

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**1119th
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 27 June 1962,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 49:</i> <i>Question of the future of Ruanda-Urundi: re-</i> <i>port of the United Nations Commission for</i> <i>Ruanda-Urundi (concluded)</i> <i>Report of the Fourth Committee (part III) . .</i>	1513
<i>Agenda item 97:</i> <i>Question of Southern Rhodesia (continued) . . .</i>	1516

President: Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia).

AGENDA ITEM 49 .

Question of the future of Ruanda-Urundi: report of the United Nations Commission for Ruanda-Urundi (concluded)

**REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE
(PART III) (A/5142)**

1. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I shall now give the floor to the speakers wishing to explain their votes. Before doing so, however, I take the liberty of asking them once again to limit their remarks to the vote which took place at the last meeting.
2. Mrs. DE ALBIZU CAMPOS (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): At this moment, immediately prior to the accession of Rwanda and Burundi to independence as two States, the attitudes of all delegations in relation to this matter are no longer in doubt. In our view, the degree of responsibility borne by delegations with regard to the immediate future of independent Rwanda and Burundi has been made clear.
3. Although it may hardly seem necessary to do so, I should like to stress that in voting on the case of Rwanda and Burundi my delegation had in mind very particularly the inhabitants of the Territory as human beings. Our purpose was to ensure that they would be able to live their lives and perform their honest labour in conditions of equal opportunity for all of them, so that all might enjoy the blessings of domestic peace and international security. We acted thus in the conviction that this was what membership in the United Nations enjoined upon us.
4. In casting our vote, we considered that we were dealing with a clear-cut case of colonialism. We realized that there were some who did not, as they still do not, find that affirmation to their taste. We are strengthened in our conviction when we see that no one, unless he has some vested interest in Rwanda and Burundi, can today deny that the colonialist nature of the case was clearly apparent.
5. We hear talk about "cold war" and "hot war". We are thinking of the existence of another war—the

permanent war, which is what we call the war silently waged by the colonial Powers against the subject peoples: the permanent war of colonialism, in which only one side has weapons, soldiers and armies, and the other side resists with its bare hands.

6. That is why the inflexible insistence of the colonial Power on keeping its forces in Rwanda and Burundi did not surprise us and we took it into account when voting, for without those forces it could not carry on the permanent war in the Territory. Everyone knows that colonialism imposes itself by force.

7. When General Assembly resolution 1743 (XVI) on the question of the future of Ruanda-Urundi was under consideration in February of this year, we told our African friends that we objected to that part of operative paragraph 3 (e), concerning withdrawal from the Territory, which read: "...with the exception of such personnel whose retention, in the view of the Commission in consultation with the authorities of Ruanda-Urundi and the Administering Authority...may be considered necessary as an interim measure". We also expressed our doubts concerning the real purpose of the phrase "...without prejudice to the sovereign rights of the future independent Ruanda-Urundi", which appears in the same sub-paragraph.

8. We informed our friends at that time of our opinion that the retention of any force—particularly in Rwanda, since Burundi had assumed another attitude—would be likely to provide a basis on which the colonial forces would remain in the Territory permanently. We were completely sceptical about the colonial Power's insistent defence of the "sovereign rights" of a country which was under its rule and which it had entered for the purpose of continuing to violate the sovereign rights of the people.

9. With those private reservations, we joined our friends in voting in favour of the resolution. There was no doubt in our minds that the colonial Power never intended to withdraw its troops. Events have proved that we were right.

10. We had similar reservations when the matter was considered in the Fourth Committee a few days ago, and it was this that caused us to vote here in favour of the draft resolution recommended by the Fourth Committee in its report [A/5142]. We were in agreement with most of its provisions, and particularly with that regarding the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement and the accession of Rwanda and Burundi to independence on 1 July 1962.

11. To be brief, let me say that we are mentioning only one major provision to which my delegation objected: the retention of the colonial troops in the new States after the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement and the establishment of the independence of the two parts of the Territory.

12. Cuba wishes it to be clearly understood that it was not simply for reasons of principle that it took that stand. The retention of colonial forces on our territory after it became independent was imposed on Cuba more than half a century ago, and those forces are still there on a part of our territory. My delegation accordingly felt that it should not contribute to the possibility of new States finding themselves in the same terrible situation. I think that this explanation should make our position entirely clear.

13. With the kind permission of the President, my delegation extends its cordial congratulations to the peoples of Rwanda and Burundi as they attain their sovereignty, and wishes them the greatest success in the exercise of their full independence. We should like to take this joyful occasion to express the hope that the time will soon come when the peoples fighting against colonialism will not have to pay for their freedom with the blood of more martyrs like Prince Louis Rwagasore and Pedro Albizu Campos—when the subjugation of peoples will be brought to an end in all parts of the world, from the Guianas to Kenya and from Algeria to Puerto Rico.

14. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) (translated from French): My delegation voted in favour of the entire resolution on the future of Rwanda and Burundi which was adopted by the General Assembly this morning by an overwhelming majority, and it did so bearing in mind the interpretation given on several occasions by the sponsors of the draft resolution when it was being discussed in the Fourth Committee.

15. I should like in particular to point out in this connexion that the decision to evacuate the Belgian troops still stationed in Rwanda and Burundi had just been taken by this resolution which the General Assembly has now adopted and which in reality merely reiterates a decision already adopted by the General Assembly in resolution 1743 (XVI). These troops will consequently be able to remain in the territories of Rwanda and Burundi only if the Governments of those countries should freely decide, in the exercise of their full sovereignty after independence, that they want them to remain. This unquestionably bears out the fact that the third Belgian amendment [see A/5142, para. 20], which would have made the request for evacuation contingent upon the will of the Governments of Rwanda and Burundi, was withdrawn by the Belgian delegation owing to the objections which were raised against it and which were considered convincing even by the Belgian delegation itself.

16. My delegation also voted in favour of operative paragraph 3 of the resolution—and specifically in favour of the words "no longer have any role to play", which appear in that paragraph—taking into account the formal assurance given by Belgium in document A/C.4/555 that the Belgian troops which the General Assembly has decided should be evacuated would be subject to the laws of Rwanda and Burundi after those two countries became independent.

17. In this connexion, I should like to point out that the oral sub-amendment proposed by the delegation of India and mentioned in paragraphs 26 and 28 of the Fourth Committee's report [A/5142] was withdrawn on the strength of the assurance—to which I have referred and which is mentioned in paragraph 30 of the Fourth Committee's report—given by the Administering Authority regarding the interpretation of the words "no longer have any role to play".

18. I do not want this happy occasion of the birth of two African sister States to pass without expressing to the peoples of Rwanda and Burundi our sincere wishes for their prosperity or without wishing the two future independent States a future of peace, national harmony and progress.

19. Mr. MATITI (Congo, Leopoldville) (translated from French): My delegation finds itself in a very delicate position in coming to speak before this august assembly. Before explaining the reasons for my vote, I should like first of all to say how touched we were that five delegations which came one after another to this rostrum mentioned my country as an example of the work of the United Nations.

20. I am aware of the situation with which my country has to contend. I thank all those representatives who, ever since we have been in this situation, have never hesitated to support us. I know that their spirit of fair play has prevented most of them, in their statements, from mentioning the Congo by name, but they have alluded to it. This is why I began by saying that we were in a somewhat embarrassing position in speaking from this rostrum. Nevertheless, in view of a fortunate event such as the one we have begun to celebrate here—the accession of these two sister States to independence—it is inconceivable that we should remain silent. And I am not thinking only that these two countries have become independent, but also that they were under a régime similar to our own. That is why my delegation abstained on the proposals that were submitted, but it does feel that the resolution which has just been unanimously adopted best reflects my Government's concern as to the future of these two Territories. Its ultimate action was therefore determined by the often-repeated statements of the Administering Authority and by its trust in the future. As I have had occasion to say in the Fourth Committee, it is not so much the past that interests us as the future, and my delegation is glad to see that the general trend has been to safeguard the future, rather than to pass judgement on the past. The sponsors of the proposals on which we abstained themselves recognize that the situation was difficult and that difficult situations call for carefully adapted measures. In the end, however, my delegation did not hesitate to vote in favour of the resolution as a whole submitted by the African-Asian Powers.

21. It is with deep emotion that, on behalf of the Congolese Government and people, my delegation welcomes the accession of these two sister States to sovereignty. It would be superfluous to repeat here the reasons which induced us to follow with close attention the discussions in the Fourth Committee which have resulted in the happy event that gladdens us all today. We extend our sincerest wishes to the people of Burundi and the people of Rwanda. We wish them prosperity, happiness and fruitful labours. We say to those countries' leaders that this is no longer a time for propaganda meetings, but for work. We ourselves are living through such a period, and it is my belief—as someone in our country has said—that if, in general, to be forewarned is to be forearmed, then in Africa it is to be doubly forearmed.

22. My delegation wishes to appeal to all the Members of this Organization to spare these new States the unfortunate experience of my own country, for everyone knows that the influences which are brought to bear on us in our inexperience are designed to lead us where we do not want to go.

23. In order not to impose upon the patience of this Assembly, I shall conclude by paying a warm tribute to the Administering Authority, which, as I have said, is moving in the direction of progress. I do this because it is the future that concerns us and because we trust in the future. From the moment that minds evolve, civilization ceases to be static; there is inevitable progress in our conceptions. We have noted that most people were concerned and afraid that what happened in our country might happen again. We sincerely believe, however, that our tribute is no flattery, and we know that as matters change and progress, we can hope for an improvement of the situation.

24. I have received news that the situation, which was better when I left the Congo, seems to be worsening, and I cannot conclude without recalling that in my statement before the Fourth Committee I alluded to a twofold figure whereby one is a friend and a sworn enemy at one and the same time. I mean that the situation in Katanga persists because certain Powers, which are in fact our friends, are playing a double game, and that is a dangerous game.

