

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**1120th
PLENARY MEETING**

Thursday, 28 June 1962,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 97:</i>	
<i>Question of Southern Rhodesia (continued) . . .</i>	1531

President: Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia).

AGENDA ITEM 97

Question of Southern Rhodesia (continued)

1. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) (translated from French): That the situation in Southern Rhodesia is wholly unsatisfactory and fraught with danger cannot be denied: that the African population of the territory, which constitutes the overwhelming majority of 90 per cent, is discriminated against socially and politically in the Constitution and does not even enjoy the human rights and civil liberties to which it would be entitled in our world of today is also indisputable.
2. In our present age, and, particularly, since the end of the Second World War and the recent happy emergence to independence, in terms of freedom, equality and human dignity of so many African countries, the conditions in Southern Rhodesia are a contrast that brings into sharper focus the political and social inequalities involved; and the problem, consequently, becomes more acute and more pressing for political solution. For in any political situations, or problems, the actual conditions in the surrounding countries and in the world at large are factors which have a direct influence upon that situation.
3. There was a time in the past when discrimination and inequality in Africa were the norm, although always contrary to basic moral principles. This state of affairs was in a way tolerated and accepted and, in itself, did not constitute a problem. Now the world has happily moved on; and in situations such as that in Southern Rhodesia, a compelling problem has been created calling for urgent solution. It is, therefore, no use to continue acting out outmoded patterns and thought which no matter how well they may have worked in their time can no longer be applied in the world of today.
4. New situations have created new conditions of life. To ignore such conditions is to shut one's eyes to the force of existing reality. In the now rapidly developing world, we have to adjust ourselves and go along with those realities. The problem, therefore, of Southern Rhodesia, like most other problems that confront us, is one of adjustment. The European settlers—the white minority—in Southern Rhodesia will have to adjust themselves and will have to reform their relations with the African population in the spirit of our times—that is, the spirit of equality. They should therefore be able to find a way to protect their interests—not by trying to remain static in a fast-moving world, nor by lagging behind, but moving on at a pace commensurate

with world developments, in an imaginative policy of co-operation with the inevitable and protecting their interests in a progressive way in a progressive world.

5. There was a time when these requirements were not necessary, because the world was then different. Slavery was, until comparatively recent times, an accepted and lawful practice. It is now universally condemned and outlawed as a most abhorrent human aberration. In the same way, conditions of social and political inequality in Southern Rhodesia and other parts of Africa are remnants of the past that can no longer continue, inasmuch as they run counter to the spirit of our times and the dictates of justice.

6. Having referred to slavery, we cannot let pass unnoticed a comparison that has been made from this rostrum in the course of the debate by one or two delegations between the conditions in South Africa and those in ancient Greece. These comparisons were in respect of a State—ancient Greece—having a slave population with no rights of citizenship.

7. It is universally acknowledged that democracy was born in ancient Greece, and it is the light of Greek culture that has illuminated the path of humanity in its course to its present stage of freedom. It is that light that has privileged the present generation to work out, through the United Nations, the independence of all peoples and the dignity of the human person. To cast a shadow on the origins of the spirit of freedom is, in effect, to try to shake our faith in that spirit. Greece is no longer a country, but a symbol in that respect—a symbol of freedom and democracy. We therefore find it necessary to say a very few words in order that we may see things in their proper perspective and evaluate them accordingly.

8. At the time of ancient Greece, the system of slavery was a part of the whole political and social structure of the world; it was a reality that could not be denied. Athens, no matter what its inclinations and its efforts might have been, could not by itself make the sole exception and break through that system. Yet it did everything humanly possible to change it. Suffice it to mention that, as historically established, Athens was known for its fairness to the slaves. To quote Glotz and Durant, "It is on common judgement that slaves were freer in democratic Athens than free men in oligarchic States".

9. The significance of the statement cannot be unrelated even to the twentieth century. Furthermore, at a time when slavery was accepted everywhere in the world, and later further codified and entrenched by the Romans, it was in ancient Greece that Alcidas, in the fourth century B.C., was free to go about the country preaching against the established system of slavery in words which, only two and a half milleniums later, Rousseau was bold enough to use. It was Alcidas who preached that "God has sent all men into the world, and Nature has made no man a slave".

10. So that even on the score of ancient slavery—which was then inevitable and, to quote the Encyclopaedia Britannica, "indispensable at the time"—the Greek spirit has been a paragon of freedom and a precursor of the abolition of slavery many centuries later. That spirit, having travelled to many lands and flourished in new continents, has brought abolition of slavery and the present stage of civilization in freedom which calls upon us today to ponder upon the situation of Southern Rhodesia in order that we may see that justice is done and that freedom is given to the people of that country.

