

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**1111th
PLENARY MEETING**

Tuesday, 19 June 1962,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 97:

Question of Southern Rhodesia (continued) . . . 1415

President: Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia).

AGENDA ITEM 97

Question of Southern Rhodesia (continued)

1. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika): My delegation represents a country which, as a Trust Territory, had long and fruitful association with this Organization. We therefore know and value the vitally important role that this Assembly can play in influencing the shape of things to come. Our country is a member of the Commonwealth of nations, and therefore the United Kingdom is a friend of ours. We are also a member of the Pan-African Freedom Movement of Eastern, Central and Southern Africa—PAFMECSA, for short—the aims and objectives of which are, among other things, first, to unite the people of Eastern, Central and Southern Africa in order to rid these countries of imperialism, white supremacy, exploitation and social degradation, so as to obtain self-determination and establish democratic government for the social and economic well-being of the people; and second, to promote the union of independent African States of the PAFMECSA area as a step towards the realization of a greater union of African States.

2. Southern Rhodesia, and indeed the whole of the Rhodesia-Nyasaland Federation, falls within the purview of PAFMECSA. Furthermore, ours too is a multiracial society, as some people like to call it, though we prefer to term it a non-racial society for obvious reasons. We are therefore extremely interested in the situation in Southern Rhodesia and the Federation as a whole.

3. It is but natural that my delegation may repeat arguments and facts that have already been presented to the Assembly, for we are dealing with the same situation. There are several aspects to the situation in Southern Rhodesia. My delegation humbly begs to submit that the situation in Southern Rhodesia revolves around a crisis in human relations. The Monckton Report,^{1/} commenting on the consequences of the break-up of the Federation, said, in paragraph 71, page 29:

"The immediate reaction to the dissolution of the Federation, both inside and outside the area, would be that a great experiment in race relations had failed. This experiment is being watched with close interest throughout the world . . . To break it up at

this crucial moment in the history of Africa would, we believe, amount to an admission that there is no hope of survival for any multiracial society on the African Continent and that differences of colour and race are irreconcilable. We cannot agree to such a conclusion. We believe rather that our objective should be to preserve the benefits of the Federation by recasting the structure of the present association in a form more acceptable to its inhabitants".

4. Recent events indicate that the Federation is likely to break up none the less. Why? The answer is contained in one obnoxious word, "discrimination". That is the crux of the matter—racial discrimination against the non-white section of the population—yes, white supremacy.

5. The Monckton report states in paragraph 218:

"Racial discrimination, though diminishing, remains one of the more important forces working against Federation. The reference to 'Partnership' in the Preamble to the 1953 Constitution led Africans to believe that discrimination would quickly disappear. The fact that it did not and that the term itself remained undefined, has resulted in growing suspicion and disillusion."

6. The Southern Rhodesian Government and the Constitution are both responsible for the hatred of the Federation felt by the majority of the inhabitants. The Monckton Report states, in paragraph 27:

"The dislike of the Federation among Africans in the two Northern Territories is widespread, sincere, and of long standing. It is almost pathological. It is associated almost everywhere with a picture of Southern Rhodesia as a white man's country."

and in paragraph 74:

"And now after seven years of Federation African distrust has reached an intensity impossible in our opinion to dispel without drastic and fundamental changes both in the structure of the association itself—and these words are important—and in the racial policies of Southern Rhodesia."

7. The seriousness, significance and urgency of the situation is highlighted by Dr. Thomas M. Franck, who states in his recent book:

"The Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland consists of some 7,000,000 Africans and 250,000 whites. This is its most obvious, most basic, and most ignored statistic. It is a fact that can easily be forgotten in studying the Federation's white government, judiciary and civil service or while wandering amongst the modern commercial skyscrapers of Salisbury, Bulawayo, Ndola and Lusaka.

"Yet this cold, immutable statistic confounds all dreams of white supremacy, places pious platitudes about 'multiracialism' in proportion, and decrees that the country is irretrievably destined, eventually,

^{1/} Report of the Advisory Commission on the Review of the Constitution of Rhodesia and Nyasaland (London, H.M. Stationery Office, 1960), Cmd. 1148.

to become an African State, and not an outpost of white Empire.

"The only question is whether that destiny will be realized as the culmination of peaceful, orderly, planned co-operation between the races, or in violence and chaos. Phrased in a way more relevant to those not resident in the Federation, the question is whether central Africa can find its way to independence as a free African state in friendly association with the western democratic community or whether it must undergo a stage of violent, introverted black nationalism".^{2/}

8. The appropriate figures for Southern Rhodesia are 240,000 white settlers as against 3,000,000 African people. My delegation therefore fully supports the findings of the Special Committee of seventeen members^{3/} as they appear in document A/5124, annex III.

9. Since the Monckton report was published, there have been further developments whose total effect has been to make the situation in Southern Rhodesia even full of more anxiety, tension and political frustration among the majority of the inhabitants.

10. The Constitution of 6 December 1961, for instance, has been promulgated. Suffice it to say that this has been rejected by the overwhelming majority of the African population. Why? The real answer is contained in a speech made by the Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia, Sir Edgar Whitehead, at the Special Congress of the Southern Rhodesian Division of the United Federal Party, at the Rhodes Memorial Hall on Wednesday, 22 February 1961. He said inter alia:

"When we started with these negotiations I had one primary aim in view—and that was to get the restrictions removed from our Constitution. Everybody will tell you, and I have said it myself in the past, that as we have governed ourselves for thirty-seven years these powers, which legally are in the hands of the United Kingdom Government, would never in fact be used. But during these last few years there have been rather ominous signs of an intention to try to interfere in our affairs.

"When the previous Secretary of State first started interviewing some of our extremist nationalist leaders in London, I protested that this was a new development. We began to find that people who were outside our Parliament, who were members of parties which in no way represented the African people as a whole, were making extravagant claims in London to represent three million people in this country. And we found that British Ministers were listening to them, were entertaining them, and that these people were being interviewed on television and trying to give the impression that they, and not the duly constituted Government of this country, represented the people of this country. And I could see the danger of this move—the steady introduction of outside elements into our affairs. And seeing this, I became more than ever determined that the reservations on the Constitution must go. Now if these proposals are adopted and if, subsequently, the electorate endorse them at the referendum, it means that the Conference which we finished a few

weeks ago will be the last Constitutional Conference that will be held in Southern Rhodesia.

"I found it very wearing and painful, with a succession of Secretaries of State, to try to explain to them the sort of first facts of life about how things go on in this country. They know nothing about it, and although eager to learn it takes a long time, and just when you have taught one you get another one.

"Now, I do want to make this absolutely clear—I know there has been considerable objection and a feeling that what we are getting is not complete independence. Well, of course, the country that will ultimately get complete independence is the Federation, because External Affairs and Defence are the Ministries which can make treaties of alliance and go to the United Nations, and so on. Those are not Southern Rhodesian subjects, and of course we cannot get complete independence while the Federal Government holds those powers. It is up to us to help the Federal Government to get that complete independence, and at the earliest possible moment."

11. Then, turning specifically to the franchise, he expanded:

"Entering into these negotiations, I had a very keen eye to Party policy—the first thing was that there should be no tampering with the upper roll. The only change made in the upper roll was to add chiefs and hereditary headmen, who number 500 in all, and there will never be more. That was the only change made. It is not known, I find, to a great many people in this country, that the Southern Rhodesian chiefs have been eligible for the Federal roll for years. And those are the people who have criticized me for putting the chiefs on the Southern Rhodesian one.