25. If there is to be friendship, we want it to be sincere. We cannot believe that Mr. Tshombé has factories in Katanga where he manufactures arms, nor can we believe that the white soldiers who are there were born in Katanga.

26. I therefore wished to conclude in this manner in order to point out that besides goodwill and hope for a life under the benefits of independence, we want sincerity to prevail, and, in addition to displays of pomp and friendship, we wish to have frank collaboration and co-operation free of ulterior motives.

27. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland): As my delegation explained in the general debate in the Fourth Committee, we are being guided in the consideration of the problem of Rwanda-Urundi by the following three principles—and the draft resolution which was submitted to us in the Fourth Committee was considered by my delegation from the standpoint of the implementation of those three principles.

28. The first principle is that the Trusteeship Agreement must be terminated by 1 July 1962, and that by that date Rwanda and Burundi should be granted independence, as envisaged by General Assembly resolution 1743 (XVI). We found in the draft resolution submitted by the African-Asian group, approved by the Fourth Committee and presented to the General Assembly [A/5142, para. 33], that this principle is amply reflected in the preamble and also in operative paragraphs 1 and 2. That is why my delegation wholeheartedly supported those parts of the resolution as reflecting the first principle I mentioned.

29. The second principle which guided my delegation in the consideration of the problem is that the independence of these two countries should be full and unqualified without any conditions whatsoever; and we consider that, as a prerequisite to this, the Administering Authority should withdraw all its military and paramilitary forces from the territories of Rwanda and Burundi prior to—I repeat prior to—the date of independence.

30. We considered this during the debate in the Fourth Committee, and we are still of the same opinion, not merely because the General Assembly has already expressed this desire and this decision in resolution 1743 (XVI), adopted on 23 February

1962, which, if I may remind representatives, has not been implemented and in the light of the position taken by the Belgian delegation, has no chance of being implemented until 1 July of this year. It is not only, I repeat, because of that resolution that we consider that the Belgian troops should be withdrawn prior to the date of independence: we consider that the maintenance of the troops, especially in view of the opinions expressed by the representatives of both countries to whom we had the honour of listening in the Fourth Committee, is a serious limitation of the independence of the countries concerned and could not be approved or legalized in any way by the General Assembly.

31. Permit me to remind the General Assembly that the tenth paragraph of the preamble of the resolution which has now been adopted by the Assembly clearly expresses the views of the Governments of Rwanda and Burundi: they do not wish the troops to stay, and they consider that, if the troops were to stay, their stay would be completely illegal.

32. That is why, when we were presented with the resolution which the General Assembly has now approved—and especially when we found in that resolution operative paragraph 3—we had serious reservations about that paragraph, because it runs counter to our previous decision of 23 February 1962. It runs counter to the tenth paragraph of the preamble to the resolution; and it runs counter to the principles of giving the two countries unlimited and unqualified independence.

33. Although we were told that operative paragraph 3 constitutes a sort of compromise—and the Polish delegation is always willing and ready to consider, and even participate in, formulating compromises—nevertheless, we consider that a compromise is not good or desirable and should not be accepted, especially if it does away, as in this case, with a strong principle about which we, in the Polish delegation, feel very strongly.

34. The final principle on which we based our consideration of the problem and the resolution was that all necessary economic and technical assistance should be provided within the existing United Nations framework, as well as on a bilateral basis. Again, my delegation found this principle reflected in operative paragraph 4 (b), (c) and (d) of the resolution, as well as in operative paragraphs 6 and 7 which, again, we wholeheartedly support. I might add that, while supporting those paragraphs, we consider that all action along the lines expressed by them should have full respect for the sovereignty and the interests of the people of both States, and should give special attention to the need for safeguarding those people against the perpetuation of colonial dependency, be it in military or economic form.

35. When we expressed our views in the Fourth Committee in the general debate, we did not have before us the draft resolution submitted by the African-Asian States. That is why we did not make our stand known on the question of involving the United Nations in an operation of a military character in Rwanda and Burundi. Our view on that is not a new thing to the General Assembly. We consider that, in all actions of the United Nations, we should strictly adhere to the provisions of the Charter—and we consider that the Charter permits only the Security Council to decide upon measures or actions of a military

nature, wherever such action might be deemed necessary.

36. We know that any departures from this or from any other principle of the Charter leads always to serious situations, to serious conflicts inside the Organization, as well as with those immediately concerned with the issue.

37. We are all well aware of the sad experiences that we had and are still having as a result of the departure from this principle of the Charter and the military action which occurred in 1961—the results of which the representative of Congo (Leopoldville) so movingly referred to just a while ago. I want my position to be very clear: it was adherence to the Charter that prevented us from supporting operative paragraph 4 (a) and (e) of the resolution. It will be understood, I am sure, that in such an evaluation of the proposal before us, especially of operative paragraph 3 and operative paragraph 4 (a) and (e), we found ourselves unable to support the resolution as a whole; and that is why we abstained.

38. In conclusion, we want to assure the General Assembly, and the people of Rwanda and Burundi, of our whole-hearted support for the full and unqualified independence of those countries.

39. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I give the floor to the Chairman of the Fourth Committee.

40. Miss BROOKS (Liberia): It is with deep humility that I accept the sentiments of appreciation which have been expressed by the President of the General Assembly and by the various delegations for my work as Chairman of the Fourth Committee and Chairman of the United Nations Commission for Ruanda-Urundi, for I am aware of the fact that the Fourth Committee has had eminent Chairmen before my time, and I want in this connexion to pay a special tribute to the preceding Chairman of that body, Mr. Pachachi, of Iraq, and to say that other eminent Commissioners have, in the wake of their experience, rendered vital contributions to the peoples of the Trust Territories, including that of Ruanda-Urundi, the previous Chairman of the Commission for that Territory having been Mr. Dorsinville, of Haiti.

41. It will not be amiss for me to mention also that the credit for my achievement as Chairman of the Fourth Committee must go to the members of that body who inspired me by their respect for my judgement, their admiration for my work and their co-operation. As to Ruanda-Urundi, I must mention also the assistance of my eminent colleagues, Messrs. Ernest Gassou, Majid Rahnema, Ernest Jean-Louis and Dey Ould Sidi Baba.

42. The General Assembly this morning took a decision to terminate the Trusteeship Agreement for Ruanda-Urundi. Therefore, on 1 July 1962, two new States will emerge in the continent of Africa, our sister States of Burundi and Rwanda. I congratulate the Government of Belgium and the United Nations. I sincerely congratulate the peoples of Burundi and Rwanda. May love, peace and prosperity be theirs. I shall look forward to their contribution here as Member States of the United Nations.

43. I extend to you, Mr. President, congratulations on the success of your administration as President of the General Assembly at its sixteenth session.

44. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I have no more speakers on my list for this question.

I must therefore close the discussion on this topic and turn to the next item on the agenda.

AGENDA ITEM 97

Question of Southern Rhodesia (continued*)

45. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (translated from French): Everyone agrees that never has a debate on so thorny a question been as moderate as the one presently in progress before our Assembly. Moreover, the United Nations, while never losing interest in this question, has always acted directly or indirectly towards Southern Rhodesia in such a manner that the problem's gravest aspects have been considered in the most delicate fashion.

46. The general direction of the United Kingdom's decolonization policy led to the belief that measures would be adapted to this Territory also which would lead it gradually and without deviation towards self-government and independence. The favourable predisposition towards the United Kingdom's policy in this respect may be explained by the success of numerous experiments in Africa and Asia that were based on respect for the principle of justice, the safeguarding of interests and the harmonizing of relationships.

47. The African leaders of Southern Rhodesia, in their turn, have been aware of the nature and complexity of the problems and have for a long time made a remarkable effort to exclude every trace of passion from a conflict which the European minority, on the contrary, has conducted exclusively upon the racial plane. Thus, in addition to the ordinary and, so to speak, classical conflict of every struggle for liberation, the people of Southern Rhodesia have been confronted by a factor of injustice springing from the vainest of human pride.

48. Paradoxically, the situation here was being sharpened while elsewhere the concept of domination was dissolving. It would seem as though the European minority, seeing the disappearance of a national supremacy, wished to replace it by a factual and institutional racial supremacy and to erect behind the ethnic diversity of the new fictitiously independent nation the real supremacy that only colonialism can make possible.

49. Resolution 1514 (XV), which fortunately is giving substance to the spirit of the Charter with regard to the liberation of peoples, does not merely eliminate the political and economic factors which, in international life, establish the domination of one nation over another, but aims at eliminating from the relationships between the former dominating Power and the new State every element which is likely to maintain an actual subordination and thus introduce a further imbalance in that State's domestic or international life.

50. Even within a single nation the establishment of racial inequality today in favour of the conquerors of yesterday destroys both the essence and the most rudimentary expression of any idea of self-government or independence unless, of course, it be the self-government or independence of the foreign minority in relation to the mother country. This seems to be the case with Southern Rhodesia.

* Resumed from the 1117th meeting.

51. My delegation fully supports the conclusions of the Special Committee of Seventeen^{1/} to the effect that Southern Rhodesia has not attained self-government. We have sincerely and without prejudice attempted to follow the reasoning which the United Kingdom Government has defended in the previous debates and which was reaffirmed in London to the delegation of the Committee of Seventeen. We have been unable, however, to understand—and far less to accept—the value of the so-called self-government that was granted in 1923, or the negative interpretation given by the United Kingdom to its reserve powers, or yet again its agreement to the Constitution of 6 December 1961.^{2/}

52. If self-government means a transfer of powers from the Administering Authority to the indigenous population, it does not seem that such a transfer was really made in favour of the Territory's African population. Quite to the contrary, the United Kingdom Government ceded its essential prerogatives to the foreign minority which had been established for scarcely a few decades, so that this act was more in the nature of a political concession in favour of an oligarchy which had imposed itself even upon the United Kingdom Government.

