

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



1114th
PLENARY MEETING

Thursday, 21 June 1962,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 97:

Question of Southern Rhodesia (*continued*) . . . 1453

President: Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia).

AGENDA ITEM 97

Question of Southern Rhodesia (*continued*)

1. Mr. KOIRALA (Nepal): In our discussion of the question of Southern Rhodesia several self-evident facts must be recognized. The territory of Southern Rhodesia has not yet acquired complete autonomy and self-rule. Although the United Kingdom claims to have refrained from intervening actively in the affairs of Southern Rhodesia, it nevertheless has retained its authority and influence and, by its own admission, ultimate, undiluted responsibility over the territory. My delegation fully endorses the view of the Special Committee of seventeen members,^{1/} also embodied in the draft resolution [A/L.386/Rev.1 and Add.1-4] which we have the honour to co-sponsor, that Southern Rhodesia has not attained a full measure of independence within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations. My delegation appreciates very much the efforts and endeavours the Special Committee has made to investigate the situation and reach the present conclusion.

2. It has been contended that Southern Rhodesia has been enjoying the status of a self-governing territory since 1923. If that is so we are surprised to find that the new Constitution of Southern Rhodesia of December 1961^{2/} was laid before the Parliament of the United Kingdom and finally approved by the Regency Council of State, and that the same order included provisions revoking the Southern Rhodesia Constitution Letters Patent, 1923. The proposed Constitution still refers to the territory as "the Colony of Southern Rhodesia" under chapter I, section 1. Further, since there is provision for a Constitutional Council under chapter VII, section 73, it could well be construed that the present Constitution has not the approval of the people of Southern Rhodesia, and this is especially true of the vast majority of the people.

3. Southern Rhodesia has not enjoyed the status of a fully self-governing territory within the meaning of the Charter, nor has it achieved that status according to customary international practice. This territory has no diplomatic exchange of missions with any other free sovereign nation, to our knowledge, and at the same

time it has never applied for membership of this Organization of free States.

4. The British, through their actions, have always indicated that obligations are concomitant with responsibilities and, in their dealings, have not sought to shirk their duties. In the present situation, where a constitution has been drafted and supported by a small minority, much to the disapproval and the resentment of the majority, and is being foisted upon the indigenous population, the British have a duty to see that it is rescinded, abrogated, negated. We are not telling the United Kingdom how it should discharge its obligations; the method can be whatever it deems most appropriate, just, and effective. But, we want to bring to the notice of the United Kingdom representatives the fact that they still have ultimate responsibility and authority over Southern Rhodesian affairs and, in the words of the report of the Sub-Committee on Southern Rhodesia:

"...there appears to be no obligation on the United Kingdom Government to act at the behest of the Southern Rhodesian Government in a manner inconsistent with the principles of justice and equality for the indigenous population". [A/5124, annex I, para. 42.]

5. It is inconceivable that the United Kingdom would wilfully and knowingly act in a manner which can only be interpreted as condoning the policies and practices pursued in South Africa, namely apartheid. For will this not be the outcome in Southern Rhodesia unless the Constitution of December 1961 is redrafted and honours the principle and ideal which the United Kingdom itself adheres to, and which is the basis of this Organization—that is, equal political rights for all based upon universal suffrage?

6. When we advocate protecting minority rights it is because of encroachments by the majority, but in the case of Southern Rhodesia the opposite is true. What rationale can possibly be offered to justify and to explain the discriminatory, unfair voting requirements prescribed for the African population in the Constitution of 1961? None. What will be created is a deeply embedded oligarchy of white settlers, jealous of their powers and prerogatives, responsible and accountable only to themselves, since the British propose to divest themselves of all responsibility and authority. The white Southern Rhodesians will retain control over the Government according to their leader, Sir Roy Welensky, for two hundred years. But, were it to be only twelve years, as predicted by the United Kingdom, does this not conceal the fact that the Constitution has been drafted on the wrong premises, ignoring the principles of equality and justice, and that its spirit and intentions are far from admirable? How can we, and especially the British with their rich heritage and tradition of parliamentary government, ignore the fact that this Constitution is not based on a consensus within the society? Rather, its sole support is that of a

^{1/} Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

^{2/} The Southern Rhodesia (Constitution) Order in Council, 1961 (London, H.M. Stationery Office).

small, recalcitrant minority, and instead of fostering and engendering harmony, and following the legacy of the United Kingdom, it has bred dissension, hostility, and bitterness.

7. It is indeed true that the "sins of the fathers will be visited upon the children". The heirs to this Constitution, unless it is changed considerably, will suffer grievously, and they will bear the brunt of the ill-will and of the inequity that it will bring and perpetuate. Whether or not the British have formally relinquished all control and responsibility, the blame and the shame is theirs. To do nothing is often as potent and positive an act as doing something. Thus, we appeal to the British to support the draft resolution [A/L.386/Rev.1 and Add.1-4] and, in their capacity as the administering Power, to act so as to ensure and to assure us that a new constitution for Southern Rhodesia will be formulated "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)", and to see that all discriminatory legislation is abrogated and that all political prisoners are released. The United Kingdom, as the administering Power, possesses the power to effect the changes outlined in this draft resolution and also has considerable moral influence which must be exerted so as to achieve a just solution whereby the rights of all Southern Rhodesians—and not merely those of the white settlers comprising less than 10 per cent of the population—are respected and guaranteed.

8. Unquestionably the colonial problem, as now manifested in Southern Rhodesia, is extremely difficult and urgent. We have all seen, in our short life as an Organization, the bloodshed, suffering and devastation that prevails in Angola, Algeria, the Congo, Ruanda-Urundi, South Africa and elsewhere. Must Southern Rhodesia fall further prey to this malady? Shall it be included in that list? Let us hope not.

9. Since this territory is situated very close to the Republic of South Africa, where the policy of apartheid prevails, there is every likelihood that Southern Rhodesia will be affected by the same malaise, the signs of which have been significantly manifest. This policy has been universally condemned. Our good friend, the United Kingdom Government, felt so strongly about this that it preferred to lose one member of the Commonwealth rather than compromise with its cherished ideals of dignity and equality. It would not be out of place to refer to the statement made by its representative, Mr. C. T. Crowe, Deputy Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom to the United Nations, in the Special Political Committee on 31 October 1961, with respect to the policy of apartheid in South Africa. I quote from the summary records of the 274th meeting, where Mr. Crowe stated:

"...the United Kingdom Government and people shared the growing frustration at the intractability of the problem of apartheid, for probably no other country outside South Africa had as great an interest in seeing a solution to that country's racial problems which would ensure a full, prosperous and free life for all its peoples. The United Kingdom feared that the continued pursuit of the policy of apartheid, which was the direct opposite of the policy it applied in the Territories for which it was responsible, would have disastrous consequences that would not only affect the peoples of South Africa but also reach far beyond its borders. In addition to being morally indefensible

it was a policy which could not succeed in practice, for it ran contrary to the main trends of modern life. In a world whose peoples were rapidly being drawn closer together by all the resources of science and organization no people or peoples could live apart from each other or from the rest of humanity. No one who had lived in the United Kingdom would deny that there existed in that country a staunch belief in the dignity and worth of the individual, expressed in a long history of resistance to tyranny and oppression, whether internal or external. That belief was not compatible with acceptance of any kind of racial discrimination in any part of the world. The British people had not fought two World Wars and suffered heavy casualties, the disruption of their economy and the destruction of their cities in order to defend a state of affairs in which doctrines of racial supremacy flourished". 3/

10. My delegation humbly suggests that these words of British conviction be transformed into action in the colony of Southern Rhodesia and that they form the basis of the new constitution envisaged in the draft resolution before the General Assembly. We earnestly commend the draft resolution to the Assembly in general and to the United Kingdom delegation in particular.

