

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**1113th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Thursday 21 June 1962,  
at 10.30 a.m.

**NEW YORK**

## CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 97:</i>	
<i>Question of Southern Rhodesia (continued)</i>	1441
<i>Statement by the President . . . . .</i>	1452

**President: Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia).**

## AGENDA ITEM 97

### Question of Southern Rhodesia (continued)

1. Mr. VOLIO (Costa Rica) (translated from Spanish): I shall be very brief, since many strong arguments have already been advanced in favour of draft resolution A/L.386/Rev.1.

2. This debate on Southern Rhodesia gives my delegation an opportunity to reaffirm its position concerning the process of decolonization. Recently, the Government of Costa Rica made the following declaration: "We must stand shoulder to shoulder with the colonial or semi-colonial peoples in their legitimate desire to achieve self-government and sovereignty".

3. And in his inaugural address, Mr. Francisco Orlich, the new President of Costa Rica, said:

"There is a collective responsibility incumbent on all States to ensure to all human beings, regardless of the flag under which they live, the unrestricted enjoyment of their fundamental rights."

This position is shared by the Costa Rican people.

4. In the question of Southern Rhodesia, my delegation wishes to associate itself with those who believe that the United Nations should exercise its powers and assert its moral authority so that this African Territory may soon achieve complete self-government and be freed from the offensive policy of racial discrimination and disrespect for the political, social and economic rights to which every human being is naturally entitled—a policy by which a minority of settlers is trying to perpetuate its domination of the people. Consequently, Costa Rica believes that the General Assembly should adopt a constructive resolution aimed at bringing about the establishment in Southern Rhodesia in the near future of a genuinely democratic constitution. In order to achieve this, the administering Power itself ought not to stand aside but should offer its fullest and most effective collaboration.

5. On the basis of these general ideas, my delegation feels that the draft resolution submitted to the General Assembly by a large group of African and Asian States is a good starting point in the search for a solution which will be more in keeping with the circumstances, since it is based on the carefully prepared report

[A/5124] of the Special Committee,<sup>1/</sup> and, in addition, recalls General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, takes into account the important factors which have led the people to reject the Constitution of 6 December 1961,<sup>2/</sup> affirms that Southern Rhodesia is a Non-Self-Governing Territory within the meaning of Chapter XI of the United Nations Charter, and proposes that the administering Power should help to bring about the drafting of a new Constitution which will respect human dignity and on this basis to ensure the emergence of a new independent African State.

6. My delegation does not consider valid the argument adduced here that the Present Government of Southern Rhodesia is autonomous and that in consequence the administering Power is unable to intervene in the internal affairs of that Territory. It is obvious that the rights which the administering Power has reserved to itself place it in the position of a trustee, thus diminishing the sovereignty of Southern Rhodesia. From this point of view, there is reason to hope that the administering Power will taken the necessary steps for the effective discharge of its obligations, which, in conformity with the United Nations Charter, should lead to the complete development of free political institutions in the Territory.

7. In thus supporting the interests of the people of Southern Rhodesia, my delegation is guided solely by the ideological principles according to which the people and Government of Costa Rica live. This in no way means that it shares the criticism expressed in this debate against the United Kingdom, both because no purpose is served in making references to past deeds which are of no help in solving the present problem and because this State has a very distinguished record in the process of decolonization, which Mr. Stevenson, the representative of the United States, recently described very aptly as "one of the great political processes of our time" [1109th meeting, para. 68]. This attitude of the United Kingdom has been repeatedly acknowledged in this debate by a number of the African representatives who have participated in it. My delegation accordingly feels that it would be most in keeping with the lofty aims of any draft resolution adopted in this case to omit any reference to the administering Power which might be unnecessary for the purpose of strengthening human rights in Southern Rhodesia.

8. Mr. CERNIK (Czechoslovakia): The debate on Southern Rhodesia at this session of the General Assembly—a debate that is being held on the initiative of a group of forty-one Asian and African countries

<sup>1/</sup> Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

<sup>2/</sup> The Southern Rhodesia (Constitution) Order in Council, 1961 (London, H. M. Stationery Office).

and of the Special Committee of seventeen members—has been evoked because of the apprehensions resulting from the deteriorating developments in that Non-Self-Governing Territory. Three million African inhabitants have been suffering there for decades under the colonial yoke and have been deprived of fundamental human rights and freedoms. The efforts and the struggle of the Southern Rhodesian people for independence and democratic freedoms have been suppressed by every possible means typical of colonialism.

9. Recently, when the General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)], which requests that immediate steps be taken aimed at ending colonialism throughout the world, and when the prospect of the early materialization of their desires opened before the people of Southern Rhodesia, we were faced with a new plot which will frustrate these hopes.

10. The enforcement of the racist Constitution of 1961 is one of the main reasons for the continuing grave and explosive situation in Southern Rhodesia.

11. If we wish to act in the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations, we must analyse the real reasons for the present situation in Southern Rhodesia which has made our present debate necessary. We must denounce all attempts to make more difficult the ending of colonialism in the world: we must find the means of implementing, in that Non-Self-Governing Territory, the Declaration on colonialism and of destroying the seeds of a potential conflict the consequences of which would be detrimental to the interests of the whole of Africa.

12. The Special Committee of seventeen members, dealing with the complexity of problems connected with the speedy ending of colonialism, has had the opportunity to become acquainted with the position of the United Kingdom representative and some of his colleagues to the effect that on the territory of Southern Rhodesia serious steps, conducive to a change in the existing untenable conditions there, have allegedly been taken. One of these steps is the coming into force of a so-called new Constitution of 1961 which, it is alleged, should be the beginning of a gradual process of democratization in this Non-Self-Governing Territory. In the light of the facts, however, this assertion cannot be substantiated.

13. On the contrary, the developments in Southern Rhodesia have been in quite a different direction from that described by the United Kingdom, which is responsible for the administration of the territory. The European settlers in Southern Rhodesia, who are fully supported by the United Kingdom, are not willing to surrender their exclusive position in the territory or to reject the policy of racial discrimination, which manifests itself in various forms in every area of life and is the permanent source of tension and of the constantly deteriorating situation in the country.

14. The policy of racial discrimination on which the supremacy of the European settlers in Southern Rhodesia has been based is incompatible with humanitarian principles and represents a denial of fundamental human rights and of the principles of the Charter.

15. The constantly deteriorating situation in the territory is characterized by intensified persecution of the progressive forces of the indigenous African

population who, by right, strive for the attainment of their objective—that of being masters in their own country, as required by the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. The efforts of the European settlers, aimed at the suppression of the growing movement of the African inhabitants, are encountering an ever stronger resistance. It becomes evident that, in the light of the provisions of the Declaration on colonialism, it is impossible to rule Southern Rhodesia according to present methods and that a conflict could take place which would result in the inglorious withdrawal of European settlers from the territory.

16. That is why the United Kingdom, in agreement with the ruling minority of European residents in Southern Rhodesia, made a manoeuvre in the form of a new Constitution intended to deceive not only the indigenous population, but also other African nations and world public opinion. It was mainly this manoeuvre, the realization of which could have serious consequences for the future development of the territory, which made it necessary to include this question in the agenda of the General Assembly, in order to arouse public opinion and our international Organization as a whole to the defence of the legitimate rights of the people of Southern Rhodesia.