11. From the statements made in this debate there emerges a wide measure of agreement as to the legal situation in Southern Rhodesia and the objectives to be sought, although there may not be equal agreement as to the means. The territory is a Non-Self-Governing Territory within the meaning of the Charter. The objectives are, first, speedy adjustment of the franchise in Southern Rhodesia for the purpose of an early attainment of universal and adult suffrage. The second objective is the elimination of racial discrimination. In the promotion of these objectives not only the United Nations but, primarily, the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, will have to play an important role.

12. We do not overlook the difficulties arising from the fact that internal self-administration has been granted to Southern Rhodesia—in fact to the white minority of Southern Rhodesia—but the ultimate responsibility of the United Kingdom in ensuring the rights of the indigenous population cannot be disregarded.

13. We hope and trust that there will be a peaceful solution of this problem. It should be a peaceful solution arrived at in a spirit of co-operation and understanding by the United Kingdom, the Government of Southern Rhodesia and the African majority of that country, with the assistance of the United Nations. It should be based on the principles of the Charter and should have due regard also to a realistic appraisal of the actual situation so that a just solution may be arrived at in a smooth and peaceful way.

14. In that connexion we want, on the one hand, a speedy move forward towards a solution by the recognition of the fundamental rights of the people of Southern Rhodesia. At the same time there should not be anything so abrupt as to create upheavals. We must move rapidly at a pace commensurate with the speed of our times, but we must move at the same time in a spirit of peacefulness and agreement.

15. My delegation has considered with great interest and care the work of the Special Committee of seventeen members.^{1/} We have studied its report [A/5124], and we congratulate it on the effective work it has carried out. We find that its work has been constructive, and that, although it has not achieved its purpose, it has helped to enlighten us on the situation and to create a basis for a future solution.

16. We have considered also the draft resolution [A/L.386/Rev.1 and Add.1-4] submitted by a number of States. My delegation believes that this draft resolution will help towards finding a solution of the problem and towards making it possible to work together

to establish a constitution in a spirit of fairness as well as in the spirit of our times. We shall, therefore, support the draft resolution.

17. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Before giving the floor to the next speaker, who is the last on my list, I should like to tell the Assembly that the delegation of Bulgaria, which is the sponsor of the draft amendments in document A/L.387, has informed me that it will not press the second of these amendments, and has withdrawn it. Thus, there remains only the amendment in the first paragraph of the document.

18. Sir Patrick DEAN (United Kingdom): Since this Assembly decided on 12 June to place this item on our present agenda as a matter that was urgent, my delegation has been waiting to hear the reasons that led delegations to believe that this was so. I have listened to all the forty-nine speakers in this debate; I am still waiting. None of the arguments that have been so far adduced has altered the conviction which I previously expressed as to the lack of urgency and I still very much regret that this debate should have taken place.

19. My delegation regrets not only the methods used to place this subject on the agenda during this resumed session, methods which in our opinion did not credit to the United Nations, but also we are sorry to see that our arguments on the general question of competence, on the constitutional issues involved and on the present needs of the situation in Southern Rhodesia have been disregarded by the sponsors and promoters of the item.

20. My delegation would wish to express its appreciation to those speakers who, though they have so far disagreed to a varying extent with our views, have paid generous tribute to our achievements and objectives. My delegation is all the more grateful to those representatives who, earlier in this debate, have shown understanding of the legal, constitutional and political realities of the present situation. In thanking these representatives for their support, I should like to make a strong appeal to all delegations, even at this late stage in the debate, to give their very close attention to the considerations which have been so lucidly and eloquently advanced by these earlier speakers, as also to the more detailed arguments which I am about to put before the Assembly.

21. The position of my Government on all the questions now before this Assembly has been already made clear in the Fourth Committee and the Special Committee of seventeen members and I do not propose to go over all the ground again now. I shall address myself only to the principal points at issue.

22. First, I shall state once more our view on the question of competence. Then I must set out again the constitutional facts regarding the relations of my Government with Southern Rhodesia. Thirdly, I shall review the attitude which we have taken on these matters in the Special Committee. In the time available I cannot answer all the points which have been made here in the course of the last fortnight. I intend, however, to refer briefly to one or two of the more important suggestions made by previous speakers. As regards subsidiary questions raised in this debate, I shall confine myself to commenting shortly only on the grosser misrepresentations put forward by a small minority of delegations. Finally, I shall sum up the general view of my Government regarding the pro-

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

ceedings which have taken place here under this item in relation to the actual situation in Southern Rhodesia.

