baffled by the rather evasive statement issued by the United States State Department.

26. Both statements from the very two parties sponsoring a negotiated settlement have been a terrible disappointment to us. It is therefore hardly surprising that the illegal régime feels encouraged by these statements and has proceeded at full steam to try to sell the internal settlement. These statements have created the impression that the principal authors of the Anglo-American proposals have to all intents and purposes abandoned their own proposals and left the matter to the fraudulent *apartheid* parliament at Salisbury.

27. What Smith has done is a new challenge to and an act of blatant defiance of the Security Council. Nigeria and Africa call on members of the Council to take up this challenge by making a positive pronouncement on the side of sanity and constitutionality. It is the minimum we demand of the Council, if Smith is to be stopped in his

current disastrous course which can only compound the hardship of the entire people in the Territory and prolong their suffering unnecessarily. We wish to remind the Council that since the unilateral declaration of independence the Smith régime has been dubbed an illegal administration by the Council. It would be highly presumptuous of any self-respecting Government now to turn round and declare that that same illegal government had suddenly become deserving of international acceptability.

28. How can anyone expect, in the middle of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, that the international community should condone a deal under which one white man's vote is worth 10 black men's votes? This is beyond comprehension; this is racist arithmetic that is certainly unacceptable to Nigeria.

29. For the optimists who might argue that the bogus Salisbury experiment should be given a trial, we should like to draw attention to a few acts of international brigandage and vandalism perpetrated by the rebel's notorious paramilitary forces. Last November, just when the rebel leader announced blithely his programme for an internal settlement, his notorious army was engaged in its worst raid to date, deep inside Mozambique, a sovereign State Member of the United Nations. Press reports of that invasion indicated that the killing was on an unprecedented scale, surpassing even the holocaust at the Nyazonia refugee camp in August 1976. Last week another incursion was perpetrated against Botswana, and only a few days ago Smith's forces invaded Zambia. How long will certain vested interests continue to connive at Smith's recklessness at the expense of Africans? How long will the Security Council allow such acts of aggression to be committed with impunity by an illegal régime?

30. Nigeria and Africa can no longer stand idly by with folded arms. The administering Power responsible for decolonizing Rhodesia should utilize the resources of the Council to achieve the right and just solution for Zimbabwe. Any humane person who has reconciliation rather than subjugation in his heart cannot reasonably conceive of such heinous crimes as have been perpetrated by Ian Smith. Smith's villainy all through the years has only proved one thing, that is, that the permanent subjugation of the majority is his ultimate goal in Rhodesia and that his instruments for achieving it are typically machiavellian, if not genocidal.

31. In summary, I should like to place on record my Government's total rejection of the obnoxious and repugnant Salisbury agreement and all that has to do with the so-called internal settlement. It constitutes a negation of the process of genuine self-determination and contradicts even the Anglo-American proposals. For example, the Anglo-American proposals, as contained in document S/12393 of 1 September 1977, provide for the following: first, the surrender of power by the illegal régime and a return to legality—by contrast, the internal settlement still retains Smith in power and has not restored legality; secondly, an orderly and peaceful transition to independence in the course of 1978—by contrast, the exclusion from the internal settlement of the key actors in Rhodesia, namely, the Patriotic Front, makes peaceful

transition impossible; thirdly, free and impartial elections on the basis of universal adult suffrage—by contrast, Smith's proposed electoral processes are entrenched unbridled racism and racial discrimination; fourthly, the establishment by the British Government of a transitional administration, with the task of conducting the elections for an independent government—by contrast, Smith's formula does not guarantee this; fifthly, a United Nations presence, including a United Nations force, during the transition period—by contrast, no provision was made for this by Smith and his puppets; sixthly, an independence constitution providing for a democratically elected government, the abolition of discrimination, the protection of individual human rights and the independence of the judiciary—by contrast, these provisions do not exist in the Smith charter.

32. Independence for Southern Rhodesia should be handed down from the recognized administering Power rather than from Mr. Smith and his clique at Salisbury. We would therefore want to see more positive action towards an internationally acceptable solution of the Rhodesian independence issue. The first step in this direction is the restoration of legality in Rhodesia and the dissolution of the illegal minority government. This should be followed by other necessary actions under the Anglo-American proposals.

33. We look forward to the Council's taking appropriate measures at the right time, if the potentially explosive situation in Rhodesia is to be defused and the threat to international peace and security removed. We believe that this is a straightforward matter within the authority of the Council. We hope that the generality of the majority African population will be able, for once, to remember this momentous debate as an occasion when the Council, in consistency with its noble role as mankind's genuine custodian of world peace and security, upheld the principles of justice, freedom and human dignity in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. Such a positive declaration should halt Smith and his collaborators in their disastrous course and serve notice to Vorster that the world is not prepared to condone an identical fraudulent experiment in Namibia.