11. Mr. COULIBALY (Mali) (translated from French): In recommending that the General Assembly should consider the question of Southern Rhodesia as a matter of urgency, the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, of which I am a member, has been fundamentally guided, in pursuance of its terms of reference, by the desire to seek a just and humane solution for the grave situation prevailing in that Territory.

12. It has noted with regret that the situation is deteriorating day by day in consequence of the systematic determination of the 240,000 white settlers to impose and maintain their tyrannical domination over 3 million Africans, who are weary of the humiliations and oppressions of every kind that they have endured in the course of more than seventy years of colonial rule.

13. The sixty-two delegations which have forced the colonial Powers and their allies to discuss the question of Southern Rhodesia during the current session of the General Assembly have wished first and foremost to be true to themselves and to remain faithful to the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

14. For indeed, one cannot advocate peace, justice and freedom and at the same time be accessory, by dishonest manoeuvres, or even merely remain indifferent, to the anachronistic situation in which a foreign minority composed of adventurers aided and abetted from outside are trying, by dint of police terrorism and extreme measures, to impose their law—the law of the jungle—on a majority, and, what is more, in the land belonging to that majority.

15. Both during the debates in the Special Committee of Seventeen and in the course of the conversations held by the Sub-Committee that went to London, my delegation had occasion to express its opinion with regard to the problem of Southern Rhodesia, by

3/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixteenth Session, Special Political Committee, 274th meeting, para. 1.

stressing its disapproval of the racist constitution imposed on the indigenous population of the country, by deploring the absence of political freedom and freedom to form trade unions and by denouncing the deliberate failure to train responsible African personnel and the obstacles set in the way of the accession of Africans to public office, the social discrimination and in particular the spoliation of land which deprives at least three million Africans of their traditional means of subsistence, in favour of the foreign colonizers. Moreover, in the debates in the Special Committee of Seventeen we frequently deplored the alliances of interests which, from the so-called Republic of South Africa to Katanga, are pregnant with grave threats to this part of Africa, whose pleasant climate has helped to make it a settlers' colony, while the root source of the oppression to which the indigenous population is subjected is to be found in the natural wealth of their country.

16. At this stage in the debate my delegation does not intend to go over once again the cruel and shameful record of colonialism, or to dwell on its ramifications, or, rather, its collusion with the greedy monopolists who are ready to trample every humanitarian principle for the sake of a kilogramme of diamonds, of uranium or of copper.

17. The aim of my statement, which will be very brief, is to invite the General Assembly to endorse the objective conclusions of the draft resolution before it [A/L.386/Rev.1 and Add.1-4], of which my delegation is a sponsor. Before doing so, however, I wish to protest against certain assertions which have been made during this debate.

18. Efforts have been made to get us to acknowledge that Southern Rhodesia has been self-governing since 1923 and that the administering Power is consequently not competent to intervene in its internal legislation. To accept this reasoning is to agree that the 240,000 white settlers, and they alone, constitute Southern Rhodesia, for as far as self-government is concerned, they alone enjoy it with respect to the British Crown. For the white settlers alone had a share in defining the conditions of self-government in 1923, just as if it were a matter of establishing areas of responsibility in a family as between the younger and the elder members. Southern Rhodesia has been, and still is, a British colony. Is the United Kingdom Government entitled to hand Southern Rhodesia and its African population over to a club of colonists and mine operators, and at the same time to proclaim that that country has achieved self-government?

19. If, at a given period of history, the colonial Powers ceded colonies or portions of colonies to one another, for reasons of which they were the sole judges, without consulting the indigenous populations who thus underwent a change of masters, it is inadmissible at the present day that, acting in violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, a colonial Power should transfer its responsibilities to a club of foreign exploiters—for there is no other way in which I can describe the present Government of Southern Rhodesia, where there is not a single African either in Parliament or in the Executive. My delegation is therefore utterly unable to subscribe to the idea that Southern Rhodesia is self-governing.

20. In fact, without wishing to disregard the presence of the 240,000 white settlers or to question the possibility of their remaining in Rhodesia, on condition, however, that they recognize and respect the rights of

the African majority, my delegation considers—and this is a fundamental tenet—that Southern Rhodesia is the homeland of the 3 million Rhodesian Africans, just as Great Britain belongs to the British, France to the French and Portugal to the Portuguese. It follows that it is these 3 million Africans of Rhodesia who must say whether their country is self-governing at present or whether it is still being subjected to one of the acutest forms of colonialism: direct government by colonists. I submit to you, Mr. President, that we have heard the reply to this question in the moving statements of the petitioners, Nkomo and Mushonga.

21. We are also being asked by some delegations not to take decisions which might embarrass the Government of the United Kingdom or the Government of Sir Edgar Whitehead. But these delegations, as Members of the United Nations, should in all logic have called upon the United Kingdom to comply faithfully with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). They would have done better to make their friends or allies—Sir Roy Welensky and others—understand the absurdity of their conception of what relations between the Whites and the Blacks in Africa should be.

22. We are quite willing to try to believe that the responsible heads of the colonial régime in Rhodesia or elsewhere may mend their ways and run with the tide of history, but we are obliged to take reality and concrete facts into account. In fact, at the very moment when we are being asked by certain delegations to trust the present Government of Rhodesia to guide the country progressively towards a more democratic régime, we find the following information in the cable dated 19 June 1962 from the France Presse agency:

"The United Nations, which is at present considering the question of Southern Rhodesia, was violently attacked on Tuesday by Sir Humphrey Gibbs, Governor of that country, and Sir Edgar Whitehead, Prime Minister.

"Opening the session of Parliament on Tuesday morning, the Governor accused the United Nations of inciting people to disregard the country's legal constitution.

"The Prime Minister, for his part, declared on Tuesday afternoon in the course of a Press conference that no resolution that the United Nations might adopt following the current debate could have any effect. He compared the debate to that which had taken place last year in the United Nations on Puerto Rico, to which he said the United States had paid no attention. Nevertheless Sir Edgar added—the debate on Southern Rhodesia 'is having serious repercussions amongst the Africans in the country, for it gives them the false hope that the United Nations is in a position to do something for them'."

23. What conclusion is to be drawn from this? Such a concept is symptomatic enough, for it provides eloquent proof that not only is the present Government of Southern Rhodesia not inclined to favour the emancipation of the Blacks, but it is also challenging the United Nations by threatening to disregard whatever decisions the General Assembly may take, and referring to a precedent.

24. In these circumstances we cannot help drawing an analogy between the mentality of the colonists in Southern Rhodesia and those who are at present resorting to a scorched-earth policy in Algeria, that other African country which has suffered martyrdom under the colonial régime. It is clear that the white colonists

and their allies are determined at all costs to retain their privileges in Southern Rhodesia and that they are therefore organizing themselves to be able to face any situation, in defiance of logic and of every humanitarian principle, just as the reactionary and racist governments of South Africa and of Portugal, and the murderers and incendiaries of the Secret Army Organization in Algeria, are doing. The aim of their policy and of their agitation is to succeed in making Southern Rhodesia a State with an all-white Government, similar to South Africa. The creation of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland appears to be a means of attaining this end. In that respect, the good understanding—not to say the coalition—that exists between Verwoerd, Sir Roy Welensky and Salazar is very significant.