53. As for the use made of the reserve powers, it was regrettable—and this was later to prove very dangerous—that the United Kingdom Government should so easily have given up its avenues and means of supervision and control over the European authorities of the Territory by so readily eliminating the recourse which constituted a last safeguard for the African population as well as a sort of assurance for the world at large, which wished to retain full confidence in the United Kingdom's policy.

54. We are therefore most regretfully forced to the conclusion that those in authority in the United Kingdom at the time deviated from the traditional line of conduct which, at least to some extent, considered the higher interests of the indigenous populations for which they were responsible. The 1923 concept of self-government was unquestionably a political error, and it would be most desirable for the United Kingdom to abandon it. A well-established tradition of clear thinking and common sense would in no way suffer from the courageous rectification of an error whose consequences are as incalculable from the standpoint of law as they have been for the interests of Africans of Southern Rhodesia.

55. The members of the Sub-Committee who went to London paid a tribute—which they record in their report [A/5124, annex I]—to the willingness of the United Kingdom Government to pursue its policy of decolonization by bringing all the Territories under its responsibility to self-government and independence. The United Kingdom Ministers who renewed their professions of faith, and were undoubtedly sincere in doing so, also reaffirmed the United Kingdom's willingness to carry out that policy in co-operation with the United Nations. However, the Fourth Committee last February, the Special Committee of Seventeen in its report and the majority of the speakers before the General Assembly have con-

cluded that the policy followed with regard to Southern Rhodesia is a mistaken one and that the thesis which was advanced to support it and which was, in fact, only an alibi to conceal that mistake, is not tenable.

56. The United Kingdom has carried out decolonization at a rate and under conditions which have earned it wide esteem and which have given its new relationship with the former colonies the character of fruitful co-operation. The policy being followed in Southern Rhodesia continues, however, to be a mystery to the United Kingdom's many friends. The intermediate status which has been bestowed upon Southern Rhodesia offers no element of progress for the future of the African population. In contrast, it offers to the settlers every advantage of actual independence, that is to say, complete freedom of action with regard to the people of Rhodesia without any supervision by the United Kingdom and, if we are to follow the reasoning of Sir Roy Welensky, without any possibility of international recourse, which is at once referred to as meddling in domestic affairs. In short, the endeavour of the United Kingdom Government to apply what Lord Home has called varied methods according to the different Territories has, through the transfer of all power to the settlers, actually resulted in a complete distortion of the concept of self-government and, in spite of all the democratic principles of equality and justice, has concentrated all legislative and executive powers in the hands of a minority that conceals neither its philosophy nor its policy.

57. We find it hard to understand why the United Kingdom, having resolutely embarked on a policy of peaceful decolonization, has halted this process to the detriment of a people which, moreover, is being subjected to the most complete domination.

58. The attempt has been made here to analyse the Constitution of 6 December 1961 by representing it as a stage in the liberalization and progressive re-establishment of the full rights of the majority within a specified period of time. There again, it seems to us at least paradoxical that a minority which has gathered all rights and powers into its hands and which remains the sole repository of legislation and the sole wielder of authority would give up its privileges and would accept the transformation of the present institutions and the logical reversal of the situation which would ensue. Seen in its proper perspective, however, the Constitution of 6 December 1961 not only enshrines past and present inequality, but it is an institutional guarantee of perpetual inequality.

59. Those responsible for United Kingdom policy have recorded in the annals of decolonization an experience remarkable for its lucidity and far-sightedness, but they must not overlook the weaknesses and foreseeable consequences of the structure which they have built.

60. The urgency of the discussion, as recognized by the Special Committee of Seventeen, in no way signifies a readiness to indict the United Kingdom. The majority of the signers of the letter [A/5127 and Add.1 and 2] in which this urgency was stressed is made up of countries that have consistently praised the clear-sightedness of United Kingdom policy, which has always been characterized by the ability to discern in time the point of intersection between its own higher moral and material interests and those of the peoples under its responsibility, and to carry out in time a transfer of powers that brooked no delay.

^{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).

61. The present situation in Southern Rhodesia and the United Kingdom's policy in regard to it give us justified cause for concern. We fear, in fact, that here the usual process of evolutionary change may be replaced by a process of violence nourished by racist fanaticism and hatred. After all, no prophet can come to reassure us or to reassure the United Kingdom itself that the 2.5 million Africans of Southern Rhodesia will submit to the inevitability of the Constitution and will await some Welensky who, in a transport of generosity, may some day offer them in peace and tranquillity the most elementary and legitimate rights which today are being denied to them in an atmosphere of terror and violence.

62. The urgency with which we have called for these debates is thus essentially an urgent appeal to the United Kingdom to continue in this case, as it has done in every other, its traditional policy of assistance and co-operation in so far as the formerly colonized peoples and the United Nations are concerned in order that the tragedy whose dangerous portents can be seen, may be avoided in time.

63. There seems to be no part of the draft resolution before the General Assembly [A/L.386/Rev.1 and Add.1-4] that should be rejected. All the principles on which it is based have received the support of the United Kingdom and, in fact, in many cases have guided its actions in colonial policy for a number of years. The convening of a new constitutional conference, the restoration of freedom of political activity and the participation of all parties in elections on a basis of universal suffrage and non-discrimination do not seem to us to be revolutionary measures for the Government and people of the United Kingdom, which have always defended these democratic principles abroad and upheld them at home, and have taken them as the line of demarcation between freedom and dictatorship.

64. To many of the members of this Assembly, the United Kingdom's reply could indicate either incomprehensible weakness beneath the pressure of 300,000 disciples of Mr. Malan, or a permanent attachment to justice and to friendship with the peoples of Africa, whose desire it is that within the framework of a scrupulously respected democracy both the people and the minority, in Southern Rhodesia as elsewhere, should be given the place which is rightfully theirs and that the United Kingdom should have the affection which is its due.

65. We know that the people of the United Kingdom have too much respect for international opinion when it is on the side of right to deny a worthy tradition and to sacrifice lightly such wide esteem.

Mr. Quaison-Sackey (Ghana), Vice-President, took the Chair.

66. Mr. HASEGANU (Romania) (translated from French): The question of Southern Rhodesia, which is fraught with consequences for the future of peace and security in the African continent, has already been under discussion in the General Assembly for some time. Our debates have brought much evidence to light which indicates in the clearest possible way that the situation in Southern Rhodesia has now reached such a critical point that if immediate measures are not taken to halt and reverse the present trend of affairs, Rhodesia will become a source of conflict of unforeseeable proportions and consequences.

67. The delegation of the People's Republic of Romania is gratified that the General Assembly has been inspired by a sense of its responsibility in recognizing, despite vigorous opposition from the colonialist forces, the urgent and acute nature of this question and has decided to discuss it at the present session.

68. With the adoption of resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1654 (XVI), the United Nations received a clear-cut mandate regarding the obligations incumbent upon it in colonial questions.

69. In resolution 1514 (XV), the General Assembly solemnly proclaimed "the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations". It further declared:

"Immediate steps shall be taken, in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories or all other territories which have not 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."

70. What is now happening in Southern Rhodesia is a typical example of the lack of desire to apply that resolution. The United Kingdom Government is not only failing to apply it, but is fostering in Southern Rhodesia a policy contrary to the provisions and principles of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

71. The danger is further accentuated by the fact that the State, as it has been organized by the colonialists, has a distinctly racial character; that is because it was founded on the concept of the supremacy of the white race, a concept which by its very nature is aggressive in character and, consequently, is condemned by present-day international law as one of the most serious dangers to international peace and security.

72. Two years have elapsed since the United Nations adopted the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, and the United Kingdom Government is still applying the methods it used forty years ago. It was thus in 1923 that it granted certain attributes of self-government to the white settlers on the basis of a referendum in which, out of a total population of more than 3 million, only 12,000 white electors took part, most of them employees of the British South Africa Company.

73. In line with the same policy, the United Kingdom Government tried, in 1961, to strengthen the racial basis of this colony. By a referendum in which no African took part, it was decided to accept a racial constitution on the basis of which the Parliament, composed of an overwhelming majority of white settlers, can pass resolutions in the interests of this minority and, amongst other things, can formally proclaim independence and create a state of a racist character of the same type as South Africa.

74. The Constitution of Southern Rhodesia, drafted in 1961 and rejected indignantly by the indigenous African population, in fact sanctions the subjugation of the people to a handful of white settlers who altogether represent only 8 per cent of the population. The General Assembly has already discussed similar cases, such as those of Angola, South West Africa

and others, where the colonial Powers are not only taking no steps to apply the Declaration, but act openly against it. Each colonial Power has its Southern Rhodesia, shrouded in legal fictions, and it is precisely these interests in common, together with those arising from military-bloc commitments, which so often in the United Nations result in the formation of what is fortunately a minority group of delegations which by their votes support the reactionary causes of colonialism.

75. The United Kingdom representatives and those who support them have tried to convince the Assembly that the steps taken in Southern Rhodesia are such as to lead towards the liquidation of colonial and racial domination, and that the only difference between their view and that of the overwhelming majority of the Assembly lies in the question of the rate of development of this process. They add that they are in favour of a gradual and peaceful evolution and that any speeding-up of the rate of change would provoke still greater suffering and difficulties.

76. Obviously, all sincere supporters of the liberation movement of the peoples still under colonial domination, and in the first place those people themselves, want the present deplorable situation to be changed and independence to be attained with the least possible suffering.

77. The truth, however, is that the principal conflict in so far as the question of Southern Rhodesia is concerned does not centre on the rate of the changes which must take place, but on the very nature of these changes. The measures recently taken in that country have only aggravated the situation. In addition, they show that the colonialist Powers will not give up their domination of their own free will and that by their attitude they are making inevitable a collision with the oppressed peoples who are struggling for freedom. Even where the colonialists realize perfectly well that they should give up the fight, they seek new ways, more subtle and better hidden, to maintain their former positions. The slogan of "peaceful changes" is, in the case of Southern Rhodesia, nothing more than means of attaining these ends.