34. I can find no better conclusion than to recall the statement of my head of State delivered in the General Assembly on 13 October 1977, in which he declared the following on the question of Zimbabwe:

"In Zimbabwe alone we have witnessed with dismay the strange phenomenon, unprecedented in recent colonial history, of a minority white régime in rebellion against the colonizing Power, and getting away with it for 12 years despite all the efforts to persuade the administering Power to acknowledge and discharge its obligations to the 6 million indigenous people, who continue to be denied their basic human rights in defiance of the Charter of our Organization. All our appeals have been met with half-hearted measures, and the invention of superficial economic sanctions that are full of loop holes. Today, therefore, the racist régime in rebellion can still boast that the white minority has a more viable economy and enjoys a higher standard of

living. But it still has to contend with the unwavering dedication, patriotism and grim determination of the nationalist liberation movements. The nationalists and freedom fighters will continue to stand ready to pay the supreme sacrifice rather than live ignominiously in perpetual bondage. Their cause is just, and their struggles sacred. Their sacrifices will not be in vain, because time is on their side and Africa stands by them, and they enjoy the full solidarity of all freedom-loving peoples throughout the world. In this regard it is necessary to emphasize once again that the Nigerian Government and people are totally committed to the cause of freedom and justice in that part of our continent. This we consider as a duty that must be performed, and we are determined to restore the honour and dignity that belong to that continent and to all its inhabitants, at whatever cost."<sup>2</sup>

35. Africa has demonstrated at all times that it is prepared to work for a peaceful solution to this problem. But if we fail, the armed struggle will continue with renewed intensity. We have always worked against internationalizing African problems. We have always preferred to be left alone to chart our destiny. But Africa has friends who are reliable and committed to our liberation. We hope that we shall not be forced to call on them to help push the armed struggle to its logical conclusion.

36. The PRESIDENT: I thank the Commissioner for External Affairs of Nigeria for the kind words which he addressed to me at the beginning of his statement. I cannot thank him for the kind words addressed to my country since, although I listened very carefully to what he had to say, I could not actually detect any. I am sure that he would not expect me to accept his strictures. I can only tell him that, naturally, we shall study what he had to say with great care and that in due course we shall, if necessary, seek to reply to it.

37. Mr. LAI Ya-li (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): Since the Security Council, on Monday, started its consideration of the question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia, we have listened attentively to the statements made by the representatives of a number of African countries and others. They have all condemned Ian Smith for his concoction of the "internal settlement" fraud. In particular, the two leaders of the Patriotic Front of Zimbabwe have reaffirmed [*2064th meeting*] their strong will to continue to persevere in armed struggle. We express our appreciation and support for this.

38. When the question of Southern Rhodesia has been considered at Security Council meetings and General Assembly sessions, the Chinese delegation has repeatedly pointed out that the atrocious and feeble Smith racist régime has habitually resorted to its counter-revolutionary dual tactics by alternately using military suppression and political deception to maintain its reactionary rule. In recent years, with the support of the African countries, front-line countries in particular, the people of Zimbabwe have won great victories in their armed struggle. Their

<sup>2</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-second Session, Plenary Meetings, 32nd meeting, para. 115.

struggle against the reactionary racist régimes and for national independence and liberation has been continuously developing, whereas the Smith régime is getting ever more isolated in the world and its reactionary Fascist rule is tottering. In the face of the situation in which the people of Zimbabwe win one victory after another and the Smith régime is at the end of its tether, the Smith régime is playing all kinds of tricks, and seeking help from the so-called "internal settlement", "parliamentary election" and so forth. This is, of course, an out-and-out fraud whose aim is to deceive world public opinion, paralyze the fighting will of the people of Zimbabwe, disrupt the unity of the national liberation organizations of Zimbabwe and realize the scheme of divide-and-rule and put out the flames of the people's armed struggle, thereby sustaining the domination and privilege of the minority white racists. Meanwhile, the reactionary Smith régime has intensified its sanguinary suppression of the people of Zimbabwe and carried on armed provocations against neighbouring countries in an attempt to cow the African countries and people now resolutely fighting against racism and to sabotage the African countries' support for the liberation struggle of the people of Zimbabwe. Just recently, the Smith régime made repeated armed intrusions into Botswana and Zambia, seriously menacing and violating their sovereignty and security. The Chinese delegation expresses its utmost indignation at these new acts of aggression and strongly condemns them.