"That was the only change made in the qualifications for the upper roll. That is why both Sir Roy and myself have taken such exception, in the Northern Rhodesia proposals, to the suggestion that the upper roll qualifications should be lowered. We have just reached the stage when, in the Federal sphere in Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland, the upper roll qualifications, with entirely minor exceptions, are almost identical. It has taken years to achieve that unity in the upper roll, and quite casually the United Kingdom Government apparently are willing to move Northern Rhodesia out of line without considering the effect on the rest of us.

"Secondly, in the negotiations, I was quite determined that the control of Parliament must remain those elected on the upper roll. We have secured this and we have fifty upper roll seats and fifteen lower. There again I am perfectly satisfied that this means that for all time the Government will remain in civilised and responsible hands, as laid down by the upper roll qualifications. That was the second point that I was quite determined to achieve, and we got it. I want to make another thing clear. I told you at the beginning that we had had our last conference. The provisions of the new proposals are that future amendments to the Constitution will rest with us here in Southern Rhodesia."

12. Turning to the Declaration of Rights,^{4/} he had this to say:

"It is a very fashionable thing to have a Declaration of Rights these days. Since the war many of the

^{2/} Thomas M. Franck, *Race and Nationalism* (New York, Fordham University Press, 1960), p. 1.

^{3/} Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

^{4/} Embodied in the Constitution of Southern Rhodesia promulgated in December 1961.

European countries have adopted the system. It was started originally by the United States a very long time ago, and in the new and modern constitutions it is the common thing to put in. One has to see that in having a Declaration of Rights there are two things that are completely safeguarded. The first is that it must not interfere with the existing body of law that exists in the country already. You could not allow a Declaration of Rights to overthrow all existing laws and face the Government and Parliament with the decision of replacing them somehow in a few months. So the Declaration of Rights does not apply to the body of law that is actually in force now. It only deals with future laws.

"The second thing you have got to ensure is that the Declaration of Rights is not so rigid that it is impossible for the Government or for the Parliament of the country to deal with essential subjects like law and order, public health and the general security in times of stress. Practically all the modern Bills of Rights carefully guard the rights of Government and Parliament so that their action is not hampered in those circumstances. Nevertheless, the Declaration of Rights does mean a real protection against future legislation that may infringe personal liberty for any race. I stress this.

"I am rather well up in our present reservations at the moment. In fact I found some I never knew existed until I started these negotiations, but in every case the present reservations are entirely for the protection of Africans with no mention of any other race at all. Under the new proposals protection is given to people of any race at this country for all time. That, I believe, is a major and most important amendment.

"I am satisfied that these new provisions will be more effective than a Secretary of State who has to ask advice from people who know nothing about this country at all and who arrives at a sort of chance decision. I believe that we have now got the whole of this on to a local basis and that once it is adopted and becomes law we shall never suffer this interference again from outside."

13. I have dwelt at length on political aspects because it is politics in these parts of the world which guide and regulate the lives of the people.

14. My delegation's stand with regard to this white-cum-black relationship crisis was most eloquently expressed by the architect of our nation, Mr. Julius Nyerere when he addressed the General Assembly in December 1961:

"The basis of our actions, internal and external, will be an attempt—an honest attempt—to honour the dignity of man. We believe that all mankind is one, that the physiological differences between us are unimportant in comparison with our common humanity. We believe that black skin or white, straight or curly hair, differences in the shape of our bodies, do not alter or even affect the fact that each one of us is part of the human species and has a part to play in the development of mankind. We believe that differences in our religions or our political ideologies may cause difficulties for our small minds, but do not, to our way of thinking, affect the rights of every individual to be treated as a man, with dignity and honour." [1078th meeting, para. 140.]

"It may be, because of the history of Africa, that we are particularly conscious of the need to reaffirm this basic faith in relation to the racial divisions of mankind. Yet we believe this is of fundamental importance. We believe—we know as a fact—that a man may change his religion, that a man may change his ideological belief, but he can never change the shape of his face, nor the race into which he was born. ... What we are in fact saying is that we shall try to use the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a basis for both our external and our internal policies." [Ibid., para. 141.]

"That Declaration confirms the right of every individual to many things, which we cannot yet provide for the citizens of our own country. In that respect this document, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, represents our goal rather than something that we have already achieved. None the less, the underlying theme of the Universal Declaration, that of human brotherhood, regardless of race, colour or creed, is the basic principle which we have been struggling to implement." [Ibid., para. 142.]

"We accept without question as a basis, a basic article of faith, that every individual has an equal right to inherit the earth, to partake of its joys and its sorrows and to contribute to the building of the sort of society which he desires for himself and also for his children. In saying this, we have committed our country to a grand endeavour. We are conscious that the implementation of the spirit underlying lofty ideas is not always achieved without some difficulty, that we shall sometimes fail in our efforts. But any apparent deviation from the articles of this Declaration will be an honest attempt on our part to balance conflicting interests while preserving the major principle itself. It will be in the light of this principle that we shall try at all times to determine our stand on every international issue which we shall be called upon to consider in this Assembly or elsewhere." [Ibid., para. 143.]

"We shall always try to understand the practical difficulties which face Governments and nations in the implementation of this principle, but we shall never compromise with those who deny this basic principle of human brotherhood. We accept that the United Nations cannot interfere in the internal affairs of any State, and we believe that, under present circumstances, that is as it should be. But we also believe that it has an overriding interest in the preservation of peace throughout the world, and further, that there is no internal conflict now which does not have external repercussions." [Ibid., para. 144.]

"My Government has unfriendly feelings towards no people, but it entertains bitter hostility towards Governments whose policies are based on racial discrimination. On this issue we cannot compromise." [Ibid., para. 145.]

15. Therefore, we cannot compromise with the racial policies of the present Government in Southern Rhodesia and the racial Constitution of 1961.

16. We all very much hope that the Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia, the Prime Minister of the Federation, their Governments and the white settlers will have learnt the bitter lesson of the Algerian war and the destruction, bloodshed and untold misery it

has inflicted on those affected and on the world at large. They are forewarned to avoid precipitating such a tragedy.

17. We now turn to economic matters. Much will be made of them—if that has not been done already—from certain well-known quarters. Our immediate reaction is that the inhabitants of Southern Rhodesia will never barter their birthright for a mess of pottage. Furthermore, it is not enough to defend the status quo by economic growth indicators of an aggregate nature. The crucial question is how the fruits of economic growth are distributed. I wish there were enough time to elaborate on this. I will only quote the following evidence given by Miss Frene Ginwalla, who petitioned the Special Committee of seventeen members while it was at Dar es Salaam. She had this to say:

"Members of this Committee will already be aware of the activities of Union Minière in Katanga. One might pause to reflect on the difference of the events of the last two years had this company accepted the independence of the Congo, and pledged its loyalty to the legally constituted Central Government.

"However, as Union Minière opposed and then tried to subvert Congolese independence, so others have opposed African independence, and will try to sabotage it in future.

"To list in detail the activities of the various companies and corporations would take more time than is warranted.

"As an example, I would like to present to you some idea of the scope of the British South Africa Company (which a British Colonial Office official was heard to describe as the 'evil genius of the Rhodesias') and to illustrate the stakes that are involved.

"The Company was set up 72 years ago by Royal Charter after Cecil Rhodes had hoodwinked the chiefs of Central Africa into signing away their birthrights, including the mineral rights of their tribes. Modelled on the East India Company, it governed all Northern and Southern Rhodesia. It exploited the country; its orders were law.

"If I seem to exaggerate the seduction by which the British South Africa Company was conceived, let me call an unusual witness, Sir Roy Welensky. He was then only Roy Welensky. He used these words in the Northern Rhodesia Legislature in 1948:

"The first point I want to make is that these arguments, if you can call them that, were negotiated in the early part of the nineties. On the one side you had company-cum-Government which was negotiating with African chiefs.