25. For all these reasons, and taking all these fears into account, the General Assembly must shoulder the responsibilities laid upon it by the basic principles of the Charter. The United Kingdom has complete responsibility in Southern Rhodesia and it cannot transfer that responsibility to a Government of foreign settlers. Such a possibility would be contrary to the principles and the provisions of resolution 1514 (XV), paragraph 5 of which stipulated that:

"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."

26. The people of Southern Rhodesia to whom all powers must be transferred are the 3 million Africans over whom the United Kingdom has established its colonial rule, the 3 million Africans who are suffering under the harsh laws of the Welenskys and the Whiteheads, who are being thrown in prison without trial and deprived of the most elementary liberties. The people of Rhodesia are not the 240,000 white settlers and their allies, who are enriching themselves by robbing and exploiting the 3 million Africans, keeping them under a régime of oppression and police terror.

27. In adopting resolution 1514 (XV) on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, followed by resolution 1654 (XVI) establishing the Special Committee known as the "decolonization committee", the General Assembly has aroused great hopes among the peoples still under foreign domination. We have no right to disappoint them, for we should thereby create a loss of confidence which would be harmful to the United Nations. For these reasons, my delegation urges the adoption of the draft resolution before us without delay and without reservations.

28. Mr. BENITES VINUEZA (Ecuador) (translated from Spanish): When the question of the approval of the General Committee's report [A/5131] was dealt with in the General Assembly [1109th meeting], my delegation abstained. In so doing it was prompted by two considerations. The first was my Government's faithfulness to the principle that every question submitted to a United Nations body by a State or group of States should be accepted for discussion if it is in accordance with the Charter. The second was that there was some doubt whether we were discussing the actual acceptance of the item or the timeliness of dealing with it. With this doubt unresolved, my delegation preferred to

abstain. Now that the item has been accepted, however, I should like to state our position on it, since it is a new subject which concerns many friendly States and involves principles that are fundamental for those of us who have emerged from a colonial status, who form a multiracial society and who zealously defend the principle of respect for the human person without distinction of race upon which western Christian democracy is based.

29. It should not be overlooked that twenty-eight African States unanimously agreed on the urgent necessity of discussing this item. We are certain that this unanimity does not constitute a challenge or a call for animosity, as might have been feared. In our view, it means that there is something new in the world which stands before us as a living and present reality: Africanness. Léopold Sedar Senghor, the eminent poet and philosopher who directs the destiny of Senegal, has called it a return to the sources of Negro being: *nigritude*. Whatever it is called, the fact is that there exists an African consciousness which is above national origins, religious feelings and doctrines, political goals or situation in cultural regions. The twenty-eight African States representing 180 million human beings are calling our attention to a problem likely to endanger peace and security because it affects the African himself, in the roots of his Africanness.

30. African solidarity on the problem of Southern Rhodesia can be explained by the fact that this problem is common to all Africa and that its history is no different from the dramatic history of nearly all the peoples of that continent. Let us recall the essential dates of that history. In 1888 Southern Rhodesia was discovered by the colonizer after whom it is named, Sir Cecil Rhodes, who surely holds the world's record for lands that bear his name. From Lobengula, the king of the Matabele, Sir Cecil acquired exploitation rights to 195,000 square kilometres of exceedingly rich territory.

31. In his book *Inside Africa*,^{4/} the American journalist, John Gunther, tells us that this purchase was made for 100 pounds a month, 1,000 rifles and a gunboat that never succeeded in navigating the waters of the Zambesi. In 1896 there was a colonial war against the Matabele. The British South Africa Company founded by Sir Cecil Rhodes expanded many thousands of kilometres beyond the original concession. In 1914, men were needed to fight in the First World War and at the same time the Company's contract expired. The contract was renewed on the basis of certain concessions of autonomy which were to go into effect after ten years. African riflemen shed their blood on the battlefields of Europe. In 1923 Rhodesia became a Crown Colony, although the Company had never acquired the right to administer the Territory but only to exploit it economically. Consultation on the Colony's wishes was limited to the white settlers.

32. In 1953 a further step was taken: the creation of the Federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland. Again according to Gunther, of 40,000 white voters only 25,000 were in favour of the Federation. The indigenous inhabitants of Nyasaland raised funds to pay the travel expenses of delegates to prevent the establishment of the Federation. Nor was Northern Rhodesia in favour of it. And in the House of Commons in London opinion was so divided that the voting was 304 in favour and 260 against. The organization that resulted was not

^{4/} John Gunther, *Inside Africa*, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1953.

like the tribal federations that mark the transition from primitive to territorial societies. Nor was it a federation in the modern sense, a national State with partial autonomy of the states composing it, such as, for example, the United States of America, Mexico or Brazil. It was the association of two protectorates in a colony which did not alter the status of the parts.

33. Thus we come to the essential question which must be elucidated before the problem before us can be resolved: what is the status of Southern Rhodesia? Is it what the Statute of the League of Nations called a colony and the Charter of the United Nations terms a Non-Self-Governing Territory? With your permission, Mr. President, I shall make an examination of this question.

34. I was privileged to act as Ecuador's representative at the meetings of the Fourth Committee during the eighth session of the General Assembly when the basic themes of colonialism were considered and the factors which should be taken into account in deciding whether a Territory has attained a full measure of self-government were established. My delegation sees no reason to change the principles that it then upheld. We still hold that, in the light of the provisions of Chapter XI of the Charter, Non-Self-Governing Territories are like incomplete States, which possess only two of the three elements of a modern State—a people and a territory—and are waiting to attain the third, which is full self-government. When they attain this, they will become complete States. The administering Powers which, under Article 73, receive the "sacred trust" of leading them to this full self-government are thus similar to guardians in civil law. And just as a guardian does not receive full dominion but only the authority to administer the property of his ward, the administering Powers do not exercise sovereignty over those Territories but have the authority to administer them, for the exercise of which they are responsible to the international community which conferred the mandate upon them. As they do not exercise sovereignty over the administered Territories, the acts of administration are not within the domestic jurisdiction of the administering Powers; hence the exception mentioned in Article 2, paragraph 7, is not applicable.

35. The administrative authority of those States does not cease until the Non-Self-Governing Territory has attained full self-government, and this capacity for self-determination can be expressed only by means of a plebiscite or universal suffrage. In this way the Territory may choose among becoming an independent State, associating itself freely with another State or becoming part of another State on a basis of equality. From this standpoint, Southern Rhodesia is not an independent State, not a freely associated State and not another State in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. We must therefore concur with the conclusion reached by the Special Committee in its report [A/5124] regarding the legal status of that Territory.

36. This brings us to a consideration of the situation created by the new Constitution of 1961. In our opinion this is not a constitution such as that which governs the juridical existence of independent States. It seems more like a colonial statute which may promote the attainment of independence within a more or less short space of time: the shortest has been calculated at twelve years, the least short at the almost archaeological figure of 200 years. This character of a colonial statute appears to be defined in part 2 of Chapter X of

the so-called Constitution, which reads: "'Southern Rhodesia' means the Colony of Southern Rhodesia."

37. The most important aspect of the new Constitution seems to be the relinquishment of the limited powers exercised by the United Kingdom and the transfer of those powers to a Constitutional Council empowered to examine all Bills passed, except those on monetary matters, and to report within a period of thirty days whether such Bills contain any provisions which are contrary to human rights. This Council, consisting of a Chairman and eleven members, would be appointed the first time by the High Court, which is of course composed of Whites; we do not know how it would be elected subsequently.