39. Why does the Smith régime dare to be so rampant? The reason for its rampancy cannot be separated from the protection and abetment by one super-Power, apart from the support given by the Pretoria racist authorities. This super-Power, in collusion with one of its major allies, overtly or covertly supports the Smith régime in engaging in the so-called "internal settlement" in an attempt to frustrate the Zimbabwe people's cause of genuine independence and liberation and to preserve the vested interests and privileged status of the minority whites. However, this will only result in lifting a rock to drop it on its own feet. The other super-Power, flaunting the banner of "supporting the national liberation movement", is carrying on massive infiltration and expansion in southern Africa. It is trying by hook or by crook to sow dissension and interfere in and undermine the Zimbabwe people's struggle in the hope of bringing it within its orbit of contending for hegemony with the other super-Power in this area of strategic importance. With a covetous eye it is now attempting to create greater confusion in the present situation in Zimbabwe so as to fish in troubled waters.

40. However, since the Zimbabwe people, who have been tempered through long struggles, were not bluffed in the past by the military suppression of the reactionaries, they cannot possibly be taken in today by Smith's political intrigues. History shows that no reactionary forces will ever change their counter-revolutionary nature, nor will they step down from the stage of history of their own accord. In the "internal settlement" it concocted, the Smith régime has placed in its firm grasp the two vital issues, political power and military forces. This reveals most clearly that its evil doing runs completely counter to the genuine independence and liberation of the people of Zimbabwe. Smith's role as a teacher by negative example

is bound to enhance the further awakening of the people of Zimbabwe, the strengthening of their unity and their perseverance in armed struggle. It will also enable them further to realize that only when one is prepared for armed struggle can one afford to go to peace negotiations, and while going to peace negotiations, it is all the more necessary to be prepared for armed struggle for only by basing oneself on fighting can one be able to frustrate all schemes and machinations of the enemy. Not long ago, the Organization of African Unity adopted a resolution condemning the Smith régime for the so-called internal settlement and calling upon all to give stronger support to the armed struggle under the leadership of the Patriotic Front of Zimbabwe. This is exactly what the present situation calls for. The Chinese delegation firmly supports this stand.

41. The Chinese Government and people firmly support the people of Zimbabwe in their courageous struggles for national independence and liberation and strongly condemn the Smith racist régime for its various frauds. We are deeply convinced that so long as the people of Zimbabwe fight dauntlessly, persist in unity, adhere to principle, persevere in struggle and always guard against super-Power meddling and sabotage, they will certainly be able to win final victory in their struggle.

42. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Before turning to the substance of the problem being considered by the Security Council, I should like to congratulate you, Mr. President, upon your assumption of your important post for March and to express the hope that under your experienced leadership the Council will be able to arrive at a favourable decision on a question so important for the future of the people of Zimbabwe.

43. The Soviet delegation wishes to welcome the Commissioner for External Affairs of Nigeria, His Excellency Mr. Garba. His participation in the Council's work is further confirmation of the great importance his country attaches to the achievement of the earliest possible liberation of southern Africa from colonialism.

44. I should like to take this opportunity warmly to welcome our new colleague the representative of Venezuela, Ambassador Rubén Carpio Castillo, and to wish him success in his work. On behalf of the Soviet delegation, I should like to assure the new representative of Venezuela of our readiness to co-operate with him and his delegation in solving the important problems facing the Council and the other organs of the United Nations.

45. Permit me also to express my gratitude for the compliments to the Soviet Union and me personally in connexion with my discharge of the functions of President of the Council last month.

46. Recently the attention of world public opinion and the United Nations, in particular the Security Council, has once again been focused on what is happening in southern Africa, an area which has long been one of the sources of tension on our planet. The essence of the process occurring there is an intensification of the struggle for the

immediate elimination of the outrageous system of colonialism and racial domination which still survives in that part of the world. The struggle of the people of Zimbabwe for self-determination and independence and for the elimination of the racist régime of Ian Smith is not a regional problem but a problem of great international importance. The Smith régime's refusal to satisfy the lawful demand of the African majority that it should be granted freedom and elementary rights has now created in southern Africa a situation fraught with serious danger to international peace and security. Only the early elimination of that colonial régime as well as the racist régime of Vorster and the total and final victory of the patriotic forces of the African majority can ensure peace and justice in southern Africa.

47. It is well known that as it draws closer to its doom every obsolete and reactionary régime tends to intensify its struggle against what is new and progressive and resorts to the most subtle contrivances in order to keep its hold on power and the wealth it has plundered. The Salisbury deal between the chief of the Rhodesian racists, Ian Smith, and the so-called moderate African leaders is aimed at creating a government which, on the one hand, would guarantee the preservation of the political, economic and social domination of the white minority and, on the other, would create the semblance, and only the semblance, of participation by representatives of the African population in the government of the country. It has been possible to find collaborationists who are ready to go along with the perpetration of this fraud, but they no more represent their people than did those who in the last war collaborated with the Hitlerites in the occupied countries of Europe. These are attempts by the racists and their protectors to make the illegal régime of Salisbury appear more acceptable or, to be more accurate, less revolting.