"I have no doubt that the Company knew what it was after; I certainly question whether any African chief, whether he was the King of the Barotse or any other African chief, knew that he was disposing of or parting with the mineral rights. I question whether any African chief, including the King of the Barotse, without consulting his people, had the right of disposing of the mineral rights.

"As a matter of interest, if honourable members care to read the Pim report, they will see that the Yeta III petitioned the King direct expressing surprise that the Company should have thought that any

mineral rights were ceded to them in their capacity as a company; his suggestion was that they had obtained the mineral rights in their capacity as the Government of the territory.'

"In the early twenties the British South Africa Company relinquished its administration of Southern and Northern Rhodesia and its right in land (but not its mineral rights) in return for a cash payment of £3,750,000 by the Government and a half interest for 40 years in the proceeds of sales of land in North West Rhodesia.

"In 1923 the Government of Southern Rhodesia bought the Company's mineral rights for £2 million, but it kept these rights in Northern Rhodesia, the territory of the rich copperbelt. Later, an agreement was made with the Northern Rhodesia Government by which the Company will retain the mineral rights until 1986, paying meanwhile 20 per cent in taxation to the Government. That is to say, the Company will get its tribute on every ton of copper or other mineral for another 25 years.

"In the five years to 1960 the British South Africa Company, in round figures, pocketed £50 million from mining royalties. The arrangement is that it takes 13.5 per cent of the average London Exchange quotation for the month, less £8. For example, at a price of £300 per ton the royalty would be £32 5s. In the boom year 1956 the Company took £34 per ton. In the slump year of 1958 the royalty was reduced to £13 per ton.

"The wealth of the Company is so great, however, that even in a lean year it is able to pay a dividend of 30 per cent. It has established an amortization fund aimed at ensuring its present rate of revenue in perpetuity, even after 1986 when its mineral royalties are dated to end.

"Indeed, it has been stated that the directors aim, if the status quo of the European-dominated Federation is maintained, to build up a fortune of not less than £200,000,000.

"The interests of the British South Africa Company in Central Africa are not limited to mining royalties. It has already been mentioned that until 1964 the Company is to have half the proceeds of land owned by the Government in North West Rhodesia. It owns 99 per cent of the shares of the Rhodesia Railway Trust.

"In addition, the Company has mineral rights in over 16,000 square miles in Nyasaland. Minerals have not yet been exploited in Nyasaland although it is known that asbestos, bauxite and other minerals exist. It is a matter of doubt whether independent Nyasaland, when it comes into being, will countenance this arrangement.

"Indeed, the one fear of the directors and shareholders of the British South Africa Company is that the Rhodesias as well as Nyasaland will move rapidly towards democratic independence. The African people of Northern Rhodesia, existing in poverty, are not likely to allow an alien company to net millions of pounds a year from royalties on their natural resources.

"If one takes an average year, 1957, between boom and slump, the mineral royalties paid to the British South Africa Company amounted to £8,857,691, whilst the 39,000 African miners were paid £7,341,374 in wages. Those who do not do a

stroke of work in mining get more than the labourers in the mines.

"It is not an accident that those who are directors of the British South Africa Company are also the leading opponents of African political advance. Some of the Tory directorate are the Marquess of Salisbury, Lord Robins, Mr. Julian Amery (until he became a Minister), Earl de la Warr and Captain Charles Waterhouse.

"There is a Rhodesian whose name I should add: Viscount Malvern, Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia from 1933 to 1953, perhaps more uncompromising even than the present Sir Roy Welensky in opposition to African democracy.

"He revealed his mind in a speech to the Institute of Mining and Metallurgy at Kitwe on 11 May 1957. He remarked that people in Britain seemed to give up their sense of spiritual values. 'They have become idolators worshipping the idol of a universal vote. ... It would be a complete sell-out because you know the sort of thing that would satisfy them.'

"It is not known whom the Viscount meant by 'them'. If the African people, the sort of thing which would give them satisfaction certainly would not satisfy the British South Africa Company. The plunder of royalties would be stopped long before 1986.

"The Northern News, published in Ndola, stated in 1959 that right from the beginning of federation the British South Africa Company and the big mining interests have been paying a considerable subsidy to United Federal Party funds—a subsidy that ran into five figures yearly.

"There have been other allegations by the UNIP of Northern Rhodesia about British South Africa Company financing for the opposition and for disruptive elements within the nationalist movement.

"Realizing the stake the British South Africa Company has in maintaining the status quo in Northern Rhodesia, one can understand its anxiety to sabotage African advance and independence.

"This Committee is already aware of how the British Government has succumbed to pressure from its own ranks over Central Africa. Is it a coincidence that the leaders of the 'Tory lobbies', the Marquess of Salisbury and Captain Waterhouse, are also directors of the British South Africa Company?

"As I have stated above, these major companies are all inter-connected and work together. As the British South Africa Company operates in Northern Rhodesia, so others do within their 'spheres of influence'."

18. There is more evidence, and I would recommend the Assembly to pay attention particularly to the seventh, eighth and ninth paragraphs of the petitions submitted by Miss Frene Ginwalla to the Special Committee of seventeen members.

19. Financiers and industrialists will do well to remember that by supporting programmes, parties and governments that are against the development of people as a whole, they are investing in South Sea Bubble adventures. For it is people that matter most, and all people matter equally—both rich and poor, white and black. They should use their financial and economic power and influence to end the present cancer in the Southern Rhodesian white body politic.

20. The Church has made a laudably significant contribution in the development of Southern Rhodesia, particularly in the field of education. More work for the Church still lies ahead, for, as Trevor Huddleston has said,

"... the desire to dominate in order to preserve a position of racial superiority, and in that process of domination to destroy personal relationships, the foundation of love itself ... is anti-Christ."^{5/}

We call upon the Church and men of goodwill to exert their influences to end the commission of this sin of white racist supremacy.

21. To summarize, the key to the crisis in Southern Rhodesia is the franchise. There are powerful racial, financial and industrial vested interests that will try to "go the whole hog" to maintain the status quo. It is the duty of the Assembly to remedy this explosive and highly dangerous situation.

22. Just this morning, at 10 a.m., Mr. Joshua Nkomo, the President of the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) received the following cabled message from the deputy president of ZAPU in Salisbury:

"Situation highly tense and explosive. Leaders find it harder and harder to keep people from erupting. Britain must suspend constitution and start negotiations for new."

23. The least that this Assembly can do is to support the findings and recommendations of the Special Committee, and also particularly General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 742 (VIII). The Assembly is, therefore, urged to adopt the draft resolution on the question of Southern Rhodesia sponsored by several of its Members [A/L.386/Rev.1 and Add.1-3]. The time to act is now.

24. Mr. KIZYA (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (translated from Russian): The General Assembly has before it, at its resumed session, the very important and urgent question of the situation in Southern Rhodesia. The inclusion of this question in our agenda was requested by forty-one African-Asian delegations.

25. The action of the Assembly in including this question in the agenda was entirely correct. The Special Committee of seventeen concluded that:

"... in view of the grave and potentially explosive situation in Southern Rhodesia ... the situation in Southern Rhodesia should be considered by the General Assembly at its resumed sixteenth session or at a special session, as a matter of urgency." [A/5124, annex I, para. 45.]

26. The same importance and urgency of considering the question is emphasized by the forty-one delegations in their submission of document A/5127. These delegations, with complete justification, believed not only that events in Southern Rhodesia have not taken a favourable course in recent months but that, on the contrary, the situation in this African territory has become markedly worse. This was also revealed quite convincingly during the very fruitful discussion held on this problem in the Special Committee of seventeen.

