

At The UN Discussion Of Rhodesia

Britain's Set-Up Threatened With Exposure

Action in the United Nations Security Council last week, traceable to U.S. State Department initiatives, has blighted British hopes of making Rhodesia the scene of a U.S.-Soviet confrontation, by making sure that the penalty would be a politically devastating exposure of London's instigating role.

Early last week, the Security Council passed without dissent a resolution condemning Rhodesian Prime Minister Smith's British-scripted "internal" settlement to Rhodesia's governmental crisis, a scheme that excludes the political arm of the anti-Smith guerrilla forces, the Patriotic Front. The British were pressured not to veto under U.S. threat of isolation, and the appearance of Anglo-American solidarity was maintained through the abstention of all "Big Five" powers.

On March 17 the Security Council went further, and unanimously passed a Zambian resolution condemning the recent Rhodesian raids into Zambia as flagrant violations of sovereignty. The resolution also called on the British to bring a speedy end to Rhodesia's illegal Smith

regime, singling out Britain as the party that must implement a transfer to genuine majority rule — essential for durable peace in the region.

The resolutions put an end to the pretense that the Smith government and the Patriotic Front are forces of equal standing in the dispute over how Rhodesia will be governed, and that both are equally obliged to make concessions. U.S. support for the resolution rests on the recognition that an attempted confrontation with the Soviets in this issue would fail, being based only on U.S. bluff, and would hand Africa over to East bloc influence. As in Angola and Ethiopia, the U.S. would once again find itself on the losing side.

Not only did the U.S. refuse to play, but spokesmen from several African nations and the Patriotic Front have begun attacking the British for their role in the Rhodesia crisis. It could be that the exposure the British so fear could come even as their plans for a U.S.-Soviet showdown evaporate.

The British On The Firing Line In Security Council

At the same time that the U.S. was threatening to break publicly with the British on policy toward the Rhodesia crisis and Smith's internal solution, African nations and Patriotic Front spokesmen began targeting British complicity in the prolongation of the crisis. This African attack came to a head at the UN the week of March 13-17, when two resolutions were passed condemning both Smith's internal settlement, and the Rhodesian military raids into Zambia.

Rhodesia Resolution

United Nations Security Council Resolution 423 (1978)
Adopted by the Security Council at its 2067th meeting
on 14 March 1978

The Security Council...

1. *Condemns* all attempts and manoeuvres by the illegal régime aimed at the retention of power by a racist minority and at preventing the achievement of independence by Zimbabwe;

2. *Declares* as illegal and unacceptable any internal settlement under the auspices of the illegal regime and

calls upon all States not to accord any recognition to such settlement;

3. *Further declares* that the speedy termination of the illegal regime and the replacement of its military and police forces is the first prerequisite for the restoration of legality in Southern Rhodesia so that arrangements may be made for a peaceful and democratic transition to genuine majority rule and independence in 1978;

4. *Declares* also that such arrangements as envisaged in paragraph 3 include the holding of free and fair elections on the basis of universal adult suffrage under United Nations supervision;

5. *Calls upon* the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to take all measures necessary to bring to an end the illegal racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia and to effect the genuine decolonization of the territory in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and other United Nations resolutions;

6. *Considers* that, with the assistance of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the United Kingdom as the administering Power should enter into immediate consultations with the parties concerned in order to attain the objectives of genuine decolonization of the

territory through the implementation of paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 above;

7. *Requests* the Secretary-General to report, not later than 15 April 1978, on the results of the implementation of this resolution.

Zambia Resolution

United Nations Security Council Resolution 424
Adopted by the Security Council at its 2070th meeting
on 17 March 1978

The Security Council...

1. *Strongly condemns* the recent armed invasion perpetrated by the illegal racist minority régime in the British colony of Southern Rhodesia against the Republic of Zambia, which constitutes a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Zambia;

2. *Commends* the Republic of Zambia and other front-line States for their continued support of the people of Zimbabwe in their just and legitimate struggle for the attainment of freedom and independence and for their scrupulous restraint in the face of provocations by the Rhodesian rebels;

3. *Reaffirms* that the liberation of Namibia and Zimbabwe and the elimination of *apartheid* in South Africa are necessary for the attainment of justice and lasting peace in the region;

4. *Calls upon* the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, as the Administering Authority, to take prompt effective measures to bring to a speedy end the existence of the illegal racist minority régime in the rebel colony of Southern Rhodesia, thereby ensuring the speedy attainment

and thus contributing to the promotion of durable peace and security in the region;

5. *Decides* that in the event of further acts of violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Zambia by the illegal racist minority régime of Southern Rhodesia, the Security Council will meet again to consider the adoption of more effective measures, in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, including Chapter VII thereof.