78. It has become a fashionable practice among the colonial Powers to invoke the "difficulties" which the colonialists are experiencing in applying the Declaration for the liquidation of colonialism in those Territories where the population is "multiracial", that is to say, where there is a relatively larger concentration of white settlers. This is the case in South Africa, in the Central African Federation, in Kenya and elsewhere, and the fact is that in such cases the African population does have very great difficulties to surmount during the process of attaining independence.

79. This is so because the colonialist Powers put the question of independence in terms of the degree to which the interests of the settler minorities will be maintained after liberation. In this respect, the report of the Special Committee of Seventeen stated the position of the United Kingdom Government very clearly:

"In the drafting of constitutions, due weight had to be given to the position of minorities..." [A/5124, para. 16.]

80. The question, however, then arises as to why in Territories where the number of settlers is

greater, it is more difficult to grant rights to colonial peoples than in Territories where there are fewer settlers. What has happened to the "civilizing" mission of colonialism to prepare colonial peoples for self-government? Naturally, replies to such questions are avoided.

81. Behind the humanitarian façade of the arguments by which the representatives of the colonial Powers endeavour from this rostrum to defend the "security" and the "rights" of the white settlers, there hides an important economic substratum.

82. In 1959, Lord Robins, President of the British South Africa Company (which dominates the copper industry in Southern Rhodesia), stated that the predominance of the white man, of the white English-African, must continue for at least another generation, and he asked why it should be supposed that the black African, just because he washes, speaks English and wears European clothes, must necessarily be accepted in white society? The meaning of a declaration like this is evident. Its implications are also very clear, for the company of which Lord Robins is President has always paid larger amounts in dividends to shareholders than for the total wages paid to 40,000 African miners.

83. It is not by chance that these Territories which pose so-called "difficult" problems are the richest Territories. Thus, the report of the Director of Mines, Mr. W. Ralson, to the Southern Rhodesian Parliament in 1959 stresses that the base mineral resources of Southern Rhodesia continue to attract the interest of the large companies which work the copper, nickel and iron reserves there. The report shows that Southern Rhodesia has become the main supplier of chrome to the United States. The evidence very clearly emerges that the interests of the settlers living in the Territory are closely linked with the interests of United Kingdom, and other foreign capital. This combination of interests creates the main difficulties to the liberation of colonial countries, for the interests of these circles are incompatible with the aspirations of the peoples of Africa for freedom and for political and economic independence.

84. These circumstances clearly reveal the utter falsehood of the assertion that the 1961 Constitution, with its system of voting that was devised in Southern Rhodesia, is a measure that will prepare the way for independence and ensure an African majority. It has been asserted that the economic level of the Africans will rise within a reasonable time to the point where the African will be able to qualify as a voter, but this assertion will be devoid of foundation so long as discriminatory treatment of the Africans is maintained and while their income is thirty-three times lower in the country and more than ten times lower in the town than that of Europeans for the same work.

85. In spite of the interpretation given by the United Kingdom Government, the real meaning of the various kinds of discrimination that have been imposed was indicated some years ago, in the Legislative Assembly of the white settlers, by the present Minister of Law in the Government of the Central African Federation who stated:

"In order to prevent the Native (African) getting on the roll in such numbers as to be a serious danger to the control of affairs for a measurable

time by the European (white) population, we should raise both the means and educational qualifications... If the Native is left with the right to get on the voters' roll, he will feel there is a certain amount of fair play in the matter and there will not be built up in him that sense of frustration... The combination of a means test and an educational qualification will severely restrict these numbers." [A/AC.109/PET.4.]

86. Statements such as these reveal most clearly the essence of the policy for granting independence "gradually", the policy of the calculated "step by step" and "little by little" method of granting independence. This policy is an expression of the tendency to perpetuate colonial domination even though this domination is softened here and there by diversions designed to blunt the eagerness of the colonial peoples' liberation movement.

87. In the light of these facts, all those who want the progress of Southern Rhodesia towards freedom to be truly peaceful must act now to halt the present course of events in that part of the globe. Any vacillation can only encourage the colonialist and racist elements which are now in control in the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, and can only strengthen the position of these colonialist circles, increase tension and bring on increasingly violent conflicts that will have repercussions throughout Africa. No one can imagine that the oppressed peoples will accept any prolongation or tightening of colonial and racial oppression.

88. The Romanian delegation accordingly believes that the General Assembly can and must speak out. The General Assembly must resolutely advocate the immediate rejection of the racial constitution and the granting of universal suffrage according to the principle of "one person, one vote". The General Assembly must speak out for the immediate granting of independence to Southern Rhodesia.

89. In his statement to the Committee of Seventeen, the President of the ZAPU party (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union), which represents almost 100 per cent of the African population, said that the African people in Southern Rhodesia were ready to assume the responsibility of running their country immediately, that they had been ready to do so all along and that no further preparation was necessary [A/AC.109/SR.16.]

90. In the opinion of the Romanian delegation, 1962 must be the year of independence for Southern Rhodesia and freedom for its people.

91. Mr. BORJA (Philippines): At the outset my delegation must state that it does not have to reaffirm its high regard for the United Kingdom at this advanced date of our friendly relations. Our two Governments have co-operated and are co-operating in a number of endeavours of some importance to the world and to both of us. As a country which gained its freedom not only in bloody revolution but also in democratic understanding and peaceful negotiation with the ruling Power, we are not unaware that the United Kingdom has liberated or set on the road to liberation millions of people in the brief period following the end of the Second World War. Such a record speaks well for the well-known British sense of fair play. It speaks even better for the thorough realism, in the light of current historical trends, with which the United Kingdom pursues solutions to its multifarious problems.

92. We are confronted with the question of Southern Rhodesia. That it is a difficult question goes without saying. That it is a painful question, particularly for the submerged indigenous millions of Southern Rhodesia, will hardly admit of debate. That it is confusing and sometimes subject to perverse logic is something to which perhaps only those who are well inclined to the subtleties of convenient equivocation can answer.

93. The problem is to bring to birth a multiracial society—always a difficult endeavour in any time and place. In ordinary experience the question is one of providing full constitutional guarantees of the rights and liberties of minorities. It is when we begin to reflect on the African problem—which is not the assimilation of minorities but rather the assimilation of majorities—that it begins to acquire a slightly surrealistic cast, shocking alike to our sense of order and to our sense of the fitness of things.

94. By what strange sanction, we may well ask ourselves, does a handful of settlers, numbering less than half a million, hold dominion over well above six times as many men and women? To ask the question in this manner is not, of course, to supply a solution. But, much as it grates on our sensibilities, this is the given fact to which we must address ourselves and to which we must find a practical solution.

95. It has been suggested many times in these debates that the process of evolution in Southern Rhodesia, with the implication that it shall ultimately lead to full political equality between settlers and indigenous inhabitants should not be disturbed lest the situation in that country take a sudden turn for the worse. In this regard we accept the sincerity of the United Kingdom, which also holds this view. Indeed, we refuse to look upon this view as a perversion of the substance of this question.

96. None the less, this view seems to us to bypass the point altogether, and perhaps even to quarrel with the truth. If we read the report of the Special Committee of seventeen members [A/5124] correctly, we see that it is precisely the process of evolution and the direction it is taking that are in question. The Constitution of December 1961 is, in the judgment of the Special Committee, a retrograde step which threatens to perpetuate the iron grip of the minority on the indigenous population. While it is true that the new Constitution has a certain liberalizing effect, the waiver of the United Kingdom's reserve powers in practice would abandon the native inhabitants to the mercy of the minority. The African power of veto over any attempt to make the Constitution less liberal is a negative one and far less significant than the fact that to extend the franchise would require a two-thirds majority in the Legislature, which from the beginning would be in the uncontested control of the settlers.

97. It can always be claimed that the Constitution is a provisional one. But this can be accepted only if we are willing to grant the optimistic estimate that the Africans would be in control of the Legislature in a matter of eight to twelve years. But there seems to be little basis for such optimism in the light of the electoral qualifications for the native population. It would be truer to say that African enfranchisement would take generations under these conditions, and the word "generations" means in the lexicon of emerging nations, practically for ever.

98. The deficiencies of the Constitution of 1961 are best summed up in the report of the Sub-Committee on Southern Rhodesia [A/5124, annex-I] which states that it is not in accordance with the Declaration contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and does not recognize the democratic principles of equality and justice.

99. Indeed, it would appear that the negation of these principles in the new Constitution is the very reason why the situation in Southern Rhodesia has suddenly assumed menacing potentialities. Deplorable as it may be, violence is still the natural outlet for men denied the lawful avenues of protest. It is a proud claim of Southern Rhodesia that until quite recently its police had not fired a shot in anger. This bespeaks a readiness on the part of the people of Southern Rhodesia to conduct its internal affairs along rational lines and in the warming spirit of compromise. But such attitudes may well have passed beyond recall, for events in Africa and elsewhere in the world today have overtaken the pleasant backwater, if such it ever was. In Southern Rhodesia, as elsewhere, the passion for equality is breaking its fetters.

100. It is not merely the fact that people are held in wilful subjection that furnishes incitement to violence, although this is normally a sufficient reason. Even more, it is the ugly connotations of racialism that lend the quality of desperation to the problem of Southern Rhodesia. The saving grace in the situation is that, determined as the white settlers are to maintain their ascendancy, they do not hold this as an article of fanatic faith. They do in fact—at least elements among them do—hold that the objective of Southern Rhodesian social and political evolution is the complete equality of races. This will suggest, for those who wish to look at the problem from the brighter side, that doctrine will not prove an immovable impediment and that realism will prevail when the African tide proves too strong to resist.