27. It is very gratifying that, in its decisions, that Committee went far beyond the limitations of the question, posed in resolution 1745 (XVI), "whether the

^{5/} Trevor Huddleston, Naught for your Comfort (London, Collins, 1957), p. 248.

territory of Southern Rhodesia has attained a full measure of self-government".

28. Actually the answer, and in fact a completely negative answer, was obvious even when that resolution was adopted. Such an answer is also the one contained in the Committee's report. But the Committee would not have fulfilled even half of its mandate if it had confined itself to the mere finding of that fact.

29. The Committee—and we say this with a feeling of satisfaction—went about its task in a considerably more thorough manner. It probed the situation in that Territory deeply and comprehensively from the standpoint of its terms of reference as embodied in resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1654 (XVI).

30. The Committee formulated the following question and answered it fairly successfully: What specific measures must be taken to allow the people of Southern Rhodesia to realize its legitimate aspirations to freedom and national independence; what should specifically be done, with regard to Southern Rhodesia, in order to implement the historic Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples?

31. Those proposed measures are contained in the Committee's summary as well as in the resolution which was adopted and in the draft resolution [A/L.386/Rev.1 and Add.1-4], which is submitted to the present Assembly.

32. The conclusions of the Committee of Seventeen leave no shadow of doubt that the situation in Southern Rhodesia is so tense, the condition of the indigenous population so frightful, that it is precisely the present session of the General Assembly which must consider this question without delay and must make its proper contribution to a solution of the problem in the interests of the overwhelming majority of the population of that Territory.

33. The Committee of Seventeen quite legitimately noted that "if there is no genuine attempt to revise the policies and procedures adopted hitherto... a mood of desperation may set in which might lead to serious conflict and violence, whose repercussions might not be limited to Southern Rhodesia alone" [A/5124, annex I, para. 44].

34. Moreover, the Committee itself stated that there had been no such "genuine attempt" up to that time and that "the United Kingdom Government has not indicated any change in its approach to the situation concerning Southern Rhodesia" [*ibid.*, para. 38].

35. Indeed, the policy of the United Kingdom remains the same as before—an ultra-colonialist policy—despite all the efforts of the United Kingdom to camouflage the situation and mislead world opinion.

36. How can one disregard the historical fact that the present status of "self-governing" colony was imposed upon the people of Southern Rhodesia in 1923 by 13,000 white voters, while the indigenous population of more than 2,000,000 was excluded from any in deciding its own fate?

37. And what happened afterwards? Let us turn again to the Committee's report. That report states: "... whatever was done in 1923 was done without regard to the views of the indigenous people who had not even been consulted" [*ibid.*, para. 23].

38. We understand quite well why the indigenous people had not been consulted. The reason was that

everything that was being done, all the laws, all the colonial practices of the British authorities, were aimed directly against that indigenous people.

39. The rule of the colonizers in Southern Rhodesia was marked by ruthless theft of the country's wealth, the establishment of a régime of crude racial oppression, and police terror. That system was reinforced and sanctified by a whole series of ultra-reactionary, anti-democratic laws. I shall take the liberty of mentioning a few of those laws. They are as follows:

40. The Native Affairs Act, 1927, made it a punishable offence for an African to criticize any organ or official of the Government and restricted the indigenous population's freedom of movement.

41. The Land Apportionment Act, 1931, divided the country into African and European areas, forbade Africans to live in the European areas, and gave more than 53 per cent of the best cultivable land to the 200,000 white settlers.

42. The Native Land Husbandry Act, 1951, deprived many indigenous residents of their lands and livestock. Those deprived of their possessions by this colonialist law were then arrested for vagrancy and sent to work on the farms of white newcomers.

43. The Vagrancy Act, 1959, permitted the colonizers to deprive Africans of their employment for any convenient reason or for no reason at all, and then to arrest them because they allegedly had no means of subsistence.

44. The Public Order Act, 1955, was directed against democratic freedoms of any kind and prohibited the activity of a number of parties and organizations.

45. The Unlawful Organizations Act, 1959, enabled the Government to ban any political party which it did not like and to confiscate its property.

46. Lastly, the Preventive Detention Act, 1959, enabled the Government to arrest and imprison its political opponents without trial and judicial investigation.

47. Mr. Paul MUSHONGA, a representative of the Zimbabwe African Peoples Union appearing as a petitioner before the Committee of Seventeen, pointed out that it was precisely under this Act that members of his party were imprisoned for three years. Mr. Mushonga and Mr. Nkomo, the President of the Zimbabwe African Peoples Union, in their statements before the Committee of Seventeen, mentioned numerous facts and gave a horrifying description of the injustice, poverty and police persecution prevailing in Southern Rhodesia. They pointed out, in particular, that on the farms the average annual wage for Africans was £24 while for Europeans it was more than £800. Farm labourers were not permitted to organize trade unions.

48. With respect to the educational situation the petitioners presented some truly shocking facts. The Government of Southern Rhodesia had spent more than £5 million for the benefit of 40,000 white pupils and only £2 million for 500,000 African children. Mr. Mushonga indicated that out of 14,000 African children in the first grade less than 20 per cent completed six grades and only fifteen children (only fifteen children!) completed secondary school. And after all that, the representatives of the United Kingdom try to convince us here that they are carrying out some kind of "civilizing mission", that they are concerned about the indigenous population, about progress, and so on and so forth.

49. All these arguments and all these deceptions collapse like a house of cards. When we consider the words and deeds of Sir Roy Welensky, who in the middle of the twentieth century could go so far as to say that the right of universal suffrage was a myth and that, so long as he headed the Federal Government he would permit no discussion of that question. He suited his deeds to his words. Sir Roy Welensky, who was once a boxing champion and is now a champion of racialism, in fact "knocked out" even the most elementary democratic freedoms and rights of the indigenous population. But even that was not enough for him. The people of Southern Rhodesia was saddled with the Constitution of 1961. Welensky and Whitehead hastened to proclaim that the Constitution had been approved by the population. To achieve this a crude farce was staged. On 21 July 1961 a referendum was held, and 65 per cent of the voters approved the Constitution. But, gentlemen, who were those voters? Eighty-four thousand people were permitted to vote, and of these only 4,000 belonged to the indigenous population—out of the country's 3 million inhabitants!

50. In the Committee of Seventeen, Mr. Nkomo gave a detailed description of the way in which that ultra-racialist document came into being. What happened at the so-called constitutional conference of 1961? When the first session concluded and the delegates left for home in order to report to their voters how matters were going, the African deputies were purely and simply forbidden to participate in political gatherings and meetings, under the threat of twenty years' imprisonment. What is there to say—that is a characteristic feature of colonialist democracy!

51. The Constitution of 1961 makes no mention of the most elementary condition for democracy: universal suffrage. What the right to vote means, according to that Constitution, is clear from the fact that one African deputy is elected by 200,000 voters and one European deputy by 5,000 voters.

52. The Committee concluded that "the new Constitution further entrenches the authority of the European settlers" [*ibid.*, para. 24], that "the 1961 Constitution was not in accordance with the Declaration contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and that it did not recognize the democratic principles of equality and justice" [*ibid.*, para. 29].

53. Why should anyone be surprised that the indigenous population of Southern Rhodesia categorically rejects this thoroughly racist document? Why should anyone be surprised that in an unofficial referendum conducted by the largest political party of Southern Rhodesia, the Zimbabwe African Peoples Union, the Constitution was rejected by an overwhelming majority?