38. The functions of the Council are merely advisory. If it decides against a law, the same may nevertheless be promulgated if a two-thirds majority of the Parliament insist upon it. Since this majority would be composed of Whites, their opinion would prevail. Nor is even the two-thirds majority necessary, for a decision may be taken by simple majority after a delay of six months. Theoretically, any person may exercise his right of complaint, but as he must obtain a legal aid certificate, in practice only those persons whom the Council authorize may lodge complaints.

39. As for human rights, the Constitution provides for a minimum: the right to life, liberty, security of the person, the enjoyment of property and the protection of the law; freedom of assembly, expression, conscience and association and respect for private life. It does not, however, include the rights of man as a political and social person, nor, apparently, is habeas corpus provided for.

40. Lastly, I shall speak about the franchise. According to the annex to document A/AC.109/L.9 of 26 April 1962, there are two categories of voters, A and B, which is equivalent to having first- and second-class citizens. The classification, which is very complicated, is made on the basis of financial and educational qualifications, from those having a yearly income of £720 or immovable property worth over £1,500 to those having a yearly income of £120 or property worth £250, and from those who have had four years of secondary education to those who have completed a course of primary education. There is also provision for the election of fifty members for "constituencies" and fifteen for "districts". Rather than comment on this myself, I shall refer to the statement made on 21 March 1962 before the Special Committee [A/AC.109/SH.17, page 14] by the former Prime Minister of Rhodesia, Mr. Garfield Todd, a former missionary who has performed an act of imperishable humanitarianism. Mr. Garfield Todd, the President of the New African Party, said that:

"The Constitution provided for a two-roll system of registration for elections. Persons registered on roll A had to have high qualifications and elected fifty members. Those on roll B had lower qualifications and elected fifteen members."

What Mr. Garfield Todd said would mean that in a Parliament of sixty-five members, fifty would represent 220,000 Whites and fifteen would represent 2,500,000 Africans.

41. This brings us to the tender spot in this problem: the fact that the society of Southern Rhodesia is multiracial. To us, a multiracial society is one in which races co-exist in conditions of equality. For the Rhodesian politicians who wish to impose the Consti-

tution, it means that the white minority must completely govern the indigenous majority. Mr. Godfrey Huggins, a former Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia, called this a "nursery" policy for Blacks. In other words, with a population ratio of twelve Blacks to every White, fifty Whites are to legislate in a Parliament of sixty-five members. We must bear in mind that the educational level of the population is very low. It appears that only 1.4 per cent of the children of appropriate age attend secondary school. To enable the indigenous inhabitants to vote in equal conditions with the Whites, it would be necessary, according to Mr. Todd, to devote £50 million to education instead of the £4 million at present allocated to education.

42. From the economic standpoint, too, there is little hope that there will be an improvement for the indigenous population which would enable it to vote under the new Constitution. In a speech before the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1959, the Reverend George MacLeod affirmed that under the Land Apportionment Act the Africans would retain 160,000 square kilometres and the Whites 195,000, which is monstrous if we consider the twelve to one ratio of Africans to Whites in Southern Rhodesia. In a statement made before the Special Committee on the morning of 16 March [A/AC.109/SR.15] Mr. Joshua Nkomo, President of the Zimbabwe African People's Union of Rhodesia, asserted that the Land Apportionment Act "had provided a further basis for the exploitation of the Africans, the fertile areas having been declared European while remote areas not previously inhabited had been declared African". Ndabaningi Sithole, a native of Rhodesia and a Minister of the English Methodist Church, states in his book entitled African Nationalism^{5/} that in Rhodesia two-thirds of the land is in the hands of white settlers.

43. It is doubtful, to say the least, that in a Territory which is not autonomous, since it is called semi-autonomous, constitutional changes which are clearly opposed to the provisions of the United Nations Charter concerning racial discrimination could be brought about without the Administering Power being able to do anything to prevent it. It would seem that this is not altogether impossible for the United Kingdom. On the contrary, since the Constitution has not gone into effect, the United Kingdom could be asked to consider whether a transfer of powers is timely or advisable, or whether it would not be better for it to retain those powers until Southern Rhodesia becomes truly democratic and self-governing. This would make negotiations, adjustments and corrections possible and would prevent the African population of Southern Rhodesia being tied hand and foot.

44. There is everything to justify the hope that the United Kingdom will clearly understand its international duties. The history of England since the days of Magna Carta is one of an increasing conquest of human freedom. English philosophy created liberalism. We, the peoples of South America, owe a great debt to Great Britain in regard to our emancipation. The contribution of English libertarian ideas in the days preceding the May emancipation movement in the River Plate may be debated but not denied. Britain's assistance to the precursor of that movement, Francisco Miranda, is indisputable. It is an unforgettable fact for us that English soldiers fought in the armies of Bolivar. And there is no denying that in

recent times the United Kingdom has promoted the emancipation of many African peoples which are now Members of the United Nations.

45. To sum up, my delegation would be inclined to favour measures to prevent the new Constitution being imposed upon Southern Rhodesia without any consultation of the wishes of the majority of its inhabitants, so long as those measures are in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations. We realize that the situation is serious and that the impatience of those who call for radical measures is justified; but we do not think that haste can be a constructive factor in seeking solutions. We consider that in the political field it is not always the most rapid solutions which are good but rather those which are most effective from the standpoint of securing the proposed objectives. We feel, however, that the imposition of a system which would dash the hopes of the African populations is inadmissible.

46. It is our understanding that the key to the conflict which prevents the free development of the people of Southern Rhodesia towards full independence is not to be found in the ill-will or even the inaction of Her Britannic Majesty's Government, still less of the English people. As in other parts of Africa, it is the stubborn will of the settler, accustomed to years of domination, that prevents a solution. The settler demands cheap labour and cannot obtain it except through the maintenance of low levels of living, as in all colonial or semi-colonial societies. He requires blind obedience, which cannot be secured without maintaining low educational levels among the indigenous inhabitants. He requires political domination in order to impose discriminatory systems of life. To leave full power in his hands without the moderating influence of an equitable administering Power would, at this time, be risky and unfortunate. The administering Power has duties towards the international community. The unilateral Government of the settlers will have no authority above it to compel it to fulfil those duties. We call upon those who today have power and responsibility to reflect upon this, whatever may be their present attitude.

47. We fully understand the difficulties in the way of the immediate attainment of a full measure of self-government which would transform Southern Rhodesia into an autonomous State, but we cannot allow the transfer of powers to a minority to create an unjust, explosive and dangerous situation in the Territory. We understand that in this question we are sailing perilously between Scylla and Charybdis. My delegation would therefore like to express its hope that patient, prudent and calm solutions will be found. My delegation does not think that the patience, prudence and calmness it is asking for can mean a betrayal of the principles which it firmly upholds. Depending on our point of view, the Charter can be something as fragile as a piece of paper or as strong as the very conscience of the international community. With the latter in mind, we believe that it is within the letter and the spirit of the Charter to prevent the extension to Rhodesia of the discriminatory, racist and authoritarian systems which in some parts of Africa represent a negation of the democratic sentiment based on the respect of man himself—of man as an end in himself and not as a means—which constitutes the greatest ethical conquest of mankind.

48. These are the considerations upon which my delegation will base its vote when the time arrives.

^{5/} Ndabaningi Sithole, African Nationalism, Cape Town, Oxford University Press, London, New York, 1959.