48. In spite of resounding assertions about the introduction of the principle "one man, one vote", representatives of the indigenous African population, which makes up 95 per cent of the country's population, will not receive any real power in the governmental organs to be set up pursuant to the internal settlement. In essence all power will remain in the hands of the insignificant minority, and all the racist régime's apparatus of military and police repression will remain in the country indefinitely.

49. In creating in Rhodesia a puppet parliament and government, the Salisbury clique is attempting to exclude the Patriotic Front of Zimbabwe from any decisions affecting the destiny of the country, to lend the appearance of legitimacy to the racist régime and to escape the condemnation of the international community and United Nations sanctions. It is, however, obvious that the Patriotic Front enjoys broad support in world public opinion and in the world community as the only legitimate representative of the people of that country. This fact is continually being confirmed and reconfirmed by statements and documents from international organizations, from States belonging to the most widely differing political and social systems and from the independent countries of Africa. For example, in a letter from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Algeria to the Secretary-General, re-

cently circulated at the United Nations [see S/12583, annex], we find the following statement:

"In this sensitive area, in which the problems of South Africa and Namibia are still unsolved, peace can be ensured only if the peoples concerned join in working out a solution and, in this particular case, if the Patriotic Front, the authentic representative of the people of Zimbabwe, takes part in that effort."

50. The redecoration of the façade of the racist régime in Rhodesia should, according to the calculations of the strategists of neo-colonialism, give the Western Powers an excuse to take no further part in talks with the patriotic forces of Zimbabwe. In putting forward plans which pay lip-service to the principle of government by the African majority in Rhodesia, what the Western Powers are doing in actual fact is tantamount to legitimizing the racist régime in one form or another and undermining the national liberation struggle of the people of Zimbabwe. It would appear that they are banking on splitting the anti-colonial front of African States and trying to get some of them to recognize the deal between the racists and those Africans who are willing to go along.

51. Everyone knows that the actions of the racist clique at Salisbury aimed at bringing about a so-called internal settlement have been dictated not only by the desire to preserve their rights and privileges but also by their anxiety to protect the interests of international monopolies operating actively in southern Africa. It is typical that in the agreement signed at Salisbury on 3 March direct provision is made for protection against deprivation of property. Thus under that agreement the imperialist monopolies are getting constitutional guarantees protecting their property against nationalization.

52. Only recently those who bear direct responsibility for the situation in Southern Rhodesia have asserted that any subterfuges on Smith's part will fail to receive their support and will be condemned. I would remind Council members that in January 1978 a letter was circulated in the Council from the representative of the United Kingdom which contains a statement made in the House of Commons by the Foreign Secretary, Mr. Owen [see S/12540, annex], who stated:

"... an internal settlement which excludes one of the leading nationalist groups cannot bring about a cease-fire during the elections or bring peace and stability to a newly independent Zimbabwe, nor would it eliminate the threat to international peace and security. It would, therefore, be most unlikely to be recognized by the Security Council. We are signatories to many Security Council resolutions."

53. The Permanent Representative of the United States also criticized the "internal settlement" when he said that the only consequence of such a step would be an intensification of the armed struggle. He pointed out that any Rhodesian settlement which did not involve the participation of the Patriotic Front would open the way to civil war in Southern Rhodesia.

54. Yet now the British Foreign Secretary describes the deal at Salisbury as an "important step towards majority rule" and stresses the reluctance of his Government to do anything to "undermine a peaceful settlement, from whatever source it may come", while the representatives of the United States Government refer only to certain obscurities in its provisions. Certain Western representatives have described the events in Salisbury as "a step in the right direction". Probably those events can be so described—if, of course, by the "right direction" we mean further bloodshed and further repression of the people of Zimbabwe.

55. We are not supporters or followers of the so-called Anglo-American plan, but we cannot fail to point out that a strange situation is being created. The United Kingdom and the United States have, in essence, been taking a favourable view of Smith's manoeuvres and have been hastening to divorce themselves from their own proposals which, they had asserted, provided for the elimination of Smith from power at Salisbury. Furthermore, the Western Powers have been openly putting pressure on the Patriotic Front, trying somehow or other to involve it in the machinations of the Smith régime and its henchmen. We cannot fail to agree with the comment of the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, Ambassador Salim, who at the Council's meeting on 6 March of this year stated:

"a legitimate question will arise as to how serious they [the United Kingdom and the United States] were in the first place in promoting a just settlement" [2061st meeting, para. 45].

It is precisely the connivance of those Powers that has made it possible for Smith to continue his aggressive action against the independent African States, the latest example of which was the incursion of Rhodesian troops into Zambia, which caused a large number of casualties.