Andrew Young Says: Why Trust Smith?

Excerpts from a statement by Ambassador Andrew Young, United States Representative to the United Nations, in the Security Council on Rhodesia March 14, 1978:

— Smith's signature has been obtained on a commitment eventually to step down. There is still no iron-clad assurance, however, that he will do so....

That being said, Mr. President, there is much in the Salisbury agreement which raises questions regarding the ability to withstand the political pressures which have built up over the past few years....

Second, the Anglo-American proposals *recognize that transitional political institutions must not be subject to control by the existing illegal regime or any one of the parties to the conflict.* The Salisbury plan would intro-

duce a transitional arrangement of shared responsibility subject to the rule of unanimity and the ultimate authority of the present parliament. *This would allow Smith to hold effective power and to wield a veto...*

The Salisbury agreement would rely on the existing Rhodesian army, absorbing into it those guerrillas capable of passing a screening process. We cannot but conclude that such a provision fails to take into account the history of bloodshed which makes the Rhodesian army, as now constituted, an unsatisfactory guarantor of the rights of all Zimbabweans, black and white.... However, for a period of approximately ten years changes in all entrenched aspects of the constitution could come about only with the concurrence of all the black members and six of the white members of the parliament. Indeed, there is no guarantee that this system will not carry over after the initial ten-year period. This limitation of the ability of the new government to bring about necessary change and meet the aspirations of the majority appear inconsistent with the full exercise of sovereignty (sic) by an independent government representing all the people of Zimbabwe.

Nigeria Says British Must Reject Internal Solution

Excerpts from a statement delivered in the Security Council, on the question of Southern Rhodesia by Brigadier J.N. Garba, Commissioner for External Affairs of the Federal Republic of Nigeria on Friday, March 10, 1978.

...When we in Nigeria heard about the questionable actions of Bishop Muzorewa, Reverend Sithole and Chief Chirau in joining the illegal minority racist regime, we brushed the news aside, considering it an exercise in self-deception and futility. We took for granted that the British Government would immediately reject the so-called Salisbury settlement and so inform the Security Council and Member States of the United Nations....

I wish to express here the disappointment of my delegation at the fact that this meeting 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 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....

...we believe that this present meeting should discuss the deteriorating situation in Southern Rhodesia and the continued aggression by the racist

of indep

regime against independent African countries.

The Security 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 this 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 reports of the Sanctions Committee 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 anyone 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....

...my government cannot but recall with intense displeasure, the British hesitations that have frustrated all meaningful efforts at a just and lasting settlement....

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....

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 Britain turned over power, in political and material terms, to racist minorities in Southern Africa. We still say categorically, for the umpteenth time, that Britain, 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....

The talks were by no means a failure because of the far-reaching concessions that were made by the Patriotic Front vis-a-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....

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 Britain 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 Department (sic). 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 regime 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 in Salisbury. What Smith has done is a new challenge to and an act of blatant defiance of the Security Council....

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 those friends to help to push the armed struggle to its logical conclusion.

Zambia Says British Lack The Will

Excerpt from a statement delivered in the UN Security Council by Zambian Foreign Minister Siteke Mwale on March 15, 1978.

...Britain has lacked the will. Paradoxically, even recent American attempts to complement British power have not yielded the desired results. The colonial Power continues to shun its full responsibilities over Rhodesia. The British must remember that it is they who colonized Southern Rhodesia in their zest for imperial grandeur, their action spearheaded by that arch-imperialist-capitalist Cecil John Rhodes. Surely, the British were never invited by Africans to colonize the country now called Southern Rhodesia. After exploiting Zimbabwe, today the British have a duty to the people of Zimbabwe and the world to decolonize Rhodesia in the interests of the majority....

Patriotic Front Spokesmen Attack British In British Press

The Guardian, *March 15*

Mr. Nkomo said, The British seem to have shifted from the Anglo-American proposals. They want a proximity conference starting on March 20. To that we say No — a big No. We say resume the conference, with the Americans taking part, which you (British) adjourned in Malta six weeks ago.