17. Let us consider what the new Constitution of 1961 contains in comparison with the present state of affairs. Let us consider some of its fundamental provisions which, the United Kingdom delegation claims, will result in a change for the better.

18. In the first place, the Constitution of 1961 envisages the creation of a Legislative Assembly with sixty-five elected representatives of the Southern Rhodesian population. Where is the democratic character of the Constitution, as alleged by the United Kingdom and its supporters, if 3 million indigenous African inhabitants get fifteen seats at the most, while 220,000 European settlers get fifty seats, which is more than two-thirds of the total number of seats in the Legislative Assembly? Consequently, the European settlers are sure of a two-thirds majority, which is necessary for any decision in the interest of the ruling European minority, including an amendment of the Constitution. On the contrary, the representatives of the indigenous African population are not in a position, through their fifteen votes, to prevent decisions against their interests. That, of course, is not democracy, it is injustice and political discrimination against the indigenous African population and benefits the ruling European minority.

19. Secondly, as regards the franchise, the franchise of the African population is restricted by a number of conditions. The monetary qualifications vary between £120 a year and £720 a year.

20. Let us ignore the fact that any restriction of franchise based on the income of a voter is totally incompatible with the democratic character of elections and let us concentrate on the annual income of African voters, and we see immediately the discriminatory character of this measure which excludes the overwhelming majority of the indigenous population from participation in the elections. The average annual wage of an African worker does not reach the lower level of the required sum and is £81, whereas the average annual income of the European worker is £1,134.



21. But that is not all. The franchise is further restricted by the educational qualifications which are required for inclusion in the electoral registers. Two years of secondary education are required. In the past year only 677 African students met the requirements stipulated by the franchise law.

22. Thirdly, under the new Constitution, elections to the Legislative Assembly will be carried out by two rolls of voters. Fifty representatives will be elected by those registered on the "A" roll, and 80,000 European settlers who meet the monetary and educational qualifications set up by the franchise law are registered on this roll. Only about 1,000 persons from the 3 million indigenous African inhabitants of Southern Rhodesia qualify for the "A" roll. The remaining fifteen representatives will be elected by persons registered on the "B" roll. According to the Zimbabwe African People's Union, scarcely 15,000 Africans qualify for the "B" roll. Europeans who are not registered on the "A" roll may register on the "B" roll and thereby easily outnumber the African voters.

23. In these circumstances it is quite clear that, owing to this transparent colonial electoral manoeuvre the African population, which is thirteen times greater than the European population in Southern Rhodesia, will at best get slightly more than a quarter of the seats in the so-called Parliament.

24. Fourthly, as regards the Declaration of Rights, which is part of the new Constitution, it allegedly will cover all the inhabitants of Southern Rhodesia irrespective of race, colour or creed. The advocates of the so-called Constitution do not mention the fact that this Declaration is only a scrap of paper because it will affect only future discriminatory legislation. It will in no way affect the present régime of more than thirty discriminatory laws which have been adopted in the past.

25. It will not affect the so-called Preventive Detention Act of 1959, under which people can be arrested summarily and detained without recourse of the courts. Under this Act a number of African leaders have been arrested and have been held in prison up to now. It will not affect the so-called Unlawful Organizations Act of 1959—a law which is aimed at the liquidation of African opposition—under which the African National Congress was prohibited in 1959 and the National Democratic Party in 1961. It will not affect the so-called Law and Order Maintenance Act under which in 1961 over 10,000—I repeat, over 10,000—Africans, including 2,000 women, were arrested because they opposed the so-called Constitution. Some of the arrested persons were even sentenced to terms of twenty years and sixty-three persons were killed during the upheaval. It will never interfere with such discriminatory Acts as the Land Apportionment Act, Native Affairs Act, Native Education Act, Vagrancy Act and any other discriminatory laws which deprive the African population of its fundamental human rights in the very sense of the word.

26. Fifthly, as regards the Constitutional Council, a so-called Constitutional Council is to be set up. This Council, which creates the impression of basic democracy, is to be composed allegedly a little more justly and will study the Acts adopted in the past. However, in the draft Constitution of 1961, we find that in fact the Council will only have delaying and advisory powers, in other words, no powers at all. By using its two-thirds majority in the Parliament, the Government can reintroduce the same bill and pass

it even if the Council were to declare it to be discriminatory. It is not my intention to elaborate any further on this, but I wish to stress that the President of the Council is to be appointed by the Governor-General, who will be appointed by the Queen of England, that members of the Council will also be appointed by the white settlers, that the Council has no powers in the financial field and that in some cases the Council does not even have the right to delay a bill.

27. Sixthly, as regards the question of land, the so-called Constitution will leave the problem of land, which is of paramount importance in every agricultural country and particularly in a colonial country, in the hands of the white settlers. We note that the Europeans, who represent less than 10 per cent of the population, hold 51 per cent of the land while 90 per cent of the population, the Africans, hold only 42 per cent of the land. The vital land question is left unresolved and the African people will hardly agree to it.

28. Lastly, as regards the transfer of powers to European settlers, the entry into force of the so-called Constitution through elections, the results of which would evidently be similar to those of the so-called referendum of 1961, would represent the transfer of all powers held by the United Kingdom to the European minority. This would be a step denoting the creation of a racist State patterned after the Republic of South Africa and would leave the African population at the mercy of a minority of European settlers.

29. All this proves that the so-called Constitution of 6 December 1961 is only an instrument to increase the power of a small minority of European settlers over the oppressed and exploited African population and that its objective is to strengthen colonialism in that African territory. This document is thus not only contrary to the interests of the African people, but is also contrary to General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) containing the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples and also contrary to the principles and aims of our Organization.

30. To avoid any misinterpretation I should like to stress that we are in favour of the idea that the country must have a constitution, but it must be a democratic one which secures equal rights to every citizen, irrespective of race, colour, origin, property or education. We are in favour of the Constitution's entry into force through elections, but we are also convinced of the necessity for the application of universal adult franchise, in harmony with the slogan of the African peoples' party—the African People's Union—"One man, one vote". We favour the idea that the United Kingdom should give independence also to this Non-Self-Governing Territory, and that it should waive its rights and claims. But, recalling once again the Declaration on colonialism, we demand that it should be genuine, not fictitious, independence, that the right of the African people to self-determination should be recognized and that the arbitrariness of the fanatic racist minority of British settlers should not be made legal and further strengthened.

31. The African people have made it perfectly clear that the document called "the Constitution" cannot be implemented with their consent. This was attested to by, for example, the democratic referendum held on 23 July 1961 in which 476,189 Africans voted

against the so-called Constitution and only 584 voted in its favour. On the occasion of the previous official referendum they had been prevented from expressing their genuine views. The total opposition of the African people to the Constitution is beyond any doubt. The developments in Southern Rhodesia have shown that the enforcement of the Constitution of 1961—which would postpone the granting of independence to the African people for a long time and would entrench political power and authority in the hands of a European minority to the detriment of the African people—could cause serious unrest in the Territory. It could become a spark which might incite the desires—for tens of years suppressed—of the African population to attain freedom, equality and independence. This manifestation might acquire proportions and forms which could be suppressed neither by demagoguery nor by terror. That is why many representatives of African countries have warned us, rightly, that Southern Rhodesia might become a new Algeria or Angola.