101. But to the African of the present, this is merely a theoretical and academic distinction. For the central fact of his life today is the existence all around him of an all-too-palpable colour bar that forcibly checks his growth and prevents his emergence into the modern world.

102. Yes, racialism is still the supreme emotional heresy of our time. Not the least of the ironies of the Southern Rhodesian problem is that the United Kingdom, with its long and honourable democratic tradition, should be caught squarely in the throes of change. Sympathetic as it is to the plight of the Africans—as on its record it must be—it must at the same time heed the wishes of the ruling minority. Yet this minority is not united, for even among them the democratic tradition is too deeply rooted to permit the perpetuation of an injustice. In this respect, it is perhaps instructive to study the case of Mr. Garfield Todd, whose efforts to introduce liberal reforms in Southern Rhodesia were rewarded with loss of office and who must today perform the lonely rôle of advocate against his own class. If the 1961 Constitution is a compromise, as it is claimed to be, then it must be a compromise of views held by elements of the ruling minority, for unfortunately it still places at grave issue the future of the African for whom, surely, the Constitution is at least partly intended.

103. My delegation is encouraged to note that the United Kingdom has not entirely denied its re-

sponsibility in the matter. It heartens us further that, in meeting with the Sub-Committee on Southern Rhodesia, the United Kingdom appears tacitly to have recognized United Nations responsibility, under the terms of the Charter, for the future of Southern Rhodesia. Indeed, its attitude of helpful co-operation has opened prospects that the situation may not long stay where it is.

104. We wish to state, however, that we differ with the view that the choice in respect of the Southern Rhodesian question is limited to the 1961 Constitution or the one which it is intended to replace. If this choice was inclusive, then we may as well end this impassioned dialogue. For poverty of alternatives is not what faces us here, but rather the willingness to take courageous steps to achieve the basic objectives of the United Nations Charter. We view the draft resolution [A/L.386/Rev.1 and Add.1-4] in this light, and for this reason we are prepared to support it.

Mr. Mongi Slim (Tunisia) resumed the Chair.

105. Mr. Taïeb SLIM (Tunisia) (translated from French): Southern Rhodesia belongs to the category of colonies in which the immigration of large numbers of Europeans made possible the introduction of a strong white minority. These settlers quickly joined forces to exploit the riches of the country and eventually secured power in order to protect more effectively the privileges and rights they had acquired. This phenomenon of colonization by settlement is not unknown to us. We in North Africa have known one variant of the process, and are thus in a position to appreciate the difficulties which both the United Kingdom Government and the African population face in Rhodesia.

106. In 1922 the British authorities organized a referendum in Southern Rhodesia to determine whether the territory should become a fifth province of the Union of South Africa or should have responsible government. Needless to say, only the settlers were consulted, while the Africans stood by as powerless spectators of the tragedy which was to decide their future. Of 14,600 settlers, 8,700 declared themselves in favour of responsible white government, while 5,900 opted for fusion with South Africa. In 1923 a Constitution was promulgated for Southern Rhodesia and a white minority Government set up. The latter lost no time in creating a whole complex of laws authorizing the despoiling of the land, the exploitation of the mineral resources and the subjugation of the African population.

107. I shall not pause to criticize the régime which followed and which, unfortunately, continues to hold sway in Southern Rhodesia. Suffice it to say that the existence of such a régime is in flagrant contradiction with the United Nations Charter and constitutes a real affront to human dignity. Yet the administering Power has tolerated and fostered this state of affairs for forty years, seeing no need to intercede on behalf of the indigenous people, despite the authority vested in it under the Constitution.

108. In 1959 and 1960 the settlers took fright at the political development of Africa. The colonial territories were quickly freeing themselves and, one after another, gaining their independence. Mr. Macmillan, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, proclaimed in Africa itself the need to recognize and come to terms with African nationalism. An irresistible nationalist movement has been liberating energies

that were long pent up. Alive to the danger, and fearing to see the wind of British colonial liberalism blow over Southern Rhodesia, the white settlers have sensed that their authority is weakening and the power they usurped is in jeopardy.

109. The people of Southern Rhodesia, once conscious of their state of servitude, are organizing and demanding their rights. In the United Nations, the tireless efforts of the African and Asian delegations resulted in the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. It is no longer possible to impose such archaic régimes as that which exists in Southern Rhodesia, or to pass over in silence such racist Constitutions, as that of 1923.^{3/} Accordingly, the Government of Sir Edgar Whitehead finally acceded to the African demand for a new Constitution.

110. With great hope the African nationalists saw their leader, Mr. Nkomo, consulted and called upon to voice the wishes of his compatriots regarding their future. Unfortunately, all the consultations yielded unsatisfactory results. Once again the colonialist mind and mentality, which cannot learn from the experience of others or renounce the position of privilege, finally triumphed by wrecking an experiment which might have changed the future of central Africa and been a milestone in the process of peaceful decolonization.

111. The Constitution of 6 December 1961 is not even, as all Africans might have hoped, a step, however timid, towards an understanding which would gradually lead to self-determination and independence. It can in no sense be regarded as the long-awaited solution which would put an end to the tragedy through which our brothers in Southern Rhodesia are living.

112. What are the main features of this Constitution? It explicitly establishes the inequality of the indigenous Africans and the white settlers, by instituting two rolls of voters. The "A" roll is, in effect, reserved exclusively for the 240,000 Whites who elect fifty representatives, while the 3 million Africans are left with fifteen seats in Parliament. The right to vote, far from establishing equality between individuals and the principle of universal suffrage, is based upon the privileges of the dominant white class. The United Kingdom Government maintains that the elaboration of this Constitution is a step forward because it provides for the entry of Africans into Parliament. We are told that the Africans are not, to be sure, sufficiently numerous but that in ten or twelve years' time, with educational advancement and economic development, they may be in the majority and may then change the Constitution as they wish and manage their own country's affairs.

113. We regret that we cannot share this optimism, since it is evident that for any amendment or revision of the Constitution a two-thirds majority of the Legislative Assembly is necessary. Nor is it less evident that the privileged class, the Government and the majority in Parliament consist of Whites who will stop at nothing to safeguard their privileges and avoid being overwhelmed and, perhaps, ejected. They will contrive to delay this great surge towards education and to check, even by legislative enactment, the economic advancement of the Africans. What this

amounts to is that an indigenous majority in the Legislature, based on the natural principles of "one person, one vote", will never be possible. The mentality of the white settlers in Southern Rhodesia was excellently illustrated by the famous statement of Sir Roy Welensky that the Africans would need 200 years in which to reach equality with the Whites in Parliament.

114. Such, in brief, is the main aspect of the Constitution. Because of its anomalies and exceptions, it not only guarantees no rights to the indigenous inhabitants but, under a pretence of liberalism, actually represents a step backward in relation to the previous situation, since the right of review and supervision of the United Kingdom Government disappears and is replaced by a centralized power in the hands of the white minority, which can thus continue to impose its régime and wishes on 3 million Africans. To reassure us, the United Kingdom's Ministers and its representatives in the United Nations tell us that the right of review which authorizes the United Kingdom Government to disallow certain categories of Southern Rhodesian laws has never been exercised and that, moreover, care was taken to include in the new Constitution adequate constitutional guarantees which are ultimately more effective than the reserve powers.

115. Let us consider these constitutional guarantees which the Declaration of Rights and the Constitutional Council are supposed to represent. Sir Hugh Foot, in the statement he made on 7 March 1962 in the Committee of Seventeen, defined the purpose of the Declaration of Rights as being to ensure that every person in Southern Rhodesia enjoyed the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual. If, however, the Declaration attempts to guarantee certain rights, they are hardly the ones which may lead the indigenous inhabitants to the eventual management of their own affairs. The Declaration enunciates certain natural civil rights but does not deal with civic rights. One can even say that it represents a step backward since it gives explicit endorsement to the suppression of civic rights.

116. The enumeration of rights—the right to life, liberty, security of the person, the enjoyment of property and the protection of the law, the right to freedom of conscience, of expression and of assembly, the right to respect for the individual's private and family life, and so on—shows how retrograde this Declaration may be, for such natural rights belong to every individual from the moment of his birth. What is more, it is apparent from the analysis of these rights that no provision of the Declaration has been or could be applied in the present circumstances. In fact, the assurance that every person has the right to life and liberty is but a hollow one, since the police do not hesitate to fire on any group whose gathering seems to them suspicious and the government has assumed the power to detain indefinitely any person who has aroused its suspicion, without even summoning him before a judicial body. Indeed, under a legislative provision—article 11 of the Unlawful Organizations Act—there is no recourse against such arbitrary arrests.

117. The Declaration purports to grant the freedom and right to work, and stipulates that no one may be held in servitude or required to perform forced labour. But we know that forced labour does exist in the "native reserves" by virtue of communal or so-called

^{3/} The Southern Rhodesian Constitution Letters Patent, 1923 (London, H.M. Stationery Office).

civic obligations. The worker, who is bound by a contract for a period of several years—and we are familiar with this sort of contract between defenceless workers and their all-powerful masters—is physically constrained to fulfil the contract. The Declaration proclaims the right to property, but the Government—without right or legislation—permits itself to attach property and search premises.

118. In Anglo-Saxon legal practice, every accused person is presumed innocent until proved guilty. Although the Declaration of Rights guarantees the application of this right to individuals, there is a provision, article 9 of the Unlawful Organizations Act, under which this principle is reversed and guilt is presumed in the case of certain offences.

119. The rights of expression and assembly are guaranteed, we are told. Yet we know that freedom of expression and assembly is ensured to the nationalist parties and their leaders, and that an enactment restricting or, I might even say, revoking these rights, the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act of 1960, remains in force. The provisions of this Act are so stringent and so contrary to all justice that the Chief Justice of the Federation preferred to resign rather than apply them.