56. We share the view expressed by the leaders of the Patriotic Front of Zimbabwe, Mr. Joshua Nkomo and Mr. Robert Mugabe, in their statements in the Council [2064th meeting] regarding the situation at Salisbury. The Soviet delegation entirely agrees with the statements of the representatives of many African countries who have already spoken in the Council to the effect that the manoeuvres of the racist minority régime have led to a sharp deterioration of the situation in Southern Rhodesia and has seriously exacerbated an already tense situation in that part of the world.

57. The Soviet delegation does not consider it necessary to reply to the tired old fabrications about Soviet assistance to the peoples of Africa contained in the statement of the representative of China. They are clearly designed to divert the attention of those participating in this discussion from the essence of the problem under consideration and from a constructive search for a solution to it. It is obvious that such verbal exercises are dictated by purposes having nothing whatsoever in common with the interests of the struggle of the African countries, in particular the people of Zimbabwe, for their earliest possible liberation from colonial and racist oppression.

58. The conspiracy at Salisbury should be condemned and repudiated by the Security Council. The immediate elimina-

tion of the illegal minority régime, whatever appearance it may contrive for itself, should be the first step towards ensuring a just settlement of the Rhodesian problem. If that régime is still defying world public opinion, it is because the relevant decisions and sanctions of the Security Council are not being observed by certain Member States.

59. The Soviet Union's position on the question that we are discussing has been repeatedly set forth in the Security Council and other United Nations bodies. We have no difficulty at all in perceiving the racist and neo-colonialist aims of the Salisbury deal, and the Soviet Union categorically condemns and repudiates it. Our delegation believes that the Council should support the just and lawful demands of the African countries and of the representatives of the people of Zimbabwe, the leaders of the Patriotic Front, which have been set forth in the course of this series of meetings. The Soviet Union supports the idea that there is a need to transfer power as soon as possible to the people of that country, and I should like to take this opportunity to stress that, for us there is only one legitimate representative of the people of Zimbabwe: the Patriotic Front. The best way to find a solution to the problem of Southern Rhodesia has been and continues to be ensuring the implementation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and strict and unswerving application of full sanctions against the régime of Smith and against his ally the Republic of South Africa. That is the direct path that can and should ensure a just solution of the problem entirely in keeping with the will and aspirations of the people of Zimbabwe.

60. As was stressed by the Foreign Minister of the USSR, Mr. Gromyko:

"We do not conceal the fact that in Africa—and, indeed, everywhere—our sympathies lie with the States which have chosen a progressive course of development, the path of social and economic reform, for the benefit of the broad masses. We state openly our total solidarity with the peoples fighting for the elimination of the last bastions of colonialism and racism."

That is why we shall continue to stand side by side with the African countries and give assistance to those forces which are waging a liberation struggle in Zimbabwe, and we will support those who are attempting to put an end to oppression and domination by a minority racist régime.

61. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): I only want to make an announcement.

62. Mr. President, since we are on the eve of the week-end, I feel that I ought to inform you and, through you, the other members of the Council that the African members of the Council have prepared a working paper on the question under consideration and that we have started consultations and negotiations with some other members. It is therefore probable that we shall be in a position later today to hand this document over to the Secretariat for processing, that is, translation and distribution by tomorrow morning. We shall then be happy to receive the views of other members on our paper so that we Africans may be in a position to introduce a final draft resolution on Monday with a view to

taking a decision on it by Tuesday at the latest. I hope that this advance information will be useful to delegations.

63. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Mauritius for his courtesy in informing me in open Council of his intentions; no doubt what he has to say about the possible timing of the rest of this debate will be of interest to other members of the Security Council, and as President I will be delighted to consult with them and with him upon how we proceed with the debate.

64. I should like to inform members of the Council that I have a letter from the representative of Saudi Arabia in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite him to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with Article 31 of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

*It was so decided.*

65. The PRESIDENT: I invite the representative of Saudi Arabia to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement, in the confident expectation that the brevity of his wisdom will give us all food for thought.

66. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Before I extol you, Sir, let me say that while I do not claim to be a prophet, I do not think that the ancient prophets—of the monotheistic religions at least—were very concise, either in the Old Testament, which is quite a voluminous book, or in the New Testament, or in the Holy Koran. But not being a prophet, I will try to be as concise as is humanly possible.

67. Anyway, I know you like to rib me once in a while, and I take it with good humour because I feel you are my friend. But actually, why did you not admonish those who preceded me, my good sir—the members who always start three quarters of an hour late, always on the pretext that they were consulting with one another? It may be that they had quite a heavy lunch.

68. Having disposed of the levities of the occasion that were started by your remarks, Sir, may I say that I really feel quite confident that under your guidance, since you yourself have been involved in the question of Rhodesia, having gone there and knowing it perhaps better than any one of us around this table, it is to be hoped that, thanks to your sagacity and wisdom, some results might accrue not necessarily at the end of this meeting but from future meetings of the Council on Zimbabwe.