32. Our task is to find ways to implement the Declaration on colonialism in Southern Rhodesia also, to support morally the forces struggling for freedom and to stress their right to self-determination and independence. The task of the General Assembly is to consider all questions concerning the ensuring of international peace and security except those which fall within the purview of the Security Council. We have not only to solve the international crises which already exist but also to prevent others. We have to prevent a possible violation of international peace and security. The development in Southern Rhodesia which the United Kingdom and the local colonizers are unwilling to change represents a potential danger. We share the conclusions of the Special Committee of seventeen members which are set out in its report [A/5124] and of the group of forty-one African-Asian countries which have sponsored the draft resolution before us [A/L.386/Rev.1 and Add.1-4] that the situation in Southern Rhodesia is grave and potentially explosive, and we think that that is another reason why we should exert pressure on the competent organs to bring about a change in existing conditions.

33. We have been told that in Southern Rhodesia there are specific constitutional conditions in which neither the United Nations nor the United Kingdom Government can interfere. As to the Government of the United Kingdom, we have been told that it has no power to change the prevailing situation and that it is unable even to obtain information which the United Nations requires. However, we can learn from the facts that this sort of argument is only another pretext to divert our attention from the real policy and capabilities of the United Kingdom Government. It is well known that the Constitution of 1923<sup>3/</sup> left the function of foreign affairs and defence and the power of concluding treaties in the hands of the United Kingdom Government. Besides, that Government reserved the right to legislate and to take complete control of the government of the colony at any time when, in its opinion, it was desirable for it to do so. That right included also the right to disallow any law which would, in the United Kingdom's opinion, be discriminatory against the African people.

34. In those circumstances we can hardly speak of Southern Rhodesia as a self-governing territory—

leaving aside again any reference to the right of the African people to participate in the government of their country. After all, in the Special Committee of seventeen members it was only the United Kingdom which tried to assert something to that effect. And, finally, where was the so-called Constitution of 1961 drawn up? We know very well that it was drawn up with the help of the European settlers from the territory, in London in the office of Mr. Duncan Sandys and formally endorsed in Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia. Is it common for constitutions of self-governing countries to be prepared in another country? And how can anyone explain that, despite the fact that the Constitution was devised in London, it is now impossible to change it because of the "specific autonomous position" of Southern Rhodesia? Why is it not possible to replace it in London with a draft which would at least be based on the same principles as the British system? There is only one answer. The argument of the "specific position" of Southern Rhodesia is used only in order to mask evident unwillingness to carry out the decolonization of Southern Rhodesia, unwillingness to co-operate genuinely with the United Nations in the implementation of the Declaration on colonialism. After all, that was made perfectly clear by the United Kingdom Government during its discussions in London with the Sub-Committee of the Special Committee. Accordingly, Southern Rhodesia is a Non-Self-Governing Territory which is protected by Chapter XI of the Charter.

35. The attitude of the United Kingdom should be understandable to us. It is well known that a large number of British firms—among them some powerful financial groups and companies such as, for example, the British South Africa Company—have their interests in Southern Rhodesia in the mining of gold, copper, manganese, asbestos, chromium and cobalt, and in other economic fields. A number of facts were submitted in this connexion by the representative of Tanganyika two days ago [1111th meeting].

36. Seemingly less understandable is the policy of the United States of America with regard to the struggle to discuss the question of Southern Rhodesia. In order to elucidate the situation I should like to quote from the journal Zimbabwe Review for January-February 1962:

"With so much publicity about her policy of sympathy for the oppressed nations and aid to underdeveloped countries, one would have thought that the Kennedy Administration has long forgotten about the slave trade. By her decision... on this particular matter, one can best interpret America's sympathy for the oppressed people as a host of humbugs to deceive the oppressed people. It should not be forgotten that it is precisely the massive American and British investments in Southern Rhodesia and the whole of central Africa which are the chief props of white supremacy in Southern Rhodesia. And millions of dollars and pounds flow to New York and London drawn out of the forced labour of Africans in Rhodesian mines and industries. The African riches in central Africa have naturally whetted the appetite of Wall Street's millionaires."

I believe that we need not add anything to that.

37. This quotation also explains, among others, why the United States, along with the United Kingdom, endeavoured to bar the debate on Southern Rhodesia at this session of the General Assembly. It is very well known that Czechoslovakia will never sympathize with

<sup>3/</sup> The Southern Rhodesia Constitution Letters Patent, 1923 (London, H. M. Stationery Office).



those British and American "interests". Our sympathies are on the side of the African people which encounter so many obstacles placed by the colonizers on their road towards independence.

38. However, the General Assembly must take into account one basic circumstance, namely the existence of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples and the obligations arising from the Charter of the United Nations and from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Consequently, the General Assembly is not only morally but also legally bound to do everything in its power to implement as soon as possible the Declaration on colonialism, against which the United Kingdom did not vote, and which expresses the conviction of this world Organization—that is, of an overwhelming majority of countries—that colonialism is incompatible with the United Nations Charter, with fundamental human rights and with the strengthening of peace and co-operation. I would recall that the Declaration on colonialism [resolution 1514 (XV)] provided that immediate steps shall be taken in Non-Self-Governing Territories:

"... 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."

The racist Constitution is a very serious obstacle on the road to the real implementation of the goals defined in the Declaration and therefore it must be rejected.

39. The purpose of the current debate of the General Assembly is to ensure the implementation in Southern Rhodesia of the Declaration on colonialism and to prevent a development which might endanger international peace and security. The purpose of the debate is also to warn seriously the United Kingdom Government that it will not avoid a severe judgement by the nations if it torpedoes the Declaration on colonialism and causes such a situation. Finally, the purpose of the debate is to warn the racists in the so-called Central African Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland that world public opinion represented in this Organization will not look on in silence at their fascist arbitrariness and the sanguinary manifestations of their racial hatred, now, in the sixties of the twentieth century.

40. The road towards the solution of the question of Southern Rhodesia in the spirit of the Declaration is basically laid out in the report [A/5124] of the Special Committee of seventeen members. The United Kingdom must use its powers which it reserved for itself and must help to abolish the so-called Constitution of 1961. In place of it a constitutional conference, with the participation of all political parties, trade unions and other organizations, particularly with the participation of the Zimbabwe African People's Union which is supported by an overwhelming majority of the population in the territory, must be convened. The purpose of the conference must be to prepare for the attainment of independence by Southern Rhodesia before the end of 1962, particularly the preparation of democratic and free elections and the formulation of a new constitution. That presupposes the abolition of all discriminatory laws and practices, the release of political prisoners and a general amnesty for such prisoners as well as the creation of condi-

tions under which free activities of political parties and other organizations would be made possible.