49. Sir James PLIMSOLL (Australia): Southern Rhodesia is the most difficult of all the territories remaining to the United Kingdom because it is the territory where there is the largest number of non-indigenous inhabitants as a minority exercising considerable power, owning considerable assets and having established a stake in the country politically, economically and socially. That is one of the facts of the situation. Europeans have been there for good or for ill for some time, and any evolution of the territory has to take account of that fact. It is difficult also because the United Kingdom has over the years delegated considerable authority to Southern Rhodesia and is of the opinion that that delegation of authority is irrevocable. Both those circumstances make Southern Rhodesia a peculiarly difficult territory to handle in its evolution.

50. The first question that has been propounded in this debate concerns the status of Southern Rhodesia. It is clearly not an independent State. The United Kingdom has not claimed that it is an independent State, no one has claimed that it is independent. It is, equally clearly, self-governing in certain respects, and that fact also is not in dispute in this Assembly. The questions in dispute concern the degree of United Kingdom responsibility and whether any existing delegation or surrender of responsibility can be revoked. On those questions a number of views have been expressed during the debate. The United Kingdom asserts that in law and in fact it has no power to intervene in Southern Rhodesia in the way in which some representatives would desire. That statement has been made on a number of occasions in the General Assembly by representatives of the United Kingdom; it has been made in the British Parliament and has been asserted by Englishmen on both the Government and the Opposition sides. This is a state of affairs which may or may not be good; it is the product of actions that have been taken by the United Kingdom Government over a period of thirty or forty years, and to one who comes from a country like Australia, where we have so many of our own constitutional matters in dispute before the courts of law, it seems strange that so many Members here are prepared to take a dogmatic position on these constitutional matters.

51. One has only to look at some of the cases that come before the High Court of Australia or before the Supreme Court of Canada or, for that matter, before the United States Supreme Court, to see the complexity of so many of these issues and the vast area of doubt that surrounds constitutional matters. Accordingly I would not be prepared to make a statement on particular aspects of the competence or otherwise of Governments inside the Commonwealth; this is a matter that has so often preoccupied our courts and is not susceptible to sweeping generalizations.

52. However, I would be of the view that even if it were held that Southern Rhodesia was a Non-Self-Governing Territory within the terms of Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations, the powers of the United Kingdom Government are limited in law and in practice. We may dispute the exact way in which they are limited, but as has already been pointed out during this debate by the representative of Canada [1111th meeting], even where the United Kingdom may have held in the past or may hold now certain nominal legal powers, the practical question confronts the United Kingdom whether it could in practice assert those powers. The representative of Canada raised the question of whether the United Kingdom could be

expected to resort if necessary to military means to enforce some wish of the United Kingdom—whether it could do so, whether it would be practical politics to expect that it would, and whether it would be in the interest of the indigenous inhabitants of Southern Rhodesia for it to do so.

53. There are many examples in the constitutional development of countries of the Commonwealth which show the gradual devolution of authority by the United Kingdom so that a time comes when, either explicitly or implicitly, whether the United Kingdom wishes it or not, it is no longer in a position to revoke what it has delegated or to assert the United Kingdom's own authority. Many countries represented in this Assembly have had that experience; many countries of the Commonwealth represented in this Assembly would have resented and resisted any attempt by the United Kingdom Government to take back powers after devolution had proceeded beyond a certain stage.

54. So I submit that on this particular aspect of the question Southern Rhodesia is clearly not independent, it is clearly self-governing in certain respects and on the question of the degree of authority or jurisdiction remaining with the United Kingdom we really have to respect the views that the United Kingdom authorities themselves arrived at.

55. The United Kingdom Government can perhaps draw some wry amusement or wry satisfaction from the fact that so many of us here wish the United Kingdom to retain jurisdiction and authority in Southern Rhodesia. It is perhaps a back-handed compliment, but it is a compliment; it is a recognition of the fact that over the years in so many territories the United Kingdom has faithfully discharged its obligations, both before the United Nations came into existence and since, to bring forward the peoples of the British Empire to self-determination and self-government. We have confidence that it will continue to pursue these aims in the territories that remain under British jurisdiction and obviously the regret of many Members here is that the United Kingdom has not got complete powers in this territory.

56. Turning from these jurisdictional and legal questions to the conditions in Southern Rhodesia—the situation on the ground, as it were—where do we stand? The objective which Australia supports for Southern Rhodesia, as I have stated on previous occasions in the Committee of seventeen members, is a form of government and a form of society where there is equal opportunity for everyone regardless of race, colour or religion.

57. There is no doubt that the present situation in Southern Rhodesia falls far short of this in many respects—in the franchise, for example—in the opportunities open to Africans, in various forms of discrimination, tangible and intangible, which persist. Therefore, Australia is not supporting the continuance of the *status quo* nor does it want to freeze the present situation. The present position in Southern Rhodesia cannot persist. Neither the United Kingdom Government nor the authorities of Southern Rhodesia maintain that the present situation is there to stay or that it should be maintained. That seems to me to be the most hopeful element in the question of Southern Rhodesia: the fact that neither the United Kingdom Government nor the Southern Rhodesian authorities regard the present situation as something that should persist. They do not regard racial supremacy or control by a minority as something that should be maintained as a

permanent feature of Southern Rhodesia. The avowed objective is a government based on an African majority. The avowed aim is to bring this about in an orderly way.

58. Some objections to that have been raised in the course of this debate. It has been said that once the United Kingdom has surrendered most of the powers that it has hitherto retained, the white minority will, by one device or another, perpetuate itself permanently in power. That argument has been developed by a number of speakers here. It has also been put forward in the report of the Special Committee of seventeen members. The fear is that the complete delegation of authority to those in Southern Rhodesia would put an end to the processes or the hopes of progressive development to a state where the indigenous inhabitants, the majority of the people, win control of their own destinies.

59. The second major objection that has emerged during this debate is to the speed of advance. It has been argued that even if the processes in Southern Rhodesia are designed to lead to a government based on an African majority, these processes are going to take too long. These are genuine fears and they cannot be lightly swept aside. In foreseeing political development in any part of the world, in any country of the world, one cannot arbitrarily brush aside any possibility. It would be rash for anyone in any situation to say that something cannot occur.

60. But there are other factors that we have to be aware of and to take into account, factors that do provide some elements of hope. One of these flows from the fact that the United Nations has had some discussions already about the matter. As a result, the world is aware of the situation in Southern Rhodesia, and the authorities and the inhabitants of Southern Rhodesia know that the world is watching what is going on. They know that they cannot take decisions in a vacuum. They know that developments in Southern Rhodesia are not going to proceed in a vacuum. And so all the various forces that at present are at work in the world, the movements toward self-determination for all peoples, the international conceptions of the rights of man, of individual freedoms, the movement toward economic development throughout the world, all these forces that are debated and furthered in United Nations bodies are brought to the notice of those in Southern Rhodesia. They know that they cannot, even if they wished to, proceed in Southern Rhodesia as though these things and these feelings in the rest of the world did not exist.

61. We can also take hope from the professed aims of the authorities in Southern Rhodesia. For example, as regards the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland—whether we like the Federation or not—there is the fact that it was brought into being to create a multi-racial society. Opinions may differ as to whether the Federation is an effective instrument for bringing that about. Opinions may differ as to the sincerity of some of those who were associated with it, but the fact is that the professed purpose of the Federation was to provide the basis for a multiracial society. Then, too, many of those in authority in Southern Rhodesia have stated that the aim is an African majority. Sir Edgar Whitehead, the Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia, has said publicly that the processes now being set in train in Southern Rhodesia must lead in time to an African majority. It is very important and very valuable that a statement to that effect should be made

by the man who is the Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia.