69. That said, members will note that I do not have in front of me a prefabricated speech; I do not have to have: I have been here long enough. The first time I was seized of the question of Southern Rhodesia, as we call it—Zimbabwe—was in the Fourth Committee in the 1950s. At that time I was elaborating with a few friends the principle of self-determination as a human right—the right to self-determination—and not only in principle, because we always found that when we spoke about the liberation of a colonial people, some of our friends the erstwhile colonial Powers said: “In principle we agree that the people should

eventually be liberated”; they always said, “in principle . . . but . . .”. I was afraid of that word “but”. And we are still confronted with that reservation “but”—not necessarily by the erstwhile colonial countries but even by our own people, in Africa and in Asia. So it is not a question of policy, it is a human trait, I believe, always to seek refuge in reservations.

70. Now I want to speak to you from my own humble experience. In 1922 when I was 17 we in the Middle East woke up to find that France and Britain, the Powers that had emerged victorious from the First World War, had placed the countries of the verdant crescent under mandates. I was young, but others who were older than I asked: “What is the meaning of the mandates?” It meant that France and Britain were going to be administering Powers and that they were going to train us for self-rule. Good Lord, at one time in our history we, the Arab States, had four empires, and we got drunk with power and wealth and then fell down. We knew something about governing ourselves. In fact, when we were part of the Ottoman Empire we sent deputies to Constantinople, as it was called—Istanbul now—and there were also cabinet ministers from Lebanon, Syria and Iraq there then, in the Porte.

71. However, let me tell you something of my experience; perchance my African brothers will benefit from it. We were confronted with a fait accompli: in Syria and Lebanon we had the French, in Iraq and Palestine we had the British as the mandatory Powers. Many of us objected, some of us rioted, others raised their voices and wrote articles. We also had a few so-called freedom fighters. Finally, the Lebanese were promised by the High Commissioner, who in the beginning, I remember, was General Gouraud, a famous general of the First World War, that they would have a republic declared in 1926. I still remember the gentleman who was President of the Republic: he was Charles Debbas. Many of us, including myself, said: “He is a Francophile; he is no good; he is going to be a puppet of the French.” He had had a French education; I had had my education at the American University, so I did not know French very well. Some of us were a little fanatical about his appointment, and some of the French-speaking Lebanese were divided. To make a long story short, Mr. Debbas proved to be almost an exemplary President, and, as I learned 30 years later from some people at the Quai d’Orsay, they sometimes had trouble with him and another President of the Republic because they knew how to defend the interests of Lebanon. Another one was Habib Pasha Al Saad, who was a friend of my late father. We Baroodys were never in politics, but we knew the political families there. He too handled the French with sagacity—with duplicity, if you will—and he was also an exemplary President. Still we had a French High Commissioner—*Haut Commissaire*, as they called him.

72. Now, if you go across the border to the east of Lebanon, there was a Syrian mandate at that time, and our Syrian brothers were known as being amongst the most patriotic in the Arab world. I think they still are; I do not think they have ceased to be so. And some Syrians asked: “Why don’t we do as Lebanon is doing now and accept a President of the Republic?” “No”, they said, “we will have nothing at all to do with the French. That is colonialism in disguise.” That was true: a mandate is colonialism in

disguise. Neither we nor the Syrians exercised power, but there were so-called freedom fighters, and there were many protests. I remember that even in 1922 there was a hero by the name of El Azma, who died throwing bombs at the French. And, mind you, they were mostly not French troops either: they were from Senegal. When Senegal was under the French, our black brothers were fighting us. Now, of course, they were not fighting us because we were white but because they were under the French. What is the gist of it? Finally, the Syrians, 10 years after the declaration of the republic in Lebanon, found that the better part of wisdom would be to accept the same formula as had been worked out with the Lebanese.

73. What is the moral of what I am saying? No one can challenge what I said in the Fourth Committee about Ian Smith when that Committee was more active on the question of Southern Rhodesia. I pride myself on it. At one time I said "He has a schizophrenic personality, and the administering Power should recall him"—since the United Kingdom was the administering Power—"and chastise him". But I misled myself. I tried not to play politics—I want to be frank—and I went to Mr. Mendelevich. I think the representative of the Soviet Union knows of him, if he does not know him personally; he was very active in the Fourth Committee. And I said to Mr. Mendelevich "You are very adamant in defending the blacks. What is the use of just talking and talking? Why do you not do something about it?" He answered "Let me think about it, and I will give you my answer". In about a week or so, he said "We do not want to clash with the Western Powers".