23. The first question is the one which deals with competence; this is fundamental. I must make it clear to the Assembly that we adhere to the basic principle that the United Nations has no authority, under the Charter or otherwise, to intervene in the affairs of Southern Rhodesia. In previous debates on this subject some Members have pointed to resolutions in which it was decided to assert the competence of the Assembly in determining whether a particular territory had or had not attained a full measure of self-government. They went on to deduce from these particular resolutions that the general question of competence had been settled. My delegation must point out that an assertion of competence is an assertion and no more. It does not and cannot make something exist which does not exist in the Charter itself. It cannot create or confer a new jurisdiction. At the time that these resolutions were considered, my delegation made plain that it did not regard them as effective or binding. That remains our position today. Indeed, the whole basis of our co-operation with the Special Committee whose deliberations have resulted in the item now before this Assembly, rested on the explicit understanding that there would be no attempt to intervene or interfere in the affairs or the administration of territories in which the Charter precludes United Nations intervention. Consequently, in the view of my delegation, the Assembly has no legal right to intervene in the matter which is now before us. For the General Assembly to pass a resolution on this subject would be, in our view, ultra vires and I formally record the objection of my Government.

24. Having stated our position on that question of basis principle, I must now restate the position on the constitutional issues involved. In the Fourth Committee and the Special Committee we have more than once fully explained the present constitutional position of Southern Rhodesia—a position under which, for forty years past, the Government of the territory has exercised full autonomy in the control of its own internal affairs—and we have described the constitutional limitations on the action which my Government can take. In brief, the essential features of that position are as follows.

25. Southern Rhodesia is part of Her Majesty's Dominions. It has been self-governing, as far as its internal affairs are concerned, since 1923 when, following a referendum, the then electors of Southern Rhodesia chose "responsible government" in preference to incorporation in South Africa. In the Constitution which came into force on 1 October 1923,^{2/} executive powers were consequently transferred to elected Southern Rhodesian Ministers responsible to the Southern Rhodesian Legislative Assembly.

26. In respect of Southern Rhodesian internal affairs, the only power retained by the Government of the United Kingdom was a power of veto over certain restricted categories of Southern Rhodesian legislation within one year of enactment. This power of veto or disallowance has never, in fact, been exercised. It is most important to note that the United Kingdom Government did not retain any effective power to legislate for Southern Rhodesian internal affairs and, in consequence, Ministers in the Government of the United

Kingdom have not been answerable to the British Parliament since 1923 for Southern Rhodesian internal affairs.

27. The real point at issue is whether my Government now has the power to intervene in Southern Rhodesia's internal affairs without the consent of the Government of the territory. As I have said, the position of my Government is that we are constitutionally unable to exercise such a power. I would like to expand this point which was lucidly illustrated in the statement of the representative of New Zealand earlier in the debate [1115th meeting] and which is fundamental to a proper understanding of the Commonwealth. The whole structure of this association of States which is the Commonwealth has been raised on a foundation of the progressive withdrawal of authority and supervision by the Government of the United Kingdom. This process has in some cases been spread over a period of many years and in others has been more rapid. During its development conventions have evolved. These conventions accurately reflect the realities of political life and have the same binding legal force as that in written instruments. This may seem strange to those whose political institutions are founded on different conceptions of constitutional law and political theory. Nevertheless it is a fact. These conventions crystallize the difference between what would seem possible in constitutional theory and what can be done in practice. For example, an act of Parliament of the United Kingdom conferring a new status on a former colony could, in theory, be repealed by that Parliament, thus enabling the Government of the United Kingdom to purport to intervene in the internal affairs of independent members of the Commonwealth, and, no less indeed in theory, in the affairs of former British dependencies which are no longer members of the Commonwealth. In practice, of course, this would be unthinkable and totally impossible. By the same token, my Government cannot now resume its former powers in Southern Rhodesia. I should note in passing that the constitutional position in Southern Rhodesia is very different from that which existed in British Guiana and from which some speakers have attempted to draw an analogy. I have no time to go further into this point today.

28. Looked at in actual and realistic terms, the validity of this convention of non-interference becomes more apparent. Southern Rhodesia has a long tradition of autonomous rule. I do not pretend that this rule has not been exercised by a minority, but this autonomy, though unwelcome to some, is still a fact. There is a Southern Rhodesian Parliament and Government; there are Southern Rhodesian armed forces. The Assembly must face the fact that the authority of these institutions cannot be legally challenged. My Government believes that, in view of their record in this field, their assurances on these matters which lie particularly and exclusively within their own competence and experience should be accepted by this Assembly.