54. The demand that the Administering Authority, that is, the United Kingdom, should abrogate the 1961 Constitution was the outstanding point of the entire discussion in the Special Committee of Seventeen; it is contained in the conclusions and recommendations of that Committee. No one will be convinced by the assertions of the United Kingdom representatives that the Government of the United Kingdom cannot abrogate the Constitution because it was adopted in accordance with the wishes of the Government of Southern Rhodesia.

55. The Syrian representative in the Special Committee of Seventeen has very cogently pointed out that whenever the United Kingdom Government wished to

abrogate a constitution, whenever this suited it in similar situations, it has done so. It did so in the case of the 1953 Constitution of British Guiana and in the case of the 1958 Constitution of Malta. In the present instance, however, the United Kingdom Government, by transferring, under the 1961 Constitution, power to the racist minority in Southern Rhodesia, to the Welenskys of this world, has defied the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples which was adopted at the fifteenth session of the General Assembly [resolution 1514 (XV)].

56. Paragraph 5 of this historic document reads as follows:

"Immediate steps shall be taken, in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories or all other territories which have not yet attained independence, to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories, without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire, without any distinction as to race, creed or colour, in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom."

57. But what has the United Kingdom Government done in the case of Southern Rhodesia? It has indeed taken immediate steps to transfer all powers, but to whom? To a handful of racialists headed by Welensky, and, having done this, the British colonialists shamelessly declare the wishes of that group to be sacrosanct and not liable to review by the United Kingdom.

58. But this farce can mislead no one. The people of Southern Rhodesia are fighting not for false but for real liberation from the British colonial yoke. It wants real freedom and independence, not a semblance of them. As they say in the East, "the traveller needs a real oasis, not a mirage". The thirst of the people of Southern Rhodesia cannot be slaked with a mirage of freedom.

59. Neither diplomatic and constitutional trickery nor anything else can stand against dictates of our times. Colonialism has no place on this earth, and it has no place in Southern Rhodesia. On the basis of an analysis of the situation prevailing in Southern Rhodesia, the Committee came to the following conclusion which I quote:

"The situation in Southern Rhodesia appears to the Sub-Committee to be of great urgency and gravity." [A/5124, annex I, para. 44.]

60. The distinguished representatives of Ghana and Tanganyika, who spoke here not so long ago, were perfectly right in pointing out that this situation may lead to events similar to those which took place in Algeria. The Committee is therefore justified in calling for urgent action. It took the right course in proposing this in its summary, in the resolution it adopted and in the resolution recommended by it to the General Assembly.

61. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR considers that it is our Assembly's duty to approve these measures, to urge the United Kingdom to abrogate the Constitution of 1961. We wish to stress most emphatically that the 1961 Constitution should be, not amended or modernized, but abrogated as an ultra-reactionary and thoroughly anti-democratic instrument, totally unacceptable to the indigenous population. The next step should be to convene without delay a constitutional conference participated in by the indigenous political leaders, to restore civil liberties forth-

with, to abolish all restrictions in law and in practice on the exercise of freedom of political activity, to repeal all laws, ordinances and regulations which directly or indirectly sanction any policy or practice based on racial discrimination and, finally, to take immediate steps to apply the provision of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples in Southern Rhodesia, for the transfer of power to the people of Southern Rhodesia in accordance with universal suffrage.

62. At the same time, the Ukrainian delegation considers that this programme should be supplemented by a number of other important measures. In the first place, it is essential to decide that Southern Rhodesia should be granted independence not later than the end of 1962.

63. The abrogation of the 1961 Constitution should be accompanied by the introduction of new democratic legislation providing for universal and equal suffrage on the principle of "one man, one vote". On the same basis there should take place elections to the country's legislative body and the subsequent formation of a government which will really represent the will of the indigenous population.

64. Since the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland was imposed by the colonialists, and since the indigenous population has rejected that Federation, our Assembly should urgently demand its dissolution, its complete abolition.

65. That is the minimum which the Ukrainian delegation regards as essential for the successful accomplishment of our Assembly's responsible task of promoting the liquidation of colonialism in Southern Rhodesia.

66. The discussion in the General Committee and here in the plenary Assembly has shown how pitiful are the attempts of certain Western delegations to play the part of a fire-brigade intent on salvaging the position of the so-called "free world" in Southern Rhodesia. This "free world" is obviously not disposed to leave Africa voluntarily. Against the world-wide front of the struggle against colonialism it sets its own armed front, its military alliances and its military bases. An example of this massing of the dark forces of colonialism may be seen in the "holy alliance" between Salazar, Verwoerd and Welensky, who are trying to create a "White Africa" in the middle of the continent, with far-reaching aims of merciless colonial oppression.

67. But the peoples of Africa are taking the destiny of the continent into their own hands; and the colonizers and neo-colonizers will not succeed in putting back the clock of history, however hard they may try. No one can lull the peoples to sleep and steal their freedom; they have been awakened, they are vigilant and they know what to do. Of the 240 million inhabitants of Africa, nearly 200 million have already cast off the colonial yoke, and thirty independent States have appeared on the map of the continent. There is a good African proverb which says that "man is great only when at peace"; but the harsh realities of Africa have modified it. We may say that "man is great and a peoples is great in the struggle for the national freedom and independence of their motherland". Southern Rhodesia, like all Africa, certainly needs peace, and it is not its fault that a holy war is in progress, that the thunder of revolutions for national liberation is rolling over Africa. The peoples have languished too

long under the yoke of slavery; they are now becoming masters in their own African homes. To this the people of Southern Rhodesia, too, aspires; and Southern Rhodesia is not a lonely island. It may be said that all Central and Southern Africa is in a state of ferment. The powerful tidal wave of the liberation movement is engulfing Angola, Mozambique, the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, and other territories. And we believe that the day is not far off when the colours of the last remaining colonies will be erased from the map of Africa for ever.

68. The Ukrainian people, like all the peoples of the Soviet Union, is a true and sincere friend of the African peoples which are fighting for their liberation and of those which have already freed themselves from the imperialist yoke. And this is understandable; for a people which has won its freedom in a stubborn fight against its own exploiters and has crushed a number of armed attacks by international imperialism cannot fail to sympathize whole-heartedly with those who are now fighting in the tropical forests of Angola and in the mines of Rhodesia, and to wish them every success.

69. We are deeply convinced that the abolition of colonialism is one of the most important tasks of our times. The genuine and immediate solution of this problem is a matter of concern to millions of people and, indeed, to all mankind, since the complete and final eradication of this evil will lay the foundation for the establishment of really equal relations among peoples and will therefore promote firmer friendship and co-operation among nations and the maintenance and strengthening of universal peace.

70. Mr. BARTON (Canada): Before expressing the position of the Canadian Government on the matter before us today, I should like to acknowledge the diligence and vigour with which the Special Committee of seventeen members has been carrying out the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly, even though I must admit that we have some reservations about some of the conclusions that the Committee has reached. It is a particular pleasure to my delegation to recognize the service of the Chairman, Mr. Jha, in view of his forthcoming appointment as High Commissioner for India in Canada.

71. I think that all Members of this Assembly agree that the political situation in Southern Rhodesia is an extremely difficult one. At a time when the principles of democratic freedom have been adopted throughout most of Africa, a minority of 200,000 obviously cannot expect to exclude a majority of 2.25 million people indefinitely from participating in the political life of the country. Moreover, we do not believe that the present leaders of Southern Rhodesia intend to do so. Even under the 1961 Constitution, accepted by a two-to-one majority of the present electorate, it is anticipated that effective participation in the electoral process by a substantial majority of the population will be achieved within the next decade. The real issue is not whether Southern Rhodesia is moving in the right direction, but whether it is moving fast enough.