41. The elections must be carried out on the basis of universal adult franchise and the secret ballot. One of the most important steps in the democratization of a country is the abolition of all racial and discriminatory franchise qualifications. Universal adult franchise with guaranteed freedom of speech, of the press and of assembly and the right to pre-election campaign is inevitable. Prior to the elections all federal armed forces must be withdrawn.

42. On the basis of such elections the legislative and administrative powers are to be transferred to the duly elected representative bodies in the territory. These organs will then decide the future relations of Southern Rhodesia, if they maintain that name, with other countries.

43. The Czechoslovak delegation shares the strong belief that the glorious struggle of the people of Southern Rhodesia will lead to complete victory and that right and justice for the oppressed African population will finally prevail and independence will be granted by the end of this year.

*Mr. Bitsios (Greece), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

44. Mr. COLLIER (Sierra Leone): The General Assembly of the United Nations has been called upon to debate one of the most crucial problems of troubled Africa of which the United Nations has ever been seized, at a time when the tensions and conflicts of race relations in that continent, due to the implementation of colonialist policies, have been strained to a breaking point.

45. It is clear that the crisis in Southern Rhodesia—for make no mistake about it, we have here all the ingredients of a great crisis—is likely to lead to the break-down of law and order and to constitute a challenge to the peace of the world, not only in Africa, and is likely to have much wider repercussions if it is not nipped in the bud. Before going into some of the details of the points which have emerged in this debate, it would be useful and honest to recognize that this vexed question of Southern Rhodesia arises as a result of racialism.

46. Convenient arguments which have been advanced by the white settlers in Southern Rhodesia, and sometimes supported by their British friends, have been a defence of a policy of white racial superiority. These arguments stem from the acceptance of the hypothesis that the black man in his indigenous situation cannot be trusted with the exercise of democratic rights. In the proposed Constitution, for instance, there are stipulations as to the requirements and qualifications for registration of the would-be voter, of property qualifications put as a figure that would exclude all but a small minority of the Africans in the territory. There are other stipulations about educational qualifications demanding literacy in English, and there is, of course, a ridiculous reference to thirty years as an age at which the African can be considered adult enough to exercise the franchise. These "generous" qualifications have made it difficult for even the white Southern Rhodesian oligarchic Government to obtain enough indigenous African voters to register and ensure the implementation of the Constitution. No wonder this minority Government has asked for a deferment of the implementation of this Constitution

until next year. All this is supposed to be in the interest of democracy and ironically also in the interest of the Africans, because they need time to develop and to be made ready for the enjoyment of the blessings of democracy—the same democracy which in the United Kingdom and in other Western countries has such a very different interpretation. The principle of "one man, one vote," so laudably proclaimed by the Special Committee of seventeen members, is the only acceptable principle that should be applied in Southern Rhodesia. If we accept the right of every man to exercise an opinion in the government of his country, it is quite elementary to conclude from that that the majority opinion in any country has the right to determine the destiny of the people of that country. Whenever the quest is one of a white minority and a black majority we are always faced with these pious reflections on the fate of the minorities. The same pious people do not become so sanctimonious when the situation is reversed in those Western communities where black minorities have to live side by side with white majorities. Surely we must not apply the double standard here, a practice which the so-called big Powers seem to resent.

47. The white settlers in Southern Rhodesia will have to come to terms with their destiny sooner or later and accept the fact that if they choose to cast their lot in a country where the people are predominantly black, they will have to submit to the will of the majority. Indeed, it is the attitude and the arrogance of the white minorities which have created a crisis. Gone are the days when the people of Africa can willingly submit to the indignities of a racialist policy. To its eternal shame, the Government of the Republic of South Africa, in flagrant defiance of an enlightened world opinion, has persisted in the pursuance of its odious apartheid policy. But the day is not too far distant when even that Government will have to come to terms with destiny. In connexion with South Africa and its policy of apartheid, my delegation wonders whether the white minority in Southern Rhodesia is not anxious to create another police state against the will of the majority of the people to serve its own interest. My delegation is wholly of the view that this doctrine of racial superiority, as envisaged in the Constitution of 1961, is completely unacceptable and should be rejected by all sincere minded people.

48. We have before us the report of the Special Committee of seventeen members [A/5124] whose findings my delegation whole-heartedly supports. That report clearly brought out that in 1922 the so-called electors of Southern Rhodesia constituted a total of 13,000 whites drawn from farmers and adventurers of the British South Africa Company who were engaged in the exploitation of minerals in the territory. At the time, there were over 2 million indigenous Africans who were never consulted or given any opportunity to express their views. This was how the so-called self-governing status for Southern Rhodesia came into existence, which the British are so fond of referring to. Since 1923, successive parliaments of Southern Rhodesia have come into existence by the application of this principle of white supremacy. It is useful to mention in passing that this so-called representative Government of Southern Rhodesia has been sustained by the existence of such legislation as the Land Apportionment Act of 1930 and the Law and Order Maintenance Act. Of course, we all understand how very necessary it was for such legislation to be passed to ensure the subjugation of 3 million Africans. All

this, of course, was supposed to be in the best interest of the Africans. In 1953, against the passionate opposition of the entire African population of Nyasaland, Northern and Southern Rhodesia, in the traditional colonialist fashion, a Federation was imposed upon the indigenous African millions. And now this Constitution of 1961 calls for a Parliament of sixty-five members elected through a dual-roll system, fifty to be elected by persons registered on the "A" roll and fifteen to be elected by those registered on the "B" roll. Even if fifteen persons are elected, which is unlikely, to represent the African registered on the "B" roll, there would be only one representative for every 200,000 Africans as against one for every 5,000 settlers. This, of course, is another indication of the doctrine of white supremacy where, I suppose, one white man should be equated to 4,000 black men. Are we to accept this reasoning or are we to come out boldly and accept this as an attempt to impose an apartheid policy with all its odious undertones in Southern Rhodesia?

49. My delegation has co-sponsored the draft resolution [A/L.386/Rev.1 and Add.1-4] before this Assembly calling upon the Administering Authority to undertake urgently the convening of a constitutional conference in which there shall be full participation of all representatives of political parties for the purpose of formulating a constitution for Southern Rhodesia in place of the Constitution of 6 December 1961, which would ensure the rights of the majority of the people in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples embodied in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

50. The United Kingdom Government has sought to abdicate its responsibility to the indigenous majority in Southern Rhodesia by advancing the fictitious argument that legally Southern Rhodesia is a self-governing territory and that it could not properly intervene in the way required. This argument was fittingly disposed of by the Special Committee of seventeen members when the Committee reached the conclusion that Southern Rhodesia is a Non-Self-Governing Territory within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations. In any case, no one is deceived by the argument of the United Kingdom Government. Indeed we can all recall the case of British Guiana not so long ago when, in a comparable stage of self-government, the United Kingdom Government set aside the Constitution because it did not like the events in that territory at the time. Further, the British have always made great capital of their responsibility towards people under their tutelage and to their dedication to the principles of absolute justice to all. Let them show it even in this. They have a wonderful opportunity to point out to their friends in Southern Rhodesia where the true path of justice lies. One way of doing so would be to use their influence to convene the constitutional conference requested and to give all the people of Southern Rhodesia a chance of participating in that conference, and thus create the atmosphere on which the foundations of a truly multiracial society may well be built.