74. Of course now it is history. At that time I would not have said it. I found out that the British were still an administering Power *de jure*, but not *de facto*. You remember how Mr. Ian Smith renounced the link between Rhodesia and the United Kingdom. He said "We do not care". The British are still called the administering Power by the Commissioner for External Affairs of Nigeria and by others. They are no more an administering Power than you and I are the administering Power of a stateless island in the Pacific. Not because they lack the power; they are not that weak. But they have their economic and political problems. I can say this on their behalf without having a mandate from them. How do I know? When, after the Second World War they could not manage Palestine they threw the problem of Palestine into the lap of the United Nations, and they were then the mandatory Power. There they gave it up *de facto* and *de jure*, and we have been seized of the question for 30 years.

75. Therefore, do not expect our President today—of whom I am fond—to say these things to you. He is courageous, but he sometimes puts it in the British way, with shades of meaning and with a little sarcasm and ridicule here and there, something of which he is a past master. Anyway, he is not English, he is Welsh, like Mr. Lloyd George.

76. The British have their internal problems. It so happens that they are in the northern hemisphere and are white. But do not think that all the whites in England observe equality between races and nations. There are problems there now because of the ingress into the United Kingdom of many

people from the Caribbean, from India, from Pakistan and from other places. There is a colour problem now in the United Kingdom. The British—having a colour problem of their own—are not going to say to Ian Smith "To hell with you, Ian Smith. You are white-skinned and a dishonour to our colour". Many of the British who are seeking votes in their constituencies would lose them, so they cannot say that.

77. They cannot do it also for economic reasons. I am telling members of the Council, in an unorthodox manner, things that no one else here will tell them and I am doing it so that they may know what the situation is. Let us not talk in platitudes. We have had enough of platitudes in the 30 years that I have been serving in the United Nations. We use the same clichés, the same platitudes. Let us be frank.

78. Therefore, I ask my brothers from Africa, from Asia and from the developing world, the third world or whatever you choose to call it, to face facts; whether or not the facts are what they should be they are still the realities. Take these things into account.

79. Our friend from China and our friend from the Soviet Union come and cast aspersions at one another. I do not like this. They are neighbours and share the same ideology.

80. Also, I never thought that our relatively new colleague, Ambassador Young, would have become such a sphinx. He says nothing. Today I told him "Say something. Let us know where we stand with the United States". We have an Arab proverb: "If speech is silver, then silence is golden", but the United States has gone off the gold standard. Still, I do not blame him.

81. There has been an impasse because of inflexibility on both sides, and I commiserate with those patriotic fighters there. They are outside their country.

82. But let me make a few suggestions, and I will reply, here or elsewhere, to anyone who dares to say that I have not given the matter enough thought and that I am being lenient. I mentioned the mandatory Powers; in the instance I spoke of, the mandatory Power was France—but I could go on and on and this is not a session on history. Let me tell you that not only do the blacks in Southern Rhodesia, in South Africa and, I hope, ultimately in Namibia have their foot in the door, they are now inside. The problem is not how to outwit Smith, since if he goes there will be others like him; he has a following. It is not to say that "we do not want to do business with him". No one has criticized Ian Smith more than I have, but we have to do business with him, unless, like the proverbial bedouins, the whites steal out in the night with their tents and pitch them elsewhere. That would be the best solution, and perhaps eventually they will clear out of the whole continent, unless they want to conform to the democratic rule of the continent. But let us face the fact that they are not doing it now. So what shall we do? Have an impasse? And who will pay the price? It will be the innocent blacks, and to a lesser extent the innocent whites. Is that what we in the United Nations want? Is this what the Charter prescribes? Be like one of the caliphs, who said:

“Always keep a hair between you and your opponent. If he pulls, give in a little bit. If you pull, do not pull too hard lest that hair be broken and there then be fighting.”

83. I am not giving you a formula here. Far be it from me to tell those patriots who yesterday spoke with clarity, attention to the democratic rule and singleness of mind what they should do. Far be it from me to call the other three parties who seem to be trying to find a solution with Ian Smith weaklings or traitors. Who am I to do that? Who are we to take sides? We should not. But, for heaven's sake, there has been a transformation, even in Ian Smith. You say he shows duplicity; all right, why do you not show duplicity? We show duplicity too. But let us not arrive at an impasse so that after two or three meetings somebody will come up with a draft resolution and if it does not sit well with certain Powers that have interests in that part of the world it will be vetoed, and then we shall have achieved nothing. Why do I say that? Because we have seen many questions discussed here and there has been a veto. Sometimes the veto is better than a consensus, because a consensus solves nothing.