62. There are other hopeful developments. The courts in Southern Rhodesia are functioning. I read in *The Times* of London of yesterday that the High Court of Southern Rhodesia has just ruled that an African servant had the right to use the local swimming bath in a suburb of Salisbury. I do not know the circumstances of this particular case, but it is surely significant and encouraging that in Southern Rhodesia the courts of law are open to people and that they will rule that certain rights, certain human rights, certain privileges, are open to everyone regardless of colour. I do not want to picture unfairly or in too optimistic terms the degree to which discrimination is being eliminated, but it is being eliminated and I think that here in this Assembly and in our approach to this problem we should try and build on what has already been achieved.

63. Some of the statements that have been made in this debate have pictured the authorities in Southern Rhodesia in most extreme terms. They have pictured their objectives as one of complete segregation, complete subjection of the African population and complete superiority of one race. I have no doubt that there are people in Southern Rhodesia who would favour that; there may be some in authority who would favour that. But there are other forces at work. There are declarations in the Constitution and in legislation; there are men in high authority; there are courts that are pointing in the other direction. We should build on this instead of dismissing the situation as hopeless; we should try to build on what already exists and move forward towards a State with racial equality in an integrated society. Indeed, of all the remaining territories in Africa that are not independent and which have a substantial non-indigenous minority, Southern Rhodesia presents the most hopeful prospects.

64. Another positive element in the situation is the fact that the United Kingdom Government's influence will continue to be exerted. The United Kingdom has expressed doubts as to the degree to which it can intervene legally and in practice, but it can and it will exert influence where it may, either as a Government or through private individuals and through various institutions. We have seen in the last few months the appointment of one of the most senior members of the United Kingdom Government to the new position of Minister responsible for Central African Affairs. He has been out in the Rhodesias and in Nyasaland. He has had talks with large numbers of representatives, those of the authorities there, of the European elements in the population and of the indigenous inhabitants. I do not know what conclusions he has come back with on what needs to be done or what can be done, but his appointment and his presence in the territory is an indication that the United Kingdom is not washing its hands completely of the situation, nor is unwilling to inform itself and explore the possibilities of future developments. That is a hopeful element.

65. Then again, there is the inescapable fact that a society or government where the majority is denied representation or adequate participation in public and private affairs cannot survive, and those who are responsible for affairs in Southern Rhodesia must be conscious of that. They must be conscious of the fact that if they try to perpetuate the present situation as it is, rather than moving forward to a society with opportunities for all, the result would be disaster. And

this, given the situation and given the professed objectives, can lead us to hope that developments will continue to flow. There is a community of interest among all in Southern Rhodesia in the orderly development and transition of the territory. The Africans have an interest in preserving the machinery of government and the economic assets that have been built up in the territory, and in continuing to be able to draw on the various skills which can be contributed by so many of the non-indigenous population. The Africans have no interest in the destruction of government and of the delicate economic structure.

66. The Europeans, for their part, also have a clear interest in orderly development and transition, because it is only by having this inevitable transition brought about in an orderly and peaceful way that most of the Europeans can hope to preserve the possibility of remaining in the territory and continuing to make a contribution to the territory and to carry out the livelihood that they have hitherto followed.

67. It seems to me that in our debate more attention might have been given to some factors other than those of purely constitutional and jurisdictional development—for example, to the need for getting the various racial groups and their representatives to work together and to have more contact. To an outsider like myself one of the features in the Federation scene that causes some surprise is the lack of real personal contact and co-operation between members of the various racial groups, various ministers from different parts of the territory, and the more that co-operation and personal contact can be built up between Europeans and Africans the faster, the more efficiently and the more smoothly will development and transition proceed. It is necessary to build up trust and confidence and understanding.

68. When we look at the situation in Southern Rhodesia as it exists on the ground, we have the fact—to which I referred at the beginning of my statement—that there is a large population of non-indigenous people who own important economic assets which they have built up, who occupy various positions of power—politically, economically and socially—and who are inevitably reluctant to surrender all this abruptly unless they can be assured that the society that is evolving is one in which they will be able to find a place and in which all this economic structure is to be preserved. The task of those on the spot in Southern Rhodesia today, Africans and Europeans, is to build up trust and confidence between themselves, to allay the fears that inevitably exist on both sides—fears on the part of the Africans that the Europeans do not genuinely intend to surrender a privileged position, fears on the part of the Europeans that they are going to be driven out or deprived of all they have, or that chaos is going to ensue.

69. This situation is not going to be solved by resolution of this Assembly. It is not going to be solved by an Act of Parliament, either in London or in Rhodesia. It is, as I say, a question of building up trust and confidence, building up habits of co-operation. Because we have seen the example of other independent States in Africa we know that the possibility of having an efficient and peaceful State with African Ministers and with Africans in responsible positions is a reality. It is something which can be brought about in Southern Rhodesia. It is something that can be brought about best, most speedily, and most effectively if the various

communities learn to get on together and to co-operate with one another.

70. I am not advocating a policy of gradualism if the word "gradualism" is interpreted to mean slowness. In fact it is quite clear that the speed with which developments must proceed in Southern Rhodesia is much greater than would have been envisaged some years ago. It is not a question of hastening slowly; it is a question of hastening as rapidly as possible, but hastening, if possible, in concert. And it is necessary to supplement any constitutional developments and the building up of habits of co-operation, of confidence and of trust by programmes of education and economic development that are designed to help the indigenous inhabitants of the country to take their full part in a modern State.

71. Much has already been done in Southern Rhodesia. In the field of education the level is higher than in many parts of Africa. In the field of economic development Southern Rhodesia is probably, apart from the Republic of South Africa, the only State with reasonable prospects of self-generating economic development. There is a basis for economic prosperity and development in Southern Rhodesia. This is a good thing. It is an element of hope. It is something to be built on and not destroyed. But, having said that, it is clear that programmes of education and economic development, with or without international assistance, should be pressed on with all possible speed, and that is all the more so in view of the nature of the franchise in the new Constitution. The more the economic standards of the Africans can be raised, the more their standard of living and their incomes can be raised, the more rapidly the proportion of Africans on the present roll will increase. Then again I would say, in the spirit of what I have been saying, that it would seem desirable that as many Africans as possible should enrol and play their part in the political evolution of the country under the present constitution. I know that many Africans in Southern Rhodesia disapprove of the present Constitution. Perhaps the majority of them do. But whether they accept it or not, it would seem to me that it is to their advantage to use their opportunities to the utmost. They might continue to say that they want to change it, but I would have thought the more Africans that register now on the electoral roll and exercise their vote and play an active part under this Constitution—whether they agree with it or not, and whether or not they seek to change it—the better.

72. It will be clear, I think, from what I have said that Australia cannot support the draft resolution [A/L.386/Rev.1 and Add.1-4] that is at present before us. One reason is that it asks the United Kingdom to do things which the United Kingdom Government believes lie beyond its powers. It does not seem to my delegation to be very profitable to ask the United Kingdom to do something which the United Kingdom Government has said it does not have the power to do whether it wishes to do it or not.

73. The task in Southern Rhodesia is a task for everyone involved in it. It is a task for the United Kingdom Government; it is a task for the Southern Rhodesian authorities; and it is a task for all the inhabitants of the territory, Europeans, Africans and Asians. Each has a contribution to make. The aim, as I have said, is a society and a form of government where there will be equal opportunity for everyone, regardless of race or colour or religion. It is clear that a government or society cannot persist if it is based on the

superiority of a racial minority, if the majority of the inhabitants have neither representation nor voice.