51. As Member States of the United Nations, in whose Charter has been enshrined certain basic fundamental human rights, it is the duty of us all, including the British, to persevere in our efforts to secure for the



vast majority of the people in Southern Rhodesia the enjoyment of these fundamental rights.

52. In the draft resolution we have also called for the removal of all restraints and restrictions, in law and in practice, on the exercise of the freedom of political activity, including all laws, ordinances and regulations which directly or indirectly sanction any policy or practice based on racial discrimination. In this twentieth century it is a scandal that conditions exist in Southern Rhodesia under which people who were arrested in 1959 for political reasons still languish in gaol under the most appalling conditions. More than 3,000 members of the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU), the most influential political party in that country, are under charges based on a law ironically supposed to be in the interest of law and order. We hope that the administering Power will not only use its influence to see that these fundamental rights of the non-European population are restored but will also take immediate steps to grant an amnesty to ensure the immediate release of all political prisoners.

53. In 1960 the United Nations General Assembly adopted a most important and historic resolution on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)]. In view of the disclosure of certain details in the report of the Special Committee of seventeen members with reference to Southern Rhodesia, no one can seriously pretend that this resolution has been implemented in so far as the overwhelming majority of the people of Southern Rhodesia are concerned. The National Democratic Party held an unofficial referendum in which hundreds of thousands of indigenous Africans participated and expressed their resolute rejection of the Constitution of 1961. In view of this and also of the important statements of the petitioners who appeared before the Special Committee, it becomes a matter of the greatest urgency that, in the interests of the preservation of peace in that part of the world, no further attempts should be made to impose this 1961 Constitution on the unwilling masses.

54. The question of the future of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, in the view of my delegation, will be for the properly constituted self-governing constituent States to determine at the proper time. We are content at this stage to see the convening of the constitutional conference and the production of a constitution which will be a more worthy expression of the aspirations of the vast majority of the people of Southern Rhodesia.

55. My delegation wishes to associate itself with those who have thanked the Special Committee for their remarkable efforts. When the history of the sixteenth session of the General Assembly comes to be written, the contribution that has thus been made by our delegations is bound to enjoy a place of prominence. Let us hope that the United Kingdom Government, whose record in alleviating the lot of suffering humanity in other areas of the world has been both remarkable and creditable, will rise to the challenge of the hour and co-operate, as requested, in this resolution and thus make the solution of the Southern Rhodesian question one of their finest achievements.

*Mr. Mongi Slim (Tunisia) resumed the Chair.*

56. Mr. VELAZQUEZ (Uruguay) (translated from Spanish): My delegation has already had occasion to express its views during the debates held in the

Special Committee, whose report [A/5124] is now submitted for the Assembly's consideration. I shall therefore limit my statement to the expression of certain general views.

57. The main problem is undoubtedly to determine the legal status of Southern Rhodesia, namely to determine whether this Territory should be considered a Non-Self-Governing Territory within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter. It is necessary to determine this not only because of the existence of General Assembly resolution 1745 (XVI) concerning this matter but also because the nature and tenor of the final recommendations to be adopted by the Assembly upon the completion of this debate will depend on the reply to this question. Thus, if Southern Rhodesia is, properly speaking, a Non-Self-Governing Territory according to the conditions laid down in the Charter, then not only does this matter fall unequivocally within the purview of the Assembly, without the possibility of admitting any challenge to its competence, but in addition to that—and the principles have an ironclad logic which is independent of our will—the United Nations will have to try to ensure the fulfilment of the objectives set forth in Article 73 of the Charter.

58. My delegation recognizes that this problem has some highly complex aspects, particularly as regards the present relations between the territory and the administering Power. The legal status of Southern Rhodesia, as the United Kingdom has repeatedly maintained, does present certain peculiarities which make its inclusion among other more general, or at least more ordinary, situations or types very difficult. It is likewise true that this status is to a large extent the result of a constitutional process which has developed in various stages and which in turn reflects procedures and institutions which are very peculiar to and characteristic of the British legal spirit and national genius.

59. Although far from casting any doubts on the sincerity of this point of view, my delegation believes that a clear and unambiguous answer can be given to this question only if it is borne in mind that such answer should not be given in the light of the principles prevailing in a particular legal system but in the light of the principles of the Charter, which are the only principles here which have binding force for all. As the report of the Special Committee very correctly states:

"...Whatever might be the pattern of relationship between the Southern Rhodesia Government and the United Kingdom Government it could not affect the international character and status of the territory of Southern Rhodesia in the eyes of the United Nations, which must be determined in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter and the various resolutions of the General Assembly" [A/5124, para. 42].

60. What has to be considered, therefore, is whether the Territory of Southern Rhodesia has attained a full measure of self-government so that it can cease to be considered a Non-Self-Governing Territory—a full measure, which, as the General Assembly laid down in resolution 742 (VIII) and more recently in resolution 1541 (XV), cannot be attained in the first place except by independence or in other ways which require some previous act of sovereignty and consequently of independence.

61. Even adopting an extreme hypothesis, that is to say, even supposing that the transfer of powers to the Territory of Southern Rhodesia, as it exists at present or as is proposed in the new constitutional law, were full, effective and complete, so that the Territory would enjoy a degree of self-government which was practically tantamount to independence, even on the basis of this hypothesis it would be necessary to conclude that the situation is far from meeting the conditions and requirements prescribed by the Charter as interpreted by the General Assembly in the above-mentioned resolutions 742 (VIII) and 1541 (XV).

62. The fact is that when reference is made to the transfer, conveyance or restoration of powers, there must be a subject, a titleholder, to whom these powers are given. Now, who can this titleholder be? The idea of sovereignty, as is well known, does not relate solely to the State as a Power, to the State in the formal sense of a Power, even though this may have been its original meaning. The idea of sovereignty also embraces the State as a complete political society, that is to say, as the multitude and an authority, as the people and a government. There is not full measure of self-government, there is really no sovereignty, unless this society, which includes the multitude, the people, is supreme in rank, in the very distinct sense that it must be the people and not a part of the people which is the lawful titleholder of these powers. An examination of the constitutional situation which prevails in Southern Rhodesia, as well as of the text of the new Constitution which is to be put into effect in the near future, shows beyond any doubt that the people of Southern Rhodesia—and when I say the people of Southern Rhodesia I can only think primarily of the African people, the vast majority which makes up 92 per cent of the total population—can in no case be regarded as the titleholders of those powers of sovereignty, either now or at such time as the new Constitution is promulgated in toto.

63. In the most favourable case to which we referred, the entity might be sovereign in the formal sense of a Power or a Government, but it can never be sovereign in its real meaning of society or the people. It is sufficient to point to the limitation of the franchise and the existence of discriminatory legislation—which in any case should have been automatically repealed when the new Constitution was approved—because the pre-eminence of these norms and the unequal electoral representation that results are factors which are more than enough to prove that the Territory of Southern Rhodesia has not and will not be able to attain a full measure of self-government through the process which is now going on.