72. The Assembly has before it a report of the Special Committee of seventeen members [A/5124] which expresses the view of the majority of that body that the trend of constitutional development is not satisfactory, and advances a number of drastic recommendations which it believes should be given immediate effect. The first question which the Special Committee considered in its discussion of Southern

Rhodesia was whether or not the territory was self-governing. The British Government has pointed out, patiently and repeatedly, that Southern Rhodesia has been a self-governing colony since 1923 and that Britain cannot interfere in its internal affairs or legislate for it without the consent of the Southern Rhodesian Government. The Special Committee, on the other hand, has concluded, and the Assembly is asked to support this conclusion, that because the majority of the people are not yet included in the franchise, Southern Rhodesia has not attained a full measure of self-government.

73. It seems to my delegation that the reality behind these two contradictory positions has an important bearing on the question of whether the Assembly can take any constructive action at this time. In the first place, since the present Government of Southern Rhodesia has full control of its internal affairs, the Assembly must realize that the political changes which it desires can be brought about only with the co-operation of that Government. Second, it is not only pointless but against the interests of this Assembly for it to request the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, to impose various constitutional changes on the Government of Southern Rhodesia, when the United Kingdom has no power to do so. The United Kingdom Government can only exert influence on the Southern Rhodesian Government by persuasion and negotiation. It has no military forces stationed in the territory. And even if it had, can it seriously be imagined that military action could or would be taken against the Southern Rhodesian Government? And if it were, would the chaos, confusion and suffering resulting from such action really be in the interest of the peoples of Southern Rhodesia?

74. We believe that the transition to full representative government must be achieved peacefully. Any attempt to bring it about suddenly without the consent of the present Government could be made only by force. Given the existing situation, it would inevitably fail and would delay the transition for many more years.

75. Notwithstanding the situation both in the law and in fact, the majority of the Special Committee in its report, and the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.386/Rev.1 and Add.1-4 have implied that the United Kingdom Government is somehow capable of taking immediate steps to alter completely the Constitution of Southern Rhodesia. This, of course, is untrue. Nor does the General Assembly by itself have the power to order the Southern Rhodesian Government to alter its Constitution.

76. In these circumstances, it is the view of my delegation that the Assembly, in considering any proposed resolution on Southern Rhodesia, should be guided by two criteria: First, will the action called for by the terms of the draft resolution improve the situation of all the peoples of Southern Rhodesia? And second, can the action proposed in the draft resolution be put into effect? I am sure it is evident from what I have said that in our opinion the draft resolution does not fulfil either of these requirements.

77. What then, can we do? We think that the most useful action that this Assembly might take at this time would be to support the present efforts of the United Kingdom Government to bring about a solution to the political problems of the constituent territories of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland. These

problems of the constituent territories are closely interrelated, and the success of any one hinges on that of the others.

78. The United Kingdom Government, with the overwhelming support of the British people, has played an honourable and constructive role in bringing to full independence over 600 million people in the past fifteen years. The Governments of all its former dependencies maintain close and friendly relations with it. With its fine record and experience in resolving difficult colonial problems, the United Kingdom Government merits the confidence of the Assembly in solving those which remain.

79. The United Kingdom is still responsible for forty-two of the fifty-odd Non-Self-Governing Territories in which the United Nations is interested, and its full co-operation is needed if this Assembly is to play a constructive part in their advance to independence. It would be most unfortunate if, by passing a resolution making impossible demands on the United Kingdom, the Assembly should jeopardize the basis of this co-operation.

80. If we pass resolutions concerning Southern Rhodesia which are impossible of fulfilment and have little relation to the realities of the situation, we need not be surprised if our action contributes to the building-up of the dangerous situation which we all wish to avoid. It is the hope of the Canadian Government that action by the General Assembly will promote the achievement of a settlement, and not add to the formidable problems of the peoples of Southern Rhodesia.

81. Mr. Henry Ford COOPER (Liberia): There are two forms or types of colonialism in Africa, especially that part of Africa below the Sahara which is generally known as Black Africa. This difference in type or form of colonialism may have been the result of climate, the nature of the terrain or the peculiar characteristics of the people; at any rate, there is a difference between British colonialism in West Africa and colonialism in East Africa.

82. In West Africa, colonialism is always characterized by direct rule exercised through a representative of the colonial Power. Perhaps because of the harshness of the climate and the vast and unexplored jungles of the country, a colony could not be developed or administered except with the direct aid of the Africans, since the European could not endure the climate for a period of more than twelve to eighteen months. The slogan therefore was, "Get rich quickly and leave as soon as possible".

83. To the West African, who, like his brothers elsewhere was subject to foreign rule, the rough terrain of his soil and the climatic conditions, which were unfavourable to the European, were a blessing in disguise. He, the African, was not deprived of his land nor was there any direct interference in its cultivation. His customs and culture were not interfered with nor were any attempts made to change it. Although he was exploited like Africans elsewhere, the exploitation was never direct. Being allowed to own his land, he was taught to plant cash crops such as coffee, rubber, cocoa, peanut, oil palm and many other products. He shared in the ownership of whatever mineral sources were discovered. He was allowed to sell the fruits of his labour in an open market, even if that market was rigged by the buyer, and whatever he bought was also priced by the manufacturer. Under such a system he

could accumulate wealth, which in many instances he used to educate his children according to Western customs, either at school in his own land or in colleges abroad. He was also allowed to participate in the administration of his country, not only as a minor official, but in many cases in the higher echelons, such as Secretary or Under-Secretary. Through this medium he learned the science of government and became acquainted with all the schemings of the politician. If politics and the science of government did not interest him, he was at liberty to seek some other profession, either to become a doctor, a lawyer, an engineer, or a professor.

84. The movement of independence in West Africa did not suffer the same handicaps as it did elsewhere on that continent, for it had an intelligent and dynamic potentiality, because its leaders, being men educated and schooled in the Western form of democracy, were capable of taking over the reins of government without untold upheaval.

85. In East Africa, in contrast to West African colonialism, we have a different type of exploitation. I do not care at this time to mention South Africa, as that is a unique case on its own.

86. Although the penetration and exploitation of East Africa was more recent, nevertheless there has been a greater influx of Europeans to that part of the continent. The African, generally by nature friendly and hospitable, at first welcomed the strangers. There was then very little hostility, and out of this friendship land was given for the livelihood of the visitor. The European found the climate mild and the terrain less difficult to develop, which made it possible for him to live there and flourish under his own skill and management. Colonialism in East Africa at first developed along the lines of colonialism at one time in the Americas—it was no longer the policy of getting rich and leaving early, but of amassing wealth and remaining to enjoy it. The African, unlike the Red Indian, refused to exterminate himself in an unnecessary conflict—the arrow and the knife were replaced by the musket and the cannon. He may not have coined the phrase "He who fights and runs away will live to fight another day", but he knew all about it.

87. Through his courage and tenacity he would eventually achieve his end. The white settlers felt that it was necessary for them to own land, and not as temporary landlords but as the real owners. Since the land belonged to the indigenous population, it was necessary to devise some means of taking it away from them. Treaties were made which the indigenous people in their honesty and simplicity did not understand, or purchases were said to be made for such lands with beads, or cheap trinkets of no value. And when this deception could no longer be used, the land was seized as Crown land and the occupants driven away to some remote corner where the ground was poor and rocky. In many cases the indigenous population was forced to vacate their own land when the land was not being utilized.