120. We are also told that the Declaration of Rights ensures the equality of the inhabitants and protects them against any discriminatory measures, but if we compare the budgets for the Whites and the indigenous inhabitants in the fields of education and public health or in any other field affecting the advancement and progress of the indigenous inhabitants and the protection of his own and his family's health, we find that discrimination is complete and blatant.

121. I now come to the Constitutional Council which, according to the case argued by the United Kingdom representative, would protect the indigenous population's interests. To begin with, attention should be drawn to one anomaly: the functions of the Constitutional Council are purely advisory and its decisions merely constitute recommendations which the authorities may very well not follow. Moreover, its members are elected in such a way that the indigenous inhabitants have no say in their selection. The electoral college for the Council is composed of the Chief Justice of the High Court acting as Chairman, Puisne and retired Judges of the same Court, all white men, and the President of the Council of Chiefs, an African appointed by the Government. It is this electoral college, composed of Whites and one Negro selected for his devotion to the Whites, which will designate the body to protect the indigenous inhabitants.

122. It is an obvious fact, which has been amply demonstrated by the speakers who have preceded me at this rostrum, that the Constitution of 6 December 1961, which was drafted against the will of the African people of Southern Rhodesia, by no means guarantees that people's inalienable and inalienable right to self-determination. It is based on principles which further the interests and privileges of a class of settlers, and if fully implemented it would simply sanction the transfer of powers to a foreign minority whose only aim is to subjugate an entire people and to enrich itself at that people's expense. This Constitution entirely disregards the principles of the Charter and of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples [resolu-

tion 1514 (XV)], particularly operative paragraph 5 of that Declaration which reads as follows:

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

123. In our letter to the Secretary-General, my delegation and forty others stressed the urgency of calling the Assembly's attention to the gravity of the situation in Southern Rhodesia at this resumed session. We in fact believe that the intention of the government of the Southern Rhodesian whites to impose this Constitution upon three million Africans cannot but constitute a real threat to peace in that Territory, for it can only incite the Africans to offer every possible resistance to this trial of strength in order to defend their rights.

124. The United Kingdom was the first colonial Power to recognize the need to emancipate the peoples it had dominated and to accept their attainment of independence. My delegation and Government have always gladly applauded that wise policy which enables decolonization to proceed peacefully and for the former ties between the colonized peoples and the colonial Powers to be converted into relations of friendship and co-operation. Thanks to that policy, the United Kingdom can today count on the sincere friendship of its African and Asian partners in the Commonwealth. Our criticism of the United Kingdom Government is that it has not applied the same wise policy, the same liberalism and the same decolonization procedure to Southern Rhodesia. However, we do not despair; we are convinced that there is still time and that British wisdom will find a way to adapt its Southern Rhodesian policy to the realities of Africa so as to prevent any deterioration in the situation in Southern Rhodesia. We entirely agree with the United Kingdom Government when it says that it has full responsibility for what occurs in Rhodesia. May it discharge that full and complete responsibility and redress a situation which can lead only to tragic upheavals and grave disturbances.

125. We know that the problem before us today is serious and complex. Some have likened it to the Algerian problem; when we know what it has cost France to bring the Algerian tragedy to an end and pave the way for the reconciliation which we all fervently desire, we cannot but appreciate the urgent need to restore the balance in Southern Rhodesia in favour of three million Africans and to recognize their legitimate rights. This is why my delegation, together with thirty-seven others, submitted to this Assembly a draft resolution [A/L.386/Rev.1 and Add.1-4], operative paragraph 1 of which approves the conclusions of the Special Committee and affirms that the Territory of Southern Rhodesia is a Non-Self-Governing Territory within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations. In operative paragraph 2 (a) of our draft resolution the Administering Authority is requested:

"To undertake urgently the convening of a constitutional conference in which there shall be full participation of representatives of all political parties, for the purpose of formulating a constitu-

tion 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)."

This paragraph endorses the conclusion in paragraph 43 of the report of the Sub-Committee on Southern Rhodesia [A/5124, annex I].

126. This idea is even more concisely expressed in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution presented by three African delegations and adopted by the Special Committee:

"Expresses its conviction that it is necessary for the evolution of the territory towards independence that the United Kingdom Government should, without further delay, undertake the revision of the 1961 Constitution by convening another constitutional conference with the participation of the political leaders of Southern Rhodesia;" [*ibid.*, annex II].

127. We have been told that the United Kingdom Government is bound by certain conventions and that it no longer has the right to revise the Constitution or to draw up a new one. One of the speakers preceding me at this rostrum has already answered this argument and has quoted the precedent of the Constitution of British Guiana. Other precedents, such as the Constitution of the Island of Malta might be quoted to show that the United Kingdom Government could find the necessary arguments for revoking or abrogating the 1961 Constitution, if it wished to do so.

128. We readily agree with the representative of Canada that the United Kingdom Government still retains a great power of persuasion and negotiation. We believe that if Mr. Butler would use that power, there would be no serious difficulty in inducing Sir Edgar Whitehead to come to terms with the African nationalists.

129. We appeal to the United Kingdom Government to reconsider the 1961 Constitution and to act before it is too late.

130. We had occasion to tell the Committee of Seventeen that one Algerian war was enough for the liberation of a whole continent. We wish to repeat that unless an honourable and satisfactory compromise is reached which will bring the Africans to the exercise of power and the management of their own affairs, or, as President Bourguiba said at the Neo-Destour Congress in 1958, unless "decolonization is carried out dispassionately and in a spirit of understanding, it will be impossible to avoid dangerous upheavals, bloodshed and conflicts such as those we have witnessed in Algeria, with all the suffering, torture and misery which they entail. That is precisely what we wish to avoid. That is what we fear, because the whole future of the Africans and the white minority would be endangered by digging a trench of hatred, mistrust and incomprehension between them."

131. Our debate is drawing to a close. A great many speakers have made their delegations' valuable contribution to the Assembly's work. They have done so with great understanding, with frankness and with invariable moderation, without allowing themselves to be swayed by their feelings. We wish to pay a tribute to their efforts.

132. Some ask whether it is in the interest of Southern Rhodesia and of that Territory's African population to hold a debate which can only incite the Whites and the minority government to adopt a more flexible attitude. A great Power such as the United Kingdom, we are told, would not agree to interference in its colonial affairs, and even less to have United Nations resolutions imposed upon it.

133. Some may say that we all agree on the objectives to be attained and that the only difference between our position and that of the Rhodesian settlers is on the speed with which those objectives are to be attained.

134. It is our deep and sincere belief that this debate will have made a great contribution to the triumph of the just and noble cause of our brothers of Zimbabwe. We feel that, because of its tone and gravity and because of the frank statement of all points of view, it will have done much to lift the veil from the painful reality of this problem, thereby pointing the way to reconciliation.

135. Our debate has now brought this problem before public opinion, and public opinion has a part to play in the search for solutions. This particularly applies to the United Kingdom. We have already seen excellent results and, in this connexion, I propose to quote a brief passage from an editorial in the newspaper *The Observer* of 17 June 1962:

"If, therefore, Britain finds herself in 'the dock' today it is not a matter for either surprise or indignation. It is certainly not the fault of the 'evil machinations of the Afro-Asian bloc'. The Government is simply having to pay for its past mistakes in Central Africa. By covering up for the inadequacies of Sir Roy Welensky's leadership, it has put itself in the awkward position of having to answer for his misdeeds."

"Only if the Government recognizes these facts can British policy concentrate on the urgent task of trying to achieve a settlement between the races in Southern Rhodesia. The United Nations debates might do some good if they increase the British and Rhodesian sense of urgency about the need to scrap the new constitution as unsatisfactory. A firm British pledge should be given that majority rule is the objective of our policy in Southern Rhodesia and that no final transfer of power is envisaged until such a decision has the consent of the majority."

136. It is my delegation's hope that the draft resolution contained in document A/L.386/Rev.1 and Add.1-4 will be adopted unanimously.

137. Mr. GARCIA INCHAUSTEGUI (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): Throughout the debate in which the Assembly is now engaged—the debate on Southern Rhodesia—we have been hearing about minorities composed of ruling settlers, discrimination against indigenous inhabitants, foreign capital used as a means of exploitation, workers who earn one wage if their skins are white and another very different wage if their skins are black. We have been hearing about a "self-governing colony" and about "elections" in which the majority is barred from attaining power. We have also been hearing about cheap raw materials, wretchedly low wages, great profits for the companies, and many other things. Suddenly it seemed to us as though that inhuman frontier of colonial exploitation which is Southern Rhodesia had burst

open to reveal a pattern which, to a great extent, is everywhere the pattern of the colonialists and neo-colonialists in those vast, afflicted areas of the world where they still hold sway.

138. In defending the legitimate right of the people of Southern Rhodesia to full independence, we are upholding the principles of the Charter; we are also fulfilling our obligation of solidarity with the sister peoples of Africa; at the same time, however, we are denouncing the evils which until yesterday prevailed in our own country and which, today, beset the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America that are still subject to the rule of minorities in the service of international financial capital.

139. When we heard the African representatives denouncing, firmly and with logical arguments, the discrimination practised by the colonialists in Southern Rhodesia, we thought of the Negroes and the Indians of America, we thought of the mestizos of America—for America is a land of mestizos, although many fine gentlemen may not like to admit it; we thought of the exploitation to which the great majority of our peoples have been and still are being subjected. As we listened, it seemed to us that our feeling of solidarity with the people of Southern Rhodesia was increasing and that the Second Declaration of Havana, approved by the National General Assembly of the people of Cuba on 4 February 1962, was acquiring fuller significance:

"Cuba and Latin America form a part of the world. Our problems are part of the problems resulting from the general crisis of imperialism and the struggle of the subjugated peoples, the clash between a world in birth and a world which is dying. Whence came those colossal resources which enabled a handful of monopolists to accumulate thousands of millions of dollars? The answer is simple: from the exploitation of human labour. Millions of human beings, obliged to work for subsistence wages, produced with their toil the gigantic amounts of capital accruing to the monopolies. The workers piled up the fortunes of the privileged classes, with the latter becoming ever richer and more powerful. Through the banks, those classes succeeded in obtaining control not only of their own money but also of the money of society as a whole. Thus the association between the banks and the great industrial enterprises was brought about and financial capital was born. What was to be done, then, with the great amounts of surplus capital which were accumulating in ever larger volume? The answer was: with them, invade the world. Ever in pursuit of gain, these people began to seize the natural wealth of all the economically weak countries and to exploit the human labour of their inhabitants, to whom they paid wages far lower than those they were obliged to pay to the workers in the metropolitan countries. Thus the world began to be divided up territorially and economically. By 1914, eight or ten imperialist countries had brought under their economic and political rule territories, beyond their own frontiers, having a total area of 83,700,000 square kilometres and a total population of 970,000,000. In short, they had divided up the world."