64. My delegation can, of course, appreciate many of the arguments which were advanced during the discussion in the Special Committee against what might be called the over-simplified solution of universal adult suffrage and against the slogan, so dear to the Africans, of "one man, one vote". Uruguay has been able, fortunately for a long time, to practise not only universal suffrage without any restrictions of any kind, but also complete proportional representation, so that not only does one man equal one vote, but one vote equals one representative or an absolutely equal part in all cases for the election of a representative.

In spite of this, it admits that in certain circumstances, or for certain countries, less rigid formulae may be found which provide better guarantees of stability or unity and which, in short, conform more closely with the sociological realities. All these systems, whether

representing interests, areas, states or provinces, are perfectly compatible with democracy, provided that the exceptions to the democratic principle of "one man, one vote" or of "one vote, one representative" have some rational justification or are dictated by the need for a more efficient organization of the State. This is unfortunately not the case in Southern Rhodesia, if, of course, facts and not fictions are taken into account. Here the departures from this basic principle of democracy rest not only on motives that are alien to the most elementary requirements of the common good, but also on motives that are completely irrational because linked in one way or the other with the worst heresy of the modern world, namely, discrimination based on race and colour.

65. Today the voice of African nationalism is raised against this absurd myth of racial superiority. We realize that in any genuinely national movement there may be excesses, careless actions and perhaps injustices. Such things have also happened in our own America at one time or another, but my country—which had to attain its full measure of self-government by means of a genuine national independence movement, without the help or protection of the organs of the international community, however imperfect that community may still be—cannot stand aloof from this struggle. All these movements which are germinating in Africa today, and which have borne splendid fruit in the short period of time between the end of the Second World War and our own times, are, so to speak, if history is to continue to be a "guide to life", a lesson which we learned in far-off days and which we have not forgotten.

66. There can be no point at this late stage in discussing the authenticity of the various national freedom movements. If nations exist, it is in the last analysis because they were instituted for the good of mankind as a whole, and an indispensable condition for the common good of mankind, which is the real responsibility of this Organization, is the good of each of its parts. In other words, just as there is nothing good in a society so long as poverty, unemployment, disease, ignorance or injustice exist, neither can there be anything good in international society—which we represent here—if entire national communities are exposed to insecurity, discrimination and arbitrariness or are deprived of their fundamental rights and freedoms.

67. If Southern Rhodesia is to be considered a Non-Self-Governing Territory—and this, I repeat, is apparent from the Charter and the principles adopted by the General Assembly—then, in some way or other and despite the difficulties which admittedly do exist, the United Nations must assume its share of the responsibility for leading this people towards the enjoyment of its full rights, since this is a sacred trust not only for its Members but also for itself.

68. The colonial problem continues, as we know, to be complex, and there is many an example, including the one before us today, which demonstrates that it is not always possible to see clearly where the colonial Powers are at fault or to state categorically that their Governments must always bear responsibility for the acts of their nationals.

69. On the other hand, the history of the post-war years has eloquently shown that in this respect the United Kingdom has a worthy record. The passage of time is not in vain, and there are some peoples, the British being among them, who have a singular gift for probing and learning its meaning, whereas



others more clear-sighted and gifted fail to do so. There are peoples, indeed, which have learnt not to make the same mistake twice.

70. For us, who form a part of Western civilization, an awareness of these truths and a generous attitude on the part of those who—by what title we are not now to discuss—were until yesterday the masters of the wealth and destiny of extensive regions of the earth is not merely a moral attitude but perhaps the only attitude that can ensure the future of the free world. This is true because every time the free world contradicts itself, it loses a battle. And for us, who, I repeat, belong to this world, each battle that is lost by the West is a battle lost by mankind because the values of the West, the liberty which is our heritage from Greece, the sense of justice and order which was contributed by the genius of Rome, and the charity with which Christianity transformed the meaning of our temporal life are, in one way or another, the values of mankind. Provided that the West understands and identifies with this great revolution of our time so that others, who have nothing to lose, will not use it to their own advantage, there will be nothing to fear despite the difficulties that appear to lie ahead.

71. We are confident that the political imagination and wisdom of the United Kingdom will enable it, in conformity with its best traditions, to respond once more to the Assembly's appeal.

72. Mr. ADEEL (Sudan): What the Sudan delegation asks leave to say in the course of this debate is brief and, I trust, simple. The Sudan, it may be recalled, is a signatory to the application contained in document A/5127, to have the question of Southern Rhodesia examined at this part of the resumed sixteenth session as a matter of urgency. During the procedural discussion on the question of the inclusion of the item in the agenda, it was contended, on behalf of the United Kingdom Government, that the element of urgency had disappeared in consequence of the postponement of the elections until some time in the spring of 1963. For the suppliants in the case, it has been argued that the urgency of the matter stems from the explosive character of the situation in the territory irrespective of the elections or their date. The urgency and importance of the issue arise from the general unsatisfactory conditions prevailing in the region and the equally unsatisfactory provisions contemplated in the Constitution of 1961, which presumably was intended to brighten a long, tragic story.

73. We believe that the problem of Southern Rhodesia, with which the General Assembly is now seized, should revolve around four central points on which the General Assembly is requested, in the draft resolution [A/L.386/Rev.1 and Add.1-4] to pronounce itself. These four central points, as we see them, are: first, the international status of the territory called Southern Rhodesia and the obligations of the administering Power and of the United Nations flowing from that status; secondly, the conditions prevailing in that territory; thirdly, the import and the impact of the Constitution of 1961; and lastly, the continuing responsibility of the Government of the United Kingdom and of the United Nations towards the people of Southern Rhodesia.

74. In answering these four points we are no doubt greatly assisted by the report of the Special Committee of seventeen members [A/5124]. For this

clear and precise document my delegation is grateful to that Committee.

75. On the first question, regarding the international status of Southern Rhodesia, the Special Committee has concluded that the territory has not attained a full measure of self-government. My delegation fully endorses that conclusion. We also agree with the statement in the report of the Sub-Committee on Southern Rhodesia [A/5124, annex I] that it is difficult for the United Nations to accept a twilight status for the territory only because a special pattern of relationship had existed between the Southern Rhodesian Government and the Government of the United Kingdom since 1923 by virtue of an agreement about which the bulk of the population had not even been consulted. My delegation has carefully studied the criteria laid down in the twelve principles embodied in the annex to General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV) and the "factors" listed in the annex to General Assembly resolution 742 (VIII), in order objectively to determine the status of this territory. We have come to the firm conclusion that Southern Rhodesia has not yet attained a self-governing status sufficiently full to remove it from the ambit of Chapter XI of the Charter. In addition to this finding, we must observe that Southern Rhodesia is referred to in the United Kingdom as a self-governing colony. I note from the report of the Special Committee that the word "colony" was used by the representatives of the United Kingdom Government during the discussions in London with the Sub-Committee on Southern Rhodesia. I will not dwell on this any further. Suffice it to reiterate my delegation's position that, in our view, Southern Rhodesia is a Non-Self-Governing Territory within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter. This being the juridical position, as we see it, the obligations of both the United Kingdom and the United Nations towards the peoples of Southern Rhodesia—I mean all the peoples of Southern Rhodesia, including the white settlers—are clear and unambiguous. These obligations are contained in Article 73 of the Charter, with which, I am sure, you are all very familiar and which it is not necessary for me to quote.