88. For instance, I shall cite the case of an American visitor in Kenya. He admired the beautiful hills, called the White Hills, which the reservation set aside for the white settlers. So impressed was the American by this beautiful land that he asked his British colleague where the people were. His colleague replied, "We have yet to go and find them". Today in the Federation of Central Africa, we have 8 million Africans who are

suffering from land hunger and 297,000 white people who are not. As Mr. Joshua Nkomo has been pointing out, with increasing indignation:

"The white man has put aside land for his own use at the rate of 10 to 1, compared to what he allows his conquered compatriot, the African. And make no mistake about it—the settlers of Southern Rhodesia, who still celebrate Occupation Day as a national occasion, have not forgotten that they took over this territory by force of arms."

89. On this land the white settlers have built towns and cities—these communities have nothing in common with anything African. They are based and moulded exclusively on a foreign and distant culture and civilization. To perpetuate this system, the towns, cities, roads, and rivers have been given either European names or called after some of the great explorers and exploiters of Africa. In the case of Rhodesia, it takes its name from one Cecil Rhodes, who systematically exploited the African and after whom Rhodesia was named. He might have been a great pioneer and hero to the white settlers, but to the African he was the essence of all that was unscrupulous, wicked and evil, and in the case of Rhodesia the beginning of all the troubles and miseries of the natives. The irony is that Cecil Rhodes, who had exploited African labour and resources to amass a great fortune, set up an endowment fund for the education exclusively of Anglo-Saxons, known as the Rhodes Scholarships, and not even one penny for the Africans. It therefore follows that no African under any circumstances could with any degree of pride consider himself as a Rhodesian.

90. As these communities grew in population and in wealth, so also grew the appetite of their founders. The indigenous population, growing restless under this constant form of exploitation, presented a problem to the white settlers in regard to their lives and properties. Out of fear and a guilty conscience they could not rely on the police force or "gendarmierie" recruited from the natives. A white militia was formed, in the beginning exclusively for the protection of the white settlers and their property; however, the duties of such a force have also been extended to include enforcing the will of the European.

91. This is the picture we have today in Southern Rhodesia. This is the form of self-government which the United Kingdom Government claims has existed in South Africa since 1923—self-government based not upon the popular will of the majority but rather upon the will of the minority, since the majority was never consulted. No African will recognize self-rule for any African territory, as in the case of Southern Rhodesia, where the colonial office is transferred from Whitehall to Salisbury. It is useless for the United Kingdom to claim that Southern Rhodesia, being a self-governing territory, is the master of its own internal affairs. In the pamphlet called The Guilty Partner, written by one Patrick Keatley, we read:

"At the risk of infuriating every reader of 'Africa South' from Cape Town to Calgary, I am going to say that I do not blame Sir Roy Welensky for the present state of affairs in Central Africa and the disastrous course of events that seems bound to sweep a nation to destruction. I don't blame Sir Edgar Whitehead either. Indeed, I may as well go the whole hog and say that I blame none of the other Rhodesians who at present have their fingers on the

levers of power—some silly, some amateur, some crafty, some pigheaded, and all politically myopic.

"I think the people to blame are 5,000 miles away—in London. I think the power to prevent a fearful racial explosion, potentially as great and as ruinous as the one that hit Algeria seven years ago, rests in the hands of a few men in Whitehall. I believe that Mr. Harold Macmillan, who is the key member of the group, could summon the rest of them at any time of his own choosing, within the space of no more than fifteen minutes, and take action".

92. We cannot understand why the United Kingdom shirks this responsibility in the case of Central Africa. Has this fear of assuming responsibility grown out of past experience of the handling of colonialists of English stock, which eventually brought into existence Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, and New Zealand? It appears that Britain, which in the past has benefited from the spoils, now, like Pontius Pilate, washes its hands of the problem of restoring to the Southern Rhodesians their rights and possessions.

93. The draft resolution [A/L.386/Rev.1 and Add.1-4] tabled by the African States is based on the assumption that Rhodesia is a Non-Self-Governing Territory within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations. This argument is based on the following facts: first, that the vast majority of the indigenous population was never consulted; second, that this self-government is a government of a tiny white minority which have consistently denied to the vast majority of the people of Southern Rhodesia equal political rights and liberties; third, that the Constitution of 6 December should be rejected on the ground that it takes no consideration of the rights and privileges of the indigenous population, but entrenches the authority of the European settler.

94. It behooves us, therefore, to examine in detail some of the grievances of the indigenous population. Much has been said here about the new Constitution. The British Government argued that, under this Constitution, the lot of the indigenous African would be improved, especially on the educational and economic levels, and that eventually the African would have a majority in the Legislature. In this connexion, the Sub-Committee of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples pointed out that the 1961 Constitution was not in accordance with the Declaration contained in resolution 1514 (XV), and that it did not recognize the democratic principles of equality and justice. It asked whether the United Kingdom was bound to enact legislation which, having regard to its traditions, might be regarded as undemocratic, just because the Government of Southern Rhodesia—admittedly a white minority—so wished it, and whether the United Kingdom could not say that it could not be a party to entrenching minority power and discrimination. It pointed out that the 1961 Constitution was in some respects a retrograde step. [Step A/5124, annex I.]

95. It was difficult to understand the existence of two voters' rolls. The Sub-Committee doubted that the white settlers, with an overwhelming majority in the Legislature, would have any inclination to bring about a liberalization of the franchise. As a result, the inequality would be perpetuated.

96. The argument and contention of the Sub-Committee is borne out and substantiated by an extract

taken from a magazine called Africa South in Exile, reading as follows:

"In this same week of August Mr. Joshua Nkomo, despairing of a fair deal for Africans in Southern Rhodesia, had flown to London to protest against any imposition of the new constitution upon his people—the Whitehead-Sandys Plan. Its defects have been too often examined in print to warrant detailed analysis here. It is enough, perhaps, to point out that it hands over final control over all internal affairs to the white settler administration in Salisbury, including the appointment of the Governor. It establishes a split voters' roll, with the introduction of second-class voters (Africans of course) on a 'B' roll. There is a Declaration of Rights, so riddled with exceptions as to be almost valueless, and a Constitutional Council intended as a watchdog of minority rights which is vitiated from the paws up by the fact that its membership is to be conservative and pro-Establishment while its decisions can be over-ruled after a six-month cooling off period by a simple majority in parliament.

"Most dismaying of all, however, is the cunning device entrenching the African seats as a permanent minority. Africans will have only 15 seats out of 65 in the new Southern Rhodesian Assembly. And since any revision of seats or franchise requires a two-thirds majority, it will be beyond the power of the Africans to increase their representation. On the other hand, they will be powerless to prevent the remaining 50 members of parliament—just nicely over the two-thirds figure—from crushing or removing them altogether once the enabling legislation has been smoothly pushed through the British Parliament."

97. In paragraph 9 of the Second Schedule—entitled "The Franchise"—to the Constitution annexed to The Southern Rhodesia (Constitution) Order in Council, 1961,^{6/} it is stated:

"There shall be no limit on the number of persons who are entitled to be registered as voters."

98. To my delegation, in view of the restrictions placed on education and financial grounds, this phrase becomes meaningless. Let us examine the financial background: the indigenous population versus the European. The Rhodesian Federal Authority has just published its economic report for 1961. It contains two resounding figures which lie behind all the tortured complexities of the political battle in the Federation.

"The average annual income of wage-earning Africans is £87. Under the franchise scheme for Southern Rhodesia the minimum income rate which entitles one to vote is £120 per annum. Under this scheme while all Europeans are eligible to vote there are a few Africans eligible to vote considering his annual wage of £87."