29. It is precisely for the reasons which I have just developed that information under Article 73 e of the Charter has never been provided by my Government in respect of Southern Rhodesia. That is why in 1946 the list of territories in respect of which information was promised to the United Nations did not include Southern Rhodesia. That is why General Assembly resolution 66 (I) of 14 December 1946 noted, but did not query, the fact that Southern Rhodesia was not on the list of territories on which information was promised. That has been the situation since 1946, and the

^{2/} The Southern Rhodesia Constitution Letters Patent, 1923 (London, H.M. Stationery Office).

position therefore is that my Government could not then, and cannot now, give what it does not itself receive. *Nemo dat qui non habet*. Under the constitutional arrangements which have been in force for over a generation and a half, the Southern Rhodesian Government has been under no obligation to report on economic, social or other matters to the Government of the United Kingdom. It has not done so, nor has my Government the right to demand that it should. This is the plain fact which has precluded and still precludes the United Kingdom from submitting such information to the United Nations.

30. No good whatever can come from disregarding these constitutional facts. The solution will not be found by ignoring them. They were clearly and effectively recognized by a number of speakers who spoke earlier in this debate. My delegation can only regret that so many other speakers in the debate have chosen to bypass them altogether.

31. I now turn to the third point in my argument, namely, the attitude we have taken on these matters in the Special Committee of seventeen members. In spite of the vital reservations which we hold on issues of competence and the constitutional questions, I doubt if there are more than a dozen Members in this Assembly who will dispute the fact that my Government has gone more than half-way to co-operate with the United Nations in dealing with this question and indeed with the whole range of questions affecting dependent territories for which the United Kingdom still has responsibilities. We have taken a full part in the work of the Fourth Committee and of the Special Committee. We have provided, as must be acknowledged, all the information which we promised, and freely discussed it. We went even further. My Government invited representatives of the Special Committee to visit London, where they had the opportunity of full discussion with the responsible Ministers of my Government. No one can claim that we have not done all that we promised and more. We have patiently and carefully stated, and repeatedly explained, the practical and constitutional difficulties inherent in the situation. We have also fully explained the motives and reasons which led to the discussions in 1960 for reform of the Southern Rhodesian Constitution. The purpose then was to make a major new move towards participation by the African people of Southern Rhodesia in the affairs of their own Government. And I would emphasize here that the initiative for this came not from the Government of the United Kingdom, but from the Southern Rhodesian Government itself. The accepted and declared aims was to move in a period of years to a state of affairs under which the majority of the population would, through the extended franchise, take a steadily increasing part in the management of the affairs of their own country. Under the new Constitution—and this is the most important thing to remember—it is accepted that majority rule will come. This was a genuine effort to move in the direction which we all wish to see, a direction which British policy has set for many decades past, that of democratic representative government. Indeed, when the reforms set out in the new Constitution were discussed with all concerned, the African leaders themselves recognized that this was an important move in the right direction and they were accordingly originally willing to co-operate in putting them into effect.

32. The process of extending a franchise, in accordance with our practice and experience in many different territories, is one which should proceed step by

step. The new Constitution in Southern Rhodesia under which the African population for the first time was given the opportunity of winning seats in the legislature was a first step—a step which, it was recognized and publicly stated, must lead on to African majority participation in the Government in due course. The safeguards in this Constitution cannot, as has several times been suggested in this debate, be swept away by the Southern Rhodesian Government. The clock cannot be put back without the consent of the Africans themselves. This safeguard about the new Constitution in Southern Rhodesia was explained at length by my delegation to the Special Committee of seventeen.

33. Now let me dismiss as briefly as I can some of the false accusations which have been made against us in this debate. The same speakers who have exhorted us with such a torrent of words, such a display of enthusiasm to adhere to democratic principles, would, I suggest, do well to reflect how far these principles are being applied within their own countries. I listened with particular astonishment to the speech made by the representative of a country which has in the past, by the admission of its own leaders, violated the most elementary canons of democracy.

34. For instance, my country has been accused here of falsely claiming to have "granted" freedom to a number of our colonial territories. It appears that, according to certain doctrinaire political theories, colonial emancipation should have been—and therefore by a process of "double-think" was—in all cases achieved through bitter revolutionary struggle. I have no doubt at all that everybody in this hall knows quite well that this is untrue. It is not only British spokesmen who claim that our former Empire has been emancipated peacefully. Many of those present today heard the speeches by the Prime Ministers of Sierra Leone and Tanganyika in this Assembly in 1961 [1078th meeting], which contained generous tributes to my country for the manner in which their countries' independence had been negotiated. Some representatives will also recall the words of the Major of Freetown on this same subject:

"We in Freetown share with our brothers throughout the country the pride and joy we all feel at having achieved our independence, not by bloodshed, not by revolution, but in friendly agreement following the British tradition of evolutionary constitutional government."

35. These words were cited at the 969th meeting of the Security Council by the representative of Liberia in September 1