76. I now come to the second point, that is to say, the nature of the situation prevailing in Southern Rhodesia. The causes of the gravity of this situation have been very ably and eloquently dealt with by the speakers who have preceded me on this rostrum. In paragraph 44 of its report [A/5124, annex I], the Sub-Committee on Southern Rhodesia describes this situation as follows:

"The situation in Southern Rhodesia appears to the Sub-Committee to be of great urgency and gravity... If there is no genuine attempt to revise the policies and procedures adopted hitherto, the Sub-Committee feels that 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."

77. Following the debate on the subject in the Special Committee of seventeen members, listening to the moving stories of the petitioners, considering the political, economic and social structures that have hitherto characterized Southern Rhodesian society, there can be no denying the gravity and explosive nature of the situation. If—God forbid—the feared explosion occurs, its unpleasant consequences could hardly be expected to stop at the frontiers of Southern Rhodesia. We must never lose sight of the fact that

Africa is at a very sensitive and critical phase of its political evolution. Let us do all we possibly can to avert a repetition in Southern Rhodesia of the experiences of Algeria or Angola. That, we believe, would not accord with the tradition of British colonial policy. The impressive contribution of the United Kingdom to the process of decolonization has received wide recognition—even in the course of this debate.

78. Is it too late to prescribe a remedy for this situation? My delegation earnestly hopes that it is not so. What the indigenous people of Southern Rhodesia are asking is no more than their just treatment, as human beings, on a footing of individual equality with the settlers in the land of their ancestors.

79. Now, how can this be done? How can the mistakes of the past be rectified? How can harmony and amity between the races in the Southern Rhodesia of tomorrow be sufficiently safeguarded in advance? These questions bring me to the third central point in this problem, this is to say, the import and impact of the Constitution of 6 December 1961. On this essential and basic issue, too, the Special Committee has, by consensus, again pronounced itself. I shall not bother the Assembly by repeating the Special Committee's findings on the matter. These have been repeatedly quoted by previous speakers. What is beyond doubt, in the submission of my delegation, is that the Constitution in its present form is unacceptable to the indigenous people, who make up well over 90 per cent of the territory's population. We agree with the Special Committee's conclusion that "its application and enforcement in the face of rejection by the vast majority of the people of Southern Rhodesia is likely to lead to a dangerous situation" [A/5124, annex I, para. 7].

80. In their talks with the Sub-Committee in London, the representatives of Her Majesty's Government contended that "in the drafting of constitutions, due weight had to be given to the position of minorities and the rights of individuals" [*ibid.*, para. 16 (a)]. I think that no fair-minded person could quarrel with this principle—as a principle. But I must confess that my delegation finds it extremely hard to be persuaded that the provisions of the Constitution of 1961 do not go far beyond merely ensuring the protection of the white minority. On the contrary, we believe that the provisions regarding the franchise and the contemplated representation in the Legislature will, if enforced, further entrench the authority of the white minority—a situation which has for many decades constituted the core of African resentment and which is at the very root of the problem with which we are dealing today.

81. Some people—out of the best of intentions, no doubt—have appealed to the Africans of Southern Rhodesia to try and see in the provisions of this Constitution an olive branch which may in time turn out to be a vehicle for achieving what they need. But it appears to my delegation that the indigenous population of Southern Rhodesia conceive of this Constitution as a trap from which it will not be easy to extricate themselves, maybe not even in the two hundred years envisaged, according to reports, by Sir Roy Welensky. Here I am reminded of a statement made by a member of the British House of Commons on 8 November 1961, during the debate on the Southern Rhodesia Constitution Bill. The part of that statement which affected me most runs as follows:

"The Africans, therefore, cannot be expected to accept this new Constitution as satisfactory because they have no effective means of changing it. We cannot ask them, as the wind of change blows furiously down through Africa, to wait for the sweet by and by. Everywhere else they see rapid advance. They see everywhere else that it is possible for the races to live in harmony and that it is possible for white men and Africans to accept as their best safeguard the good will of the majority. They cannot understand—I do not blame them; I do not understand either—why this proved experiment cannot be tried in Southern Rhodesia."

I have quoted from Parliamentary Debates (Hansard), fifth series, volume 648, page 1100.

82. Indicative of the rejection of the 1961 Constitution by the African population of Southern Rhodesia is the appeal which was addressed to members of the British House of Commons by the leaders of the National Democratic Party on the eve of the adoption of the said Constitution. They said:

"We know that it would have been easier for us to win the 15 seats apportioned to the 3 million Africans. Our Party would then be helping the Government of Whitehead to preserve white domination and, it is easy to imagine, the NDP would then not be threatened with being banned, and its leaders would become 'respectable'. We reject this easy way and choose the way of strife that lies ahead. By rejecting the constitution we lay ourselves open to arrest, but this path will lead us to the desired end quicker than helping Whitehead to maintain white supremacy."

I have no reason but to believe that for all of us assembled here it would be a matter of deep regret if the vast majority of the people of Southern Rhodesia were left with no alternative but to resort to measures like the ones indicated in this statement, in order to vindicate their inalienable God-given rights to freedom, to dignity and to honour. My delegation, for one, is not yet despondent. Despair is a bad counselor. I have previously alluded to the traditions of British colonial policy. Among the general characteristics of that nation one could mention intelligence, prudence and, most important of all to my thinking, understanding.

83. In their report, the Special Committee has recommended, as a matter of necessity, that steps should be taken to reconsider the proposals embodied in the Constitution of 6 December 1961. This action they considered necessary in the larger interests of Southern Rhodesia and in the interests of peace and freedom in Africa. In the draft resolution now before the Assembly [A/L.386/Rev.1 and Add.1-4], we are making a request of the Administering Authority to the same effect. Constitutions are man-made and man, after all, is not infallible. Constitutions may be revised or even abrogated, if the requirements of justice and good sense make this desirable.

84. In the case we are considering today, in the light of the tense situation created in Southern Rhodesia in consequence of the enactment of the Constitution of 1961 and taking into consideration the sentiments expressed in this house, we believe that a rethinking of the problem has become a moral imperative. There may be difficulties; I do not know. But, appreciating to the full the sanctity in which moral values are held by the people of the United



Kingdom and their Government, and given their admirable record and experience in solving more thorny and more complicated colonial issues, we still feel justified in hoping that ways and means can be found to obviate this unpleasant situation. It is in all earnestness and in all friendship that we are addressing this appeal to the Government of the United Kingdom. We hope and trust that this appeal will be heeded, because it is an appeal for a good cause.

85. The United Kingdom delegation may be assured that a favourable response to this appeal will not be construed as a retreat or as a sign of submission. It will be construed only as a courteous gesture to world public opinion in general and to African sentiment in particular. That favourable response, will, in our view, add yet another fine hour to British history.