99. According to Mr. Patrick Keatley, and in the view of many Africans, the £87 a year African is, in fact, the victim of a paternalism which is not of his own choosing, and if he baffles the white Rhodesians by failing to be grateful, then this only points up the gulf between the black and the white way of life, a gulf that seems to the visitor in Salisbury to be the dominating feature of the Rhodesian landscape, and every bit as impressive as Kariba.

100. Let us examine the land qualification necessary for voting under the "A and B" roll of the Southern

^{6/} London, H. M. Stationery Office, 1961.

Rhodesian Constitution. The infamous Land Apportionment Act of 1930, according to the views of all Africans and impartial observers, erected a most effective wall of agricultural apartheid. The Land Apportionment Amendment Act of 1961 removes 2 million acres from the category of European land and transfers it to the Africans. But look at the balance that remains for the 220,000 fortunate people of Southern Rhodesia who happen to have white skins. There is still a total of 41 million acres—earmarked, untouchable, inviolate.

101. For the African there will now be 44 million acres of "Native Land" instead of 42 million, but, as it happens, there are 2-1/2 million Africans. Under this scheme, far too few of the native Africans could qualify to vote under this new Constitution.

102. With regard to the National Parks of Rhodesia, it is interesting to quote Mr. Joshua Nkomo who said:

"The crowning joke is that the privileged citizens in this lunatic society see nothing odd about it. For the Africans the joke is too big to be really funny. There are four million acres of European National Parks. Black people are unequal in pay (one to fourteen), unequal in land (one to ten), and unequal in social status".

103. The last and final qualification of the Franchise Act is the literary qualification. The Federal Government spent an average of £103 on a European child's education in 1950. Southern Rhodesia spent an average of £8 for each African child's education in aid of school enrolment.

104. The deduction that must necessarily flow from this is that the average child, for want of financial means, will never be able to qualify or be placed in the right range of higher education. I should like to quote from a paper on Southern Rhodesia:

"Statistics show that it will be in 1973 that the annual increase of African voters will match the present European rate of increase under the new qualifications. Further, it will only be in 1980 that Africans will be 50 per cent of the present European enrollment, since there are no radical plans for educational expansion in African secondary schools which will change this position. On the other hand more Europeans will qualify as voters than Africans, because of better educational facilities each year for the next ten years, thereby widening the gap between the races on the 'A' and 'B' roll. In terms of this geometric progression, some estimate that it will take over twenty years for the Africans to become 50 per cent of the European electorate on the 'A' roll under the new constitution."

105. What is galling and infuriating to any individual is discrimination or segregation practised in one's own home. It matters not how great or how important the politician may be in Africa, if he happens to visit Southern Rhodesia he comes under the full vindictive weight of the racial laws of Southern Rhodesia. The native Rhodesian holds an unequal status in the social life of Rhodesia hotels, restaurants and swimming pools, and in many cases schools are barred to him. There may be some improvement in the Northern Territory under the British Colonial Office, but there has been very little change in Southern Rhodesia. It is often said that the only solution for that problem of Southern Rhodesia is a multiracial society. This is rather strange reasoning for Southern Rhodesia where there are 3 million blacks to 200,000 whites. The

solution is a multiracial society. In other countries where the situation is the reverse, that is, a tiny black minority versus a white majority, there is no question of a multiracial society. One wonders what should be the basis for such a society, will it be controlled and regulated by this same tiny white minority? We also know that the white minority of this controlled society has used discrimination as a political weapon.

106. In this connexion I should like to quote again the following from the publication Africa South in Exile:

"Just to give the knife of discrimination one final vigorous twist, the Rhodesian authorities in their wisdom have made the Nyasaland leader, Dr. Banda, a 'prohibited immigrant' in Salisbury; and the same regulation has been applied against Northern Rhodesia's leader, Mr. Kenneth Kaunda. This means that these men—both of them likely to emerge as prime ministers when their territories advance to full self-government—have to confine themselves in the rectangular concrete box that is the waiting room at Salisbury Airport, when they change planes there. Whatever the concept of partnership may be in the mind of Sir Roy Welensky and his colleagues of the United Federal Party, it does not include the right of Dr. Banda or Mr. Kaunda to sit in the visitors' gallery of the Federal Parliament, for example, just to watch the debates. This leads to the ultimate absurdity—that when these two men have wanted to meet in the past year with Mr. Nkomo, they have had to go outside their own country—in Nigeria last October, and in London last December during the Federal Review Conference, when Sir Roy exchanged a few halting words with Dr. Banda during the week-end arranged by Mr. Macmillan at Chequers. At the time of this conference, it was reported to be the first time that these two leaders had met in a dozen years."

107. Many white Rhodesians have come to realize that there are tens of thousands of Africans in Southern Rhodesia, that racial discrimination in every form has got to go, and that it will be expelled by force if it is not rejected by reason. The people of Southern Rhodesia should also realize that events in other parts of Africa and in the world in general regarding racial discrimination should have some influence on the leaders of Southern Rhodesia.

108. In discussing the inclusion of the item entitled "Question of Southern Rhodesia" on the agenda of the General Assembly, the United Kingdom representative opposed inscription on the ground that no action on the Constitution would be taken before March 1963. We listened in vain to hear him say that the United Kingdom Government would intervene if given time and set aside this Constitution of 6 December 1961 which, according to the report of the Sub-Committee [A/5124, annex I], entrenches the authority of the European settlers.

109. We listened in vain also to hear him say that the United Kingdom Government would see to it that a new constitution would be drafted for Southern Rhodesia that would restore all the rights of the non-European population and remove all restraints and restrictions in law and in practice on the exercise of freedom of political activity, including all laws, ordinances and regulations which directly or indirectly sanction any policy or practice based on racial discrimination. The argument about Southern Rhodesia's

being a self-governing territory and that the United Kingdom cannot, therefore, intervene, is useless and meaningless. If the United Kingdom is responsible for Southern Rhodesia's external affairs, and also for its security, how can it claim non-responsibility for Southern Rhodesia's internal affairs? It is so unlike the English, who have given liberty and independence and brought happiness to so many of their former dependent peoples by proclaiming equality and justice for all, to hold up an umbrella under which a tiny minority exploits the vast majority.

110. In the circumstances my delegation agrees fully with Mr. Enoch Dumbutshena, who writes the following under the title "Southern Rhodesia explodes":

"The United Kingdom Government has a clear legal right to suspend the Constitution of the Self-Governing Colony of Southern Rhodesia. The British Government did this in British Guiana in October 1953, because Ministers there were accused of threatening and plotting violence. Now, while the Government of Southern Rhodesia is arming whites against Africans who demand and organize for effective political power, can the British Government refuse to intervene and yet disclaim all responsibility for what may result?"

111. It is in the light of this, and in the light of the facts which I have given that forty-one Asian-African States asked for the inscription of this question on the agenda of the United Nations at the sixteenth session. [See A/5127 and Add.1 and 2.] The draft resolution tabled by those countries [A/L.386/Rev.1 and Add.1-4] is based on the report of the Sub-Committee on Southern Rhodesia of the Special Committee of seventeen members. It is therefore hoped that this Assembly will overwhelmingly endorse the draft resolution by a great majority of votes.

112. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I have no more speakers on my list for this morning's meeting. I would like to recall the decision taken yesterday by the General Assembly (110th meeting, para. 3), to close the list of speakers tomorrow, 20 June, at 1 p.m. I would also like to draw the attention of the Members to the fact that a draft resolution [A/L.386/Rev.1 and Add.1-4] has already been presented, so that the delegations who so wish may express their point of view on this draft resolution during their statements.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.