84. The United States, more than any other country, could play a role, because it is a world Power and has a direct interest in that part of the world. I am not talking about strategic interests; to heck with those. Why should you go and bother yourselves with the whole world strategically? You have a continent here, my good friend Ambassador Young. And the Russians, their territory is twice the size of yours. Keep away from spheres of influence and power politics. We are tired of you both, waging war by proxy sometimes when you do not dare to confront one another because your own people would take issue with those in the seats of power and would lynch them should there, God forbid, be a nuclear war or mass destruction. Therefore why do we come here as false witnesses? Why?

85. I have talked with my Chinese friend and with his predecessor, my good friend who is today Foreign Minister—he is still Foreign Minister, Huang Hua? Yes. He told me “You don't know: they are conspiring against us”. I said “For heaven's sake”, and he said “Don't try, we are like oil and water”. I said “I used to be a chemist; I can make an emulsion of oil and water”. There is interest in the old tradition. Think of our Chinese brothers. I talk about brothers because, although they are from one side of Asia and I am from the other, Asia is the mother continent. Those Europeans all came from Asia.

86. We are tired, as human beings. What axe do I have to grind? Did I ever have ambitions? I am a United Nations man first and foremost because we all adhere to the Charter. Our loyalty should be to the Charter because it transcends our petty national interests, and the older one gets the more one feels that one should do so.

87. So my message—and I am going to be brief now, my good friend Mr. President—my appeal, is not to be so inflexible. First and foremost I speak to those bulwarks of strength there. If they had not been bulwarks to strength they could not have suffered what they have and still have had the clarity of mind to come and tell us what the

situation is. I appeal to you, my good friends of the Patriotic Front. I was a patriot, but I never used violence. To tell you the truth, I do not believe in it. Try to get inside and work inside. I do not know how. You are the specialists, it is your country. There is even a priest, a bishop—Bishop Muzorewa. I hear that you are not on speaking terms with him. Play on his religious sentiment, circumvent him. He is a human being like you. Let him come. Why be inflexible?

88. I will tell you something. I am an Arab, a pan-Arab, one of the first. When the usurpers of Palestine—I do not want to exacerbate matters, but this applies—meaning the Zionists, came and carved up Palestine and took it, some of my Arab friends said “We are not going to listen to them. Let us go out.” I said “Why go out?” But many of them went out of the Assembly. I said “Why don't you stay in?” They said “Solidarity.” I said “To hell with solidarity; I want to hear what they have to say so that I may reply.” And who dare say I am not as good an Arab? Perhaps I am a slightly better Arab, being more ancient. The older the wine, the better it is. I stayed and I rebutted anything that had to be rebutted.

89. So, for heaven's sake—I do not know what the others are; you call them almost traitors, I do not know, I have no right to say—bring them to your side and work from inside. And remember this, all my African friends. This is not because Ian Smith and his people happen to be white, but because they came from Europe with a more advanced background after the Industrial Revolution, whereas the blacks were still natural, in a primitive society. They went there and built, of course for their own benefit; they did not do it for the benefit of the blacks, but they had to use black labour. Now, if those whites are scared and leave, think of the economy of the country. Learn from them so that you may be able to run the country properly and, if they do not consider themselves like you, then you say “Out, it is no country of yours”.

90. But do you know what could happen? I am not going to mention specific examples, but I know States that got rid of certain elements inside their countries because of political considerations and are now more stagnant than ever. Why? Because they did not learn how to manage their own countries. I do not say that Ian Smith is the teacher of technology, science and so on. There are many whites who act emotionally, as we Asians or Africans act emotionally. Many of us sometimes act fanatically, on religious grounds, on ideological grounds, on various grounds. But you are leaders, my good friends of the Patriotic Front, you are true leaders. I would not call you that and compromise my conscience. I listened to every word you said, but I have this reservation: for heaven's sake be a little more pliable. Not that, if you are pliable, Ian Smith will change tomorrow, but eventually he has to change. He is not eternal. Your black people are eternal there. The whites are ephemeral, unless they want to live with equal rights and not set themselves above others. It is not a question of colour, it is a question of privilege. They cannot have the privilege once you know how to run affairs. And I am sure that with people like you that is not a problem. I noticed your diction, your exposition of the case. Another thing is

that bitterness, which is natural. You should have seen how bitter I was; I used to explode when I was your age, young. Grow mature.

91. Do not say they are co-operating with Smith. Again, how long will Smith last? Try to circumvent him, not necessarily by violent methods but by other methods. Sometimes you have to use violence, I agree, unfortunately, just as when one has an abscess one has to have a surgeon remove the pus.

92. That is my message—my message from the heart and from my humble experience in colonial affairs. It may be thought that because I am now old I have lost my punch. No, I still have punch. But there is a lot of suffering and it is mostly inflicted on innocent people. That is my message. I do not consider it wisdom; I consider it facts. If they were not facts they would not be so brief; it is not a question of symbols.

*The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.*

---

### كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

#### 如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

#### 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 libraire 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.

---