74. So the present situation is not one that anybody here—or indeed the Government of Southern Rhodesia—is defending as one to be preserved. What I believe we all want is rapid evolution—rapid evolution to a government and society with equal opportunity for all. I have no doubt that the United Kingdom authorities, the authorities in Southern Rhodesia and the peoples there—European and African—will be aware of what has been said here. Whether they like it or not, various forces have been exposed in our debate. The forces of the modern world, the possibilities open to modern science and technology, have been discussed in our debate and have to be taken into account.

75. Australia cannot vouch for the outcome of any particular course. No one here can. Just as the United Kingdom Government and the authorities in Southern Rhodesia claim their jurisdiction and claim that they have their responsibilities, so we, too, for our part, cannot accept responsibility for acts that they may take. None of us can. None of us is asked to do so. But we can hope that there will be evolution in the directions desired by nearly all Members of this Assembly and in the directions laid down in the United Nations Charter. We can see some elements in the situation that indicate that although Southern Rhodesia is the most difficult of the territories which are still British, it is far from being the most hopeless or the most difficult of the territories in Africa.

76. Mr. TARAZI (Syria) (translated from French): The General Assembly has been asked to consider the question of Southern Rhodesia. Most of the speakers who have preceded me have stressed the importance and gravity of the problems with which this Territory is faced in the present circumstances of its development. In the view of the legitimate representatives of the African population, the Constitution of 6 December 1961 has not solved these problems. On the contrary, it has rendered them more complicated.

77. My delegation took part in the discussions of the Committee of Seventeen and has thus been able to appreciate the critical nature of the situation and the urgent need for action by the General Assembly to prevent what would otherwise be inevitable.

78. The report drawn up by the Committee of Seventeen is, in our opinion, satisfactory; its conclusions cannot be considered biased. As a consequence of the General Assembly's adoption of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, every colonial situation falls within the jurisdiction of the United Nations. Every Administering Power must take into consideration the fact that the United Nations has decided once and for all that Non-Self-Governing Territories must reach the stage of complete independence and sovereign rule.

79. When we examine the 1961 Constitution, we are surprised to find that it does not follow the principles set out in resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, which laid the foundation for total decolonization. Since the African population is opposed to the introduction and application of the Constitution, it is our duty to avert a situation which might become explosive and dangerous.

80. Whenever the interests of European settlers have been at stake, we have seen difficulties and problems arise. It might safely be said that the administering Powers, which themselves opened up the various

colonial territories for their nationals to exploit, have subsequently not only been unable to control the European settlers but have ended by trailing behind them.

81. The problems which arise in Southern Rhodesia are, to some extent, classic ones. They are the last remaining examples of the vestiges of colonization. The idea of white supremacy—a false doctrine which has been disproved by events—continues to obsess the minds of the European settlers. Instead of abandoning the doctrine, the latter have sought a substitute capable of resisting the new forces. They have found it in racial discrimination.

82. This situation is one of the most distressing examples of the tragedy with which we are faced in contemporary Africa. We are already familiar with racial discrimination in South Africa. Do we want to see the same situation created in Rhodesia, simply because a European minority is determined to prevent the African majority from exercising its lawful rights in its own country? The United Nations has already committed the error of failing to recognize the existence of the Arab population in Palestine, in order to permit foreigners to usurp the right to rule that country in disregard of the wishes of the Arabs. Do we want such a situation to be repeated? Surely we do not. It is therefore essential that the wishes of the Africans should be respected.

83. These are the reasons which have led my delegation, together with others, to submit the draft resolution which is now before the General Assembly. The draft resolution is moderate in tone. The Administering Authority cannot accuse us of placing it in a difficult situation or of proposing impossible solutions. The convening of a constitutional conference and the removal of all obstacles to the exercise by the Africans of the most elementary rights constitute the very minimum that must be done if things are not to go from bad to worse.

84. The representative of Australia, who spoke before me, told us that it was impossible to ask the United Kingdom Government to intervene, since that Government has surrendered its jurisdiction over Southern Rhodesia. But if we cannot ask the United Kingdom Government to intervene, whom are we to ask? Are we to ask Sir Roy Welensky to appear before the General Assembly and to comply with the resolutions adopted by the Assembly? If we did, the United Kingdom Government might well say: "But you cannot ask Sir Roy Welensky to appear, for the United Kingdom Government is responsible for the foreign policy of Southern Rhodesia".

85. Consequently, it is fallacious to argue that we cannot ask the United Kingdom Government to intervene.

86. The administering Power has raised objections to the convening of a constitutional conference at which all representatives of the population would participate. These objections are really specious; they will not stand up to any kind of serious examination. There can be no doubt that in the present circumstances Southern Rhodesia is a Non-Self-Governing Territory. The administering Power remains responsible for its fate. The Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland cannot be imposed on an African population whose very physical existence is not recognized. The convening of a constitutional conference would have the advantage of making it possible to rectify a situation which is in

danger of developing in a direction which the administering Power is bound to regret later.

87. These are the reasons why my delegation expresses the hope that the draft resolution before the General Assembly will be adopted.

Mr. Volio (Costa Rica), Vice-President, took the Chair.

88. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland): The debates in the United Nations on colonialism reflect the struggle going on in the dependent territories between the forces of colonialism and those of national liberation.

89. In this respect the present debate on the question of Southern Rhodesia does not differ from the previous ones. We are participating in what is but a reflection of the clash between the aspirations and interests of the 3 million majority of indigenous inhabitants of Southern Rhodesia and a small minority of colonizers supported in their immoral determination to prolong the colonial rule by powerful metropolitan authority.

90. The arguments put forward in the present debate by the United Kingdom delegation and its supporters do not differ much from those used in previous debates on colonial questions. We are told again that we should not rush events, that the process leading to the independence of the Territory must take its time. As the General Assembly knows, the estimates of how long that time could be or should be differ greatly. Some British sources claim that it has to take twelve years, while others, more frank and fanatic, talk about colonialism living in that part of Africa for the next two hundred years, if they can help it to do so.

91. We are told that the indigenous population is not prepared for independence, that it lacks trained and qualified personnel. Who should be held responsible for that state of affairs? For more than seventy years of British rule the indigenous population was treated like an inferior race whose only purpose to exist was to be exploited. It was Sir Cecil Rhodes, the conqueror of Rhodesia, who frankly declared, "I contend that we are the first race in the world, and that the more of the world we inhabit, the better it is for the human race". We fail to see any difference in the attitude of Cecil Rhodes and of those who tell us that the people of Southern Rhodesia have to be coached and patiently led to the independence of which British imperialism robbed them more than seventy years ago.

92. To those arguments we answer as we did in all previous colonial debates: only full freedom and independence can create the best conditions for speedy and prosperous development of the people. It is true for all countries, but it is especially true for the people of the territories which are still under the colonial rule. The African countries which recently achieved independence prove in practice the validity of this truth.

93. The General Assembly, seasoned as it is in colonial debates, certainly will not be misled by the contention of the United Kingdom and its supporters that the unselfish desire to train and guide the indigenous population of Southern Rhodesia is the true and only motive behind the strong opposition of the United Kingdom Government to the transfer of powers to the African population of the territory or even against the discussion of this problem in the United Nations. My delegation believes that, as in all cases of colonialism, the true motives are of an economic and political nature often rooted, as is the case in Southern

Rhodesia, in the attitude of white supremacy to which fanatic settlers and their supporters in the metropolitan country stubbornly adhere.