Mr. Mugabe said, The Americans have been clear and forthright. But they must support those who hold the responsibility as the colonial power. It is David Owen who is giving us all the trouble now.

If it were only up to the Americans we would have no problem. They are ready to proceed, on the basis of the Anglo-American proposals, where things were adjourned in Malta.

The Times, London. March 13:

A sharp division of opinion between Dr. David Owen, the Foreign Secretary, and the leaders of the Patriotic Front, Mr. Joshua Nkomo and Mr. Robert Mugabe, caused their talks on Rhodesia to end in failure yesterday.

Mugabe said, We asked him to think again. Apparently he is going to think again now.

We are trying to press Dr. Owen to keep to the (Anglo-American) plan but it appears we are not succeeding.

The front was not opposed to others, whom Mr. Nkomo terms "the Salisbury talkers", joining in. It was not prepared, however, to move towards the Salisbury talks, which they regard as totally unacceptable, because they proceed from the rebel regime.

A Reuters wire, datelined Lusaka, March 14:

Mr. Mainza Chona, the Zambian Prime Minister, says Britain was indirectly responsible for Rhodesian raids into the country and should compensate it for the losses suffered.

Briefing Parliament here yesterday on last week's raid, Mr. Chona said Britain was "indirectly responsible for the brutal murder of innocent Zambians and destruction of Zambia's property." The British Foreign Office was propping up the Rhodesian government, both economically and militarily.

Pressure For The Internal Solution

A press campaign in Britain and the U.S. portraying Smith's internal solution" as a viable transfer to majority rule is aiding efforts to transform the situation into a Soviet-U.S. confrontation: the Carter Administration is being attacked for not adopting a hardline posture in defense of the internal solution. In the words of a Republican Party report released March 22, the Administration is giving "Soviet-supported totalitarian Marxists a veto over the future political order in Rhodesia," instead of supporting the "prowestern black majority," Smith's "internal solution" puppets are euphemistically called.

The Daily Telegraph (London) March 21, "Council End White Rule In Rhodesia" :

Exclusive White rule in Rhodesia will end today with the first meeting of the Executive Council, the four-man group which will guide the country to Black majority rule at the end of this year... The Executive Council will

become the supreme policy and decisionmaking body in Rhodesia.

The New York Times, March 22 :

The swearing in ceremony introduced the black leaders into a government structure that retains ultimate constitutional power in white hands. For example, Mr. Smith will retain the title of Prime Minister and the statutory powers that accompany it... Another problem for the black leaders will be control of the white-led Government forces. up to now, the forces have been directed by a 10-member War Council... but sources disclosed today that a smaller body was established recently under the same name, chaired by Lieut. Gen. Peter Walls, commander of the Government forces: When questioned on the topic, Mr. Smith was evasive, saying that the conduct of the war would rest, as before, with the military commanders.

James J. Kilpatrick, syndicated column, March 22:

By their refusal to embrace the Rhodesian settlement, Britain and the United States are demonstrating to the whole world how the West will be lost....How can these interests be defined? Unless reason has fled our temples altogether, we are interested in halting the spread of Soviet-Cuban adventuring in Africa; we are interested in having an anti-Communist, as distinguished from a pro-Communist, regime in this part of the world. We are interested in seeing in Rhodesia a peaceful, multi-racial, more or less democratic society...The settlement reached between Prime Minister Ian Smith and three moderate black leaders provides all these things....All that is required is for Britain and the United States publicly to welcome the compact, and to throw their influence, their money and their arms behind its acceptance....These are times when great powers must act as great powers....Britain and the United States need only to act decisively, promptly and fearlessly. So far as we are concerned, they might say, the U.N. sanctions no longer will be honored; we will support the new government with credits, loans, diplomatic recognition and with whatever military aid may be required to smash the guerillas and their Communist Cuban allies.

Public and Private

The South African Digest for the week ending March 10 reports the public reaction to the Rhodesian internal settlement by the South African Government:

His Government welcomed the fact that Whites and Blacks in Rhodesia had reached an acceptable agreement, the Prime Minister, Mr. B.J. Vorster, said in Cape Town.

Mr. Vorster added that the success of the agreement would depend on the good faith of the parties concerned and whether they would be allowed to arrange and determine their affairs according to their own wishes.

Mr. R.F. Botha, Minister of Foreign Affairs, said: "We welcome it. The leaders of Rhodesia have a right to work out their own future, just as it is the prerogative of the people of South West Africa to work out their own future."