140. The subject which we are discussing is a clear-cut case of colonialism. More than enough proof of this has been put before us here. My delegation fully shares the concern and supports the objectives of

the forty-one African-Asian delegations which requested the inclusion and discussion of this item during the current session. We likewise endorse the conclusion of the Sub-Committee on Southern Rhodesia [A/5124] that this Territory has not attained self-government. Further, we are of opinion that the racist Constitution of 1961 should be revoked and that a constitutional conference should be convened in which the people of Southern Rhodesia would participate without the exclusion of any class. A serious situation fraught with danger exists in the Territory of Southern Rhodesia, and it is the responsibility of the United Nations and of the administering Power to recognize it and to try to settle it by complying with the principles of the Charter and applying to it the anti-colonialist resolutions of the Assembly and, in particular, the provisions of Chapter XI of the Charter.

141. The colonial Powers resort to the same manoeuvres over and over again. One of their ways of evading the obligations incumbent upon them under Chapter XI as States signatory to the Charter is to put forward legal fictions such as the claim that Southern Rhodesia is a self-governing colony. It would be impossible to put two more contradictory terms together. The only self-government in Southern Rhodesia is that which enables a minority group of white settlers arbitrarily to impose its will on an entire African people and subject that people to cruel exploitation. The formula recalls to us to some extent that of "Associated Free State" which the United States colonialists invented in order to deprive Puerto Rico of its independence, thereby violating Chapter XI of the Charter. Southern Rhodesia did not cease to be a colony after 1923 and has never had self-government, inasmuch as there can be no self-government in a country if the people who inhabit it are totally disregarded.

142. The so-called Constitution of 1961, far from altering this condition of vassalage, has aggravated it, for it is an instrument with which to rivet ever tighter the fetters binding the people, an instrument to be used in preparing what other representatives have denounced as the merging of all the forces of exploitation and discrimination in Africa into a single pro-slavery bloc on the South African model which, with the participation of Southern Rhodesia, will consolidate the oft-condemned policy of apartheid throughout the area.

143. Along with the abrogation of that Constitution and the convening of a constitutional conference, the representation of the Africans in accordance with the principle "one person, one vote" should be guaranteed. There should be an end to all repressive measures against the African people of Southern Rhodesia, who are the only people legitimately entitled to exercise sovereignty and decide on their form of government. The question of the type of African government most suitable for that country should be settled in the shortest possible time.

144. But the corner-stone of this entire situation is nothing other than the control exercised by international financial capital over the country's natural wealth. Here, the companies bear such names as: Anglo-American Corporation, British South Africa Company, American Metal Climax, Rhodesian Selection Trust. These and others are the leeches which are gorging themselves on the wealth of the Rhodesian people. They are what the United Fruit Company is

to some countries of America and what the Union minière is to the Congo. Their shareholders and their head offices are not only in London; they are also very close to us here, in that pulverizer of peoples, Wall Street, whose buildings significantly stand defiant before that Statue which will one day be that of Liberty—for as a symbol it belongs to the people—but which cannot be called by that name today when it is sunk in the gold of corruption, amassed through the exploitation of peoples.

145. That situation explains very clearly the position of the United States delegation, which in the Special Committee expressed reservations and in the General Committee opposed the discussion of this item during the current session. It is the position which the United States representative has just now adopted in announcing the abstention of his Government in the vote on the moderate African-Asian draft resolution. It is clear that the existence of an independent African Government in that area would be a threat to the shareholders of the companies in Southern Rhodesia.

146. It is obvious that those who do not allow their Negro, Indian and Latin American populations to have political representation cannot be concerned about the representation of the Negro population in Southern Rhodesia. It is clear that those who practise discrimination within and beyond their frontiers do not wish to combat the discrimination practised by their associates in relation to the peoples of Africa. It is obvious that those who impose colonialism on Puerto Rico and try to export it from there to Latin America cannot be interested in curbing the colonialism of other Powers in Africa.

147. I should like to ask a question. Why is it that for the United States delegation the matter of representative democracy in Southern Rhodesia is not a matter of urgency and of principle? I have an answer to that question. The answer is that the representative democracy which the United States desires for Africa and for the world is the representative democracy of the white settlers. Freedom, yes, but freedom for the exploiters. Equality, yes, but equality among exploiters. This is democracy with slaves. If the peoples seize power by revolution and jeopardize the interests of the companies with their revolutionary methods, they are anathema and the so-called "rule of institutionalism" must be applied to them.

148. But if a group of slavery-minded settlers practises exploitation and discrimination in any part of the world and drains off its wealth, and if such exploitation serves to enrich Wall Street, then no sort of urgent question is raised by application of the sacrosanct representative democracy of elective posts for rich white men. The African Negroes can wait; "They are not ready for independence", argue the colonialists, and meantime their slave labour produces enormous profits for the all-powerful companies. The next step, as we are so persuasively told, is peaceful transition. If that transition takes 200 years, as Sir Roy Welensky appears to propose, splendid! It will mean 200 more years of illegal profits for the companies, produced by slave labour.

149. In recent statements made at the opening of a session of a so-called Parliament in Southern Rhodesia, Sir Roy Welensky attacked and threatened the United Nations and accused it of intervention in the

domestic affairs of a country which he and his associates had appropriated.

150. In exactly the same way the white settlers of Louisiana, here in the United States, recently brought charges against the United Nations similar to those made by their associates the settlers in Southern Rhodesia, and decided that, in order to show their disapproval of it, they would prohibit the hoisting of the United Nations flag on the buildings of that State.

151. Draft resolution A/L.386 and the amendments thereto [A/L.387] constitute the minimum support which we can give to the people of Southern Rhodesia in their struggle against the settlers who enslave them.

152. I should like to quote here, from the Second Declaration of Havana, a relevant passage which reads as follows:

"The subjective conditions of each country—namely the factors of conscience, organization and leadership—can accelerate or retard the revolution, depending on the extent to which they are developed; but sooner or later, in every historical epoch, when the objective conditions are ripe, conscience asserts itself, organization is achieved, leadership emerges and the revolution occurs.

"Whether the revolution occurs peacefully or is brought into the world after a painful birth is a question that does not depend on the revolutionaries; it depends on the reactionary forces of the old society, which are unwilling to permit the birth of the new society engendered by the contradictions inherent in the old. Historically the revolution is like a physician who attends the birth of a new life. It does not use instruments of force if they are unnecessary, but does not hesitate to use them if they are required in order to facilitate the birth—a birth which brings to the enslaved and exploited masses the hope of a better life."

153. We have set forth these views because we consider that real and effective guaranteeing of the independence and self-government of the Africans of Southern Rhodesia will advance a process which in any case is already predetermined by history. If this question is settled with justice today, the world will be spared new tensions, and the peoples precious lives, tomorrow.

154. Mr. BINDZI (Cameroon) (translated from French): This debate, which has faced our Assembly with a moral choice, could not fail to be of deep interest to the delegation of the Federal Republic of Cameroon. In point of fact, at the beginning of this resumed session, when we decided to place the question of Southern Rhodesia on our agenda, justice and common sense won an important victory over the science of procedure, perfected for the sole purpose of manipulating words with no regard for human problems, over power in the service of designs which cannot be openly avowed, and over ingenious delaying tactics.

155. Of course, some circles deplored our decision and typically expressed regret that a majority of the Assembly should have overruled its own rules of procedure.

156. We cannot be moved by these murmurs, which have very little foundation, as we shall shortly prove. They come from those same circles, always the same,

which, a few months ago joined to give the United Nations capability that was perhaps in conformity with their aims and interests but not necessarily with the aims and interests of the rest of the world.

157. In short, the argument used by the United Kingdom delegation and its supporters to oppose the inclusion of the question of Southern Rhodesia in the agenda of this resumed session was more or less as follows: "We agree that the question is important and that the situation is explosive and demands an urgent investigation, but you used the word 'exclusively' in the resolution adopted at the first resumed session of the Assembly. No matter how many Rhodesians die, they cannot outweigh 'exclusively'." This is the end result of a procedure which, when applied to a question as tragic as that before us now, can hardly be termed other than most disquieting and morally wrong. We will not recapitulate the legal discussion which took place here, in particular on that word "exclusively", to which a number of distinguished and right-thinking jurists gave their approval, with the support of an overwhelming majority of this Assembly.

158. Let us come to the problem itself. What exactly does it involve? It is one of the blackest mysteries in human history. God—I apologise to those who do not believe in God, but the people of my country, the Federal Republic of Cameroon, do believe in Him—God, who is great, just and wise, has shared the earth among all the groups of the human community. Better still, to prevent quarrelling and greed, He has made of the continents, the seas and the mountains, so many boundary lines which it is truly impossible to disregard.

159. Yet, wishing to repeat its achievement in establishing in the southern part of our continent that curious State known as the Republic of South Africa, whose policy towards men of my hue is the shame of the twentieth century, the United Kingdom has since 1923 sought to rob the people of Southern Rhodesia of that share of the earth which has been theirs since time immemorial.