94. Therefore I should like to analyse briefly these three elements which shape the colonial policies in Southern Rhodesia. Economic exploitation has always been the principal goal of colonial policies. It is especially true in Southern Rhodesia. The country is rich with minerals. The output of gold, coal, manganese, asbestos and other rare minerals is considerable, giving Southern Rhodesia a large share of the Western market for minerals and raw materials. For example, 50 per cent of United States imports of chrome is supplied by that territory. These riches are owned and exploited by the large British, West European and American companies, which control not only the resources of Southern Rhodesia but also the vast riches of all central and southern Africa.

95. Some call this group of companies the "Cape to Katanga Miners" and they include such infamous and well-known names as the Union minière du Haut-Katanga, De Beers Consolidated Mines, the Anglo-American Corporation of South Africa, the British South Africa Company, the American Metal Climax Corporation, the Société générale de Belgique, and the Rhodesian Selection Trust Group. This is the real power shaping and quietly directing the official policies of the Governments of the colonial States. We have seen how ruthless these imperialistic monopolies can be in the case of Katanga and the Congo. We can detect their influence in the current debate on the future of Ruanda-Urundi. And we have every reason to fear that they can be equally brutal in Southern Rhodesia.

96. If we look at the map of south and central Africa we can see the strategic location of Southern Rhodesia. It borders on Mozambique, South Africa, Bechuanaland and Northern Rhodesia. It is close to Angola and South West Africa. In short, it is right in the centre of the vast lands which are still under colonial domination and which are directly controlled by the powerful monopolies.

97. Hence the fears of those monopolies of the influence which the liberation of Southern and Northern Rhodesia might have on the whole area. They fear that the loss of political control of the Rhodesias might lead to the eventual loss of the economic control and exploitation of a large part of Africa.

98. In the course of the debate on the question of Southern Rhodesia in the Special Committee of seventeen members, of which Poland is proud to be a member, the conditions of life in Southern Rhodesia were fully exposed. In a detailed report Mr. Joshua Nkomo, leader of the Zimbabwe African People's Union—representing the indigenous population of the territory—gave the Special Committee all the data on the economic situation and the political terrorism directed against the African majority. We learned from the evidence given by him and his associates that the average wage of the European is about £90 per month while Africans earn from £7 to £10. More than half of the total area, and the best of it, is owned by the European settlers and by absentee owners in Britain, some of whom hold high positions in the United Kingdom Government. The lack of education, housing, social and health facilities for Africans is shocking. The members of the African national movement are terrorized, arrested and resettled in isolated areas. In 1961 alone more than 10,000 Africans were thrown into prison. Tension is growing in Southern Rhodesia

and there is a genuine fear among Africans there that the powerful monopolies might use the racist fanatics from among the white population to spark violence and to strike at the African movement by physically eliminating its leaders. Those fears have to be taken with the utmost seriousness, for many times in the past this was the course of action taken by colonialists. Need I remind the Assembly of the assassination of Patrice Lumumba and his associates, of Dr. Moumié of Cameroon, John Kale of Uganda, Dedan Kimathi of Kenya and Prince Rwagasore, Prime Minister of Burundi?

99. The General Assembly decided in its wisdom to include the question of Southern Rhodesia in the agenda of this resumed session as an item requiring urgent consideration and solution. It was the right decision, for the next few months may be crucial for the whole future of Southern Rhodesia. In the face of growing pressure for liberation, the forces of colonialism decided to press for the creation of a racist state which could perpetuate the control of the country and safeguard the interests of colonialism in neighbouring territories. The three following stages are to lead to their goal.

100. First, the tactical manoeuvres concerning the status of the territory. The colonizers claim that Southern Rhodesia has been a self-governing country since 1923. The folly of this claim is obvious when one remembers that self-rule was given to the white population only without any consultation or participation of the African people who constitute 92 per cent of the whole population. My delegation supported the conclusion of the Special Committee that the territory did not meet the conditions generally accepted as applicable to a self-governing territory and that Southern Rhodesia has not attained a full measure of self-government. We are sure that the General Assembly, in its wisdom, will confirm this conclusion and thus will oppose efforts to deprive the United Nations of the right to concern itself with the future of the territory.

101. Second, the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland was established in 1953. As we learn from the report of the so-called Monckton Commission,^{6/} the purpose of the Federation is to utilize the exceptionally rich mineral resources of Northern Rhodesia and the cheap labour from Nyasaland for the development of Southern Rhodesia, where the ratio of Europeans and Africans is 1 to 14, while in Northern Rhodesia it is 1 to 30, and in Nyasaland 1 to 370. It was our position in the Special Committee—and we reaffirm it now—that the Federation organized by colonizers to perpetuate white supremacy should be dissolved. The question whether and when the territories should unite can be decided only by the Africans themselves when they are able to express their will freely.

102. One of the most dangerous manoeuvres aimed at creating a racist state in Southern Rhodesia is the so-called Constitution of 1961. All African leaders oppose it most strongly, for its purpose is to perpetuate the power of the minority of settlers and it would permanently deprive the overwhelming majority of Africans of their political rights. My delegation therefore reaffirms its opinion expressed in the Special Committee that the Constitution should be abrogated and that a conference, with the participation of representatives of

the United Kingdom and of African political parties in Southern Rhodesia, should be called immediately with a view to the preparation of free and general elections on the basis of the principle, one man—one vote. The task of the conference should be to transfer all powers to the temporary African Government.

103. Time is running short in Southern Rhodesia. The growing tensions may lead fanatical colonizers to a type of provocation in Southern Rhodesia similar to that of the Organisation de l'armée secrète in Algeria. Although in the final outcome, the struggle would mean victory for the African people, many lives would be lost and the international implications of such a conflict are hard to foresee at present. It is the duty of the United Nations and the obligation of the administering Power to prevent such a course of events and to assist in the peaceful processes of decolonization of the territory. The just solution of the question of Southern Rhodesia lies only in granting independence to the country through a democratic transfer of power according to the wishes expressed by the majority of the population. The sooner it takes place, the better it will be for all concerned. My delegation believes that, in view of the dangers involved in the situation, Southern Rhodesia should become independent before 1963. To delay this process would mean to take the incalculable risk of a further deterioration of conditions in the Territory.

104. Permit me, in conclusion, to quote the words of Mr. Kambona, Minister for Home Affairs of Tanganyika, who said in his welcoming address to the Special Committee of seventeen members when it met in Dar es Salaam on 5 June 1962:

"The patience of the African people, who have suffered the indignities of the colonial system more than the people of any other continent, is exhausted and they are ready to give their lives for freedom and equality. It is essential for world peace and security that the scourge of colonialism should be wiped out, and the United Nations should concentrate on practical steps to that end."

105. My delegation fully subscribes to this expression of anxiety and of need for action by the United Nations. Those who intend to obstruct the course of justice may find themselves unbearably burdened with responsibility for causing new human misery.

Mr. Mongi Slim (Tunisia) resumed the Chair.

106. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): There are no further speakers ready to take the floor at the present meeting.

107. Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to inform members that the General Committee will meet at 3 p.m. tomorrow to fix the closing date of the session. This meeting of the General Committee will be a brief one and the General Assembly will meet in plenary immediately afterwards.

108. I would appeal to all representatives to assist the Chair by arriving punctually and I venture to hope, in view of the fact that there are still twenty-nine speakers on the list, that we might hear as many as possible of them tomorrow and, if necessary, hold a night meeting.

109. The next meeting will take place at 10.30 a.m. tomorrow.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.

^{6/} Report of the Advisory Commission on the Review of the Constitution of Rhodesia and Nyasaland (London, H.M. Stationery Office).