86. Mr. ELMU (Somalia): We are today gathered in this august Assembly to consider for the first time, and in conformity with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), the question of Southern Rhodesia, which is undoubtedly a classical colonial case because millions of Africans are faced in that part of the continent with a life of frustration and are denied their fundamental rights. Let us now consider with all serenity and objectivity how we can support these Africans and protect them from meeting the same deplorable fate as those in South Africa.

87. It is undeniable that millions of Africans in Southern Rhodesia, for over forty years, have been suffering the restraint of being ruled by an alien minority which came into being under the guise of a trading company, as had been the case before in many other countries which, through legitimate struggle and with the glowing beacon lit by the virtuous principle of self-determination, have won their freedom and succeeded in commanding respect and leadership among the world community of today.

88. The implication here sheds light on the past events of world history, which, if we consider them with open minds, could help certain colonial Powers to avoid, before it is too late, any miscalculations that may lead to disaster. I say this because the British sense of justice has been a noted tradition in so far as realistic judgement of political situations is concerned. In this connexion, my delegation expresses utter disappointment with the unclear attitude of the Government of the United Kingdom towards the question of Southern Rhodesia in general and its tendency to abandon the Africans in particular.

89. The United Kingdom delegation, in expressing its views in opposition to the inclusion of the question of Southern Rhodesia in the agenda of the present resumed session, stressed two main arguments: first, the lack of direct British authority in the domestic affairs of Southern Rhodesia because the country allegedly is a self-governing territory; secondly, the postponement of the October election to the spring of 1963, which is said to render the question not urgent enough to be considered in the resumed session. With regard to the first argument, I would like to point out that Southern Rhodesia is a pure British colony that, because of the presence of a large number of European settlers, was given a limited legislative, judicial and administrative autonomy. The recent decision taken by the United Kingdom Government, which transferred the competence of dealing with the affairs of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland from the Commonwealth Relations Office to the Home

Office, testifies once again to the real political status of Southern Rhodesia.

90. As regards the second argument, I regret to disagree again with the British view, because I sincerely believe that the announced postponement of the October election will in no way change the basic problem of Southern Rhodesia, which can be met solely by the immediate and total suspension of the proposed discriminatory Constitution. I say "suspension" because it is undeniable that the Constitution already has been partly put into force, and the postponement of the election is due merely to some administrative and technical difficulties, without any prospect of political changes.

91. It is a well-known fact that the 3 million Africans in Southern Rhodesia, after having been for so long subjugated by an alien minority of not more than 300,000 people who imposed on the Africans in that territory a Government that was most suited to the interests of the so-called settlers, while ignoring the political rights of the majority of the indigenous inhabitants, are now again being denied their political rights, with the full consent of the United Kingdom Government.

92. My delegation notes with dismay the fact that the Administering Authority in Southern Rhodesia viciously designed the electoral system in such a way that the Africans are deliberately deprived of registering their votes. Two pretexts are unreasonably given by the authorities concerned. One is in the field of education, where enough opportunities have not been given to the African population, which forms the vast majority, in comparison to the educational facilities enjoyed by the white minority.

93. I would like to quote here what Mr. J. Nkomo, an outstanding African leader from Southern Rhodesia, said on 15 June 1962 with regard to this question:

"Statistics show that it will only 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 enrolment, 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' 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."

94. The other pretext to cloak the situation has been attributed to the field of property qualifications. Here again I would like to quote a statement recently made by Mr. Nkomo:

"A look at the wage distribution of African employees according to September 1961 census reveals that the income and property qualifications will exclude as many Africans from the voters' roll as do the educational provisions. The minimum income qualifications for 'A' roll shows that £300 per annum is needed for gaining the vote. But as the 1961 wages census shows, out of a total of 612,573

workers, about 570,000 or over 90 per cent were below the minimum required for the vote."

95. Therefore, my delegation is of the vehement opinion that this is a gross injustice which can be attributed primarily to the United Kingdom, which should not bury its head in the sand but should look at the situation in Southern Rhodesia with a telescope of reality and justice and in conformity with its universally praised policy of the peaceful liquidation of its fabulous colonial empire in Asia and Africa.

96. To this end, therefore, my delegation endorses the legitimate wishes expressed by the majority of the peoples of Southern Rhodesia in rejecting the Constitution of 1961 and urges that universal adult suffrage should be provided for in any constitution for the country under discussion.

97. In conclusion, may I say that the Government of Somalia is committed to the righteous ideals of the United Nations and firmly believes in its majestic dignity. The Somali delegation is hence bound by General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) which calls for the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

98. In the light of the provisions of the aforesaid resolution, which are fortified by the conclusions on Southern Rhodesia reached by the Sub-Committee [A/5124, annex I], my delegation has associated itself with the other sponsoring delegations and has the honour to make an earnest appeal that the draft resolution be adopted and that the General Assembly, taking into consideration the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on colonialism should carry out its obligation in this important issue as a matter of urgency. It is to this Assembly that millions of Africans in Southern Rhodesia and elsewhere are looking with ardent hope to bring about justice, peace and tranquillity in their motherland so that respect for human dignity may one day prevail in their country.

#### Statement by the President

99. The PRESIDENT: Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to make a statement concerning a question which has been dealt with during this session and in which the General Assembly has shown considerable interest. In this connexion, I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Assembly

to document A/5132 of 11 June 1962, circulated by the Secretary-General at the request of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. This is an interim report on the repatriation of Algerian refugees, which has become possible as a result of the Evian agreements proclaiming a cease-fire in Algeria. These agreements—and I should like to pay a tribute to the parties to them—have in fact opened the way for the return of the Algerian refugees to their homes and have set up a tripartite repatriation commission, which includes the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, to organize the return of the refugees to their homes in Algeria under the best possible conditions.

100. It is this fortunate event that has prompted the High Commissioner to make an interim report to the Member States informing them of the conditions agreed to in the Tripartite Commission, which since May 1962 has been discussing the repatriation of refugees from Tunisia and Morocco, and specifying the means he urgently requires in order to fulfil his mission.

101. The members of the General Assembly will recall that during the first part of our session the General Assembly, confirming its previous resolutions, adopted on 18 December 1961 resolution 1672 (XVI) requesting the High Commissioner to continue his action on behalf of those refugees, to use the means at his disposal to assist in the orderly return of those refugees to their homes and to consider the possibility of facilitating their resettlement in their homeland as soon as circumstances permit.

102. In his interim report of 11 June, the High Commissioner draws attention to the amplitude of the task in which he has been called upon to participate since the Evian agreements and he urgently appeals to all States Members of the United Nations to help him and supply him with all the generous assistance which will enable him to accomplish this great humanitarian task entrusted to him by the General Assembly in various resolutions, particularly resolution 1672 (XVI), which he and his colleagues have carried out with complete and unflagging devotion, to which I should like to pay a tribute. I venture to hope that this appeal will be heard and that international solidarity will continue to contribute substantial voluntary aid so that this painful chapter in our recent history may be closed under honourable conditions.

*The meeting rose at 1 p.m.*