160. In 1923, at a time when the whole of Africa was muzzled, prostrate beneath the iron rod of colonialism, the United Kingdom, with its well-known genius for protecting its own interests, tried to forestall history and to prevent the arrival of a time when the natives of Southern Rhodesia would be able to reclaim their patrimony. To do this, it set up a dummy representative government restricted to aliens, to grant what was grandly termed self-government. Yes, the self-government of a handful of colonialists by and for themselves.

161. Was there ever a more Machiavellian hoax than this? Who could argue that such a farce could be taken seriously or have any legal value? It is logical for the United Kingdom to have given a handful of its nationals free rein to rob a people of their whole country and men to have retained responsibility for foreign affairs and defence, in other words, for the United Kingdom to say to a few Englishmen: "Here is a territory. Grab it. I will keep watch outside. I will answer for your security. Inside, it is your own affair." This is logical. But when the United Kingdom then says: "I have no responsibility for this", it is understandable that neither the Fourth Committee nor the Committee of Seventeen nor the Assembly should be able to follow the argument.

162. My delegation will limit its brief intervention, since everything has already been said in this debate, to three main points: first, the United Kingdom retains its responsibility for the Non-Self-Governing Territory of Southern Rhodesia; second, the régime applied in that Territory is inhuman and unacceptable to the majority of the population; third, the situation in Rhodesia is very serious and constitutes a covert threat to international security.

163. In doing this, I shall abstain from expressing my own feelings, but I shall borrow from previous speakers whose status and evidence cannot be suspected of the slightest hostility to the United Kingdom because of the relations between their respective countries. I shall quote, therefore, in order, the representative of the United Kingdom itself and the representative of Ghana. Lastly, I shall quote a passage from Mr. Pachachi, that jurist whose powers of subtle and refined analysis always force respect for his opinion even among those who disagree.

164. As regards the question of the responsibility which the United Kingdom retains for Southern Rhodesia, I have noted the affirmative interpretation given by the United Nations and its organs. My delegation firmly supports the Assembly and its organs in this opinion. Moreover, it was implicitly recognized by the United Kingdom representative in his statement from this rostrum on 12 June, when he said:

"Here we have a complex of questions—political, economic and constitutional—which is engaging the close and continuing attention of my Government.

"My Government regards these questions very seriously indeed, and is looking again at the whole complex. It is for this reason that the most senior Minister in the Cabinet, next to the Prime Minister, has been personally charged with responsibility in this regard and is devoting so much of his time to these problems." [1109th meeting, paras. 26 and 27.]

165. What can the phrase "has been personally charged with responsibility" mean, save that this special task was delegated because of the United Kingdom's general responsibility for Rhodesia?

166. The Prime Minister himself, Mr. Macmillan, was more categorical in his address to the House of Commons on 6 March 1962:

"The facts of the legal constitutional situation were set out by my Right Honourable friend the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations on 22 February when he said: ... 'Parliament does not possess the power to deprive itself of the right to legislate for any British territory which is not fully independent. On the other hand, there are other established conventions for legislation for self-governing dependencies'." 4/

167. We agree whole-heartedly with Mr. Macmillan's definition: Southern Rhodesia is a self-governing dependency or a dependent self-governing territory of the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom's responsibility in the Rhodesian question could not, in our view, be more clearly established. Is it a dependent self-governing territory or a self-governing dependency? I think the two things means more or less the same.

4/ *Parliamentary Debates* (Weekly Hansard No. 550), vol. 655, No. 69, p. 208 (London, H.M. Stationery Office).

168. Let us now consider the internal régime in Southern Rhodesia. One must be completely ignorant of colonial matters not to foresee the consequences for the indigenous population of self-government by the colonialists. The African countries exert a sort of irresistible attraction, it is true; unfortunately, this attraction has the power of provoking such greed in the colonizer that he tries next to gain possession of everything for himself and to dispossess the indigenous inhabitants altogether. The best and most progressive of white men soon loses his generosity and his principles. There are many examples of such open-hearted men suddenly transformed into fascists, as though by witchcraft.

169. I borrow from Mr. Pachachi his description of a group of Rhodesian laws:

"A few examples of these laws will suffice. We have the Preventive Detention Act of 1959, according to which individuals may be arbitrarily arrested and detained without judicial recourse; the Unlawful Organizations Act of 1959, under which the African National Congress was banned and the National Democratic Party was banned also in December 1961; the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act, under which more than 10,000 Africans, we are informed, including 2,000 African women, were arrested during 1961; the notorious Land Apportionment Act of 1930, under which more than 53 per cent of the best land has been transferred to white ownership; the Native Affairs Act, which created the Native Affairs Department to supervise the effective separation of the Africans from the whites, with all the discrimination and hardship this entails; and, finally, the Native Education Act, which provides inferior educational opportunities for the African population in comparison to what it offered to the white minority." [1112th meeting, para. 49.]

These few eloquent words—the more eloquent because they come from a man who, because of his training, appreciates the gravity of the charge—depict the "special" system of humanity and charity that prevails in Southern Rhodesia.

170. It has been said that what guarantees the English system is "respect for the other fellow's rights". Obviously, this is true in the United Kingdom. But are these people in Rhodesia still Englishmen?

171. Their behaviour is not limited to stealing the land and its wealth; it is coupled with regret at the presence of other human beings; from there to physical suppression is but a step, alas easily taken. Evidence of this was supplied by the representative of Ghana, whose brilliant British culture is the best guarantee of his feelings towards the United Kingdom. This is what Mr. Quaison-Sackey said here on 18 June:

"It is rather surprising that the world has not been fully informed of the killings in Southern Rhodesia, comparable to the Sharpeville shootings in South Africa in March 1960. Because of lack of information, the same note of indignation has been lacking where the shootings of Africans in Southern Rhodesia were concerned. And let us remember that there has been more shooting in Southern Rhodesia than in South Africa. The Southern Rhodesian police have shot and killed many more Africans over the past two years than the South Africans have done in the same period. It is a very gloomy picture." [1110th meeting, para. 28.]

172. It is, indeed, a very gloomy picture. We all know more or less what is happening in South Africa. We all recall with sorrow the events at Sharpeville and elsewhere; this situation has aroused general disapproval in this hall and throughout the world.

173. That the situation in Southern Rhodesia is still more alarming, that men whose only guilt is the colour of their skins and the desire to enjoy the prerogatives of human beings are losing their lives is indeed ground for anxiety, grave anxiety. When the representative of the United Kingdom tells us: "It is not urgent; let the Assembly close its eyes and simply trust my statement that my Government is dealing with the matter", there is ground for even more serious anxiety. There is no doubt that the situation is grave; it is a threat to international peace and security.

174. But there is yet another reason for anxiety. Behind a façade of flexibility the respect for the General Assembly, the United Kingdom has everywhere applied its own policy and its own policy exclusively. Before withdrawing, it adroitly left behind it in Africa and Asia almost irremediable causes of dissension and situations that are very difficult to correct. The Security Council has worked on the Kashmir question for more than ten years and there is the question of Northern Cameroon, where there have already been three plebiscites, on the incredible results of the last of which I shall refrain from comment; there is very nearly an open dispute between Ghana and Togo.

175. The real question, therefore, is this: what awaits us in East and Central Africa? The budget deficit of the artificial Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland is said to be \$900 million! How does the United Kingdom expect to pay off the cost of these fantastic constitutional creations?

176. The situation is serious, very serious. There can be no doubt that what has been said from this rostrum has been useful.

177. Yet, the draft resolution before us very moderately expressed and asks only the minimum. My delegation would have liked to see the principle of complete self-determination stated even more fully and forcefully in the draft resolution, as the great principle of our time.

178. During the debate we have heard a number of proposals. One of these merited our particular attention because it came from a man who is eminently worthy of respect and whom we respect, a man with a burning passion to serve Africa, a man of whom our continent can be proud.

179. Despite the progress it would mean in the representation of the indigenous inhabitants, this proposal—and we deeply regret that we are unable to agree with him on this point—for an equal distribution of seats between the communities seems rather too perfectionist and to resemble somewhat the judgement of Solomon. In point of fact, this proposal is more like tight-rope walking than real democracy. The commonly accepted democratic rule is "one man, one vote". That is universally valid and should be valid in Rhodesia also. It must be made clear that usurpation does not give a British colonialist who has grown wealthy on usurped land a greater right than a despoiled black to determine the destiny of his territory. It is not a question of trimming and balancing,

but of taking radical action and looking facts in the face.

180. A great deal of praise has been bestowed on the United Kingdom's former policy. It is now time for it to be courageous and to adopt a position like that of France in Algeria. There can be no doubt that if there had been this realism earlier, a great deal of bloodshed would have been avoided and friendship between the communities would have been kept intact.

181. It is in order to ward off what divides other men under other skies that my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution before us, in the hope that in future all Rhodesians will be able to live together in friendship and brotherhood.

182. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call on the representative of the United States who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

183. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America): I do not take the floor to make any substantive reply to the baseless attacks on my country made here this afternoon by one representative; nor would I dignify

such a torrent of abuse by replying in kind, no matter how tempting or how easy it might be to do so. I will say only that it is a pity that a representative of a neighbouring people, for whom we have always had the most friendly feelings, should have so imposed upon the patience of representatives in this hall and so misused the opportunities for debate. Surely, such an irrelevant tirade as we heard here this afternoon is no service to the people of Southern Rhodesia, whose welfare is, or should be, the present concern of this Assembly. The use of this rostrum for cold war polemics does not serve the purposes of this debate or of this Organization.

184. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We have heard all the speakers on the list for this afternoon. With one meeting tomorrow, we should be able to conclude the consideration of the question of Southern Rhodesia, take the vote, and close the session. To make this possible, I appeal to all delegations to get here before 10.30, so that we can begin the meeting promptly at 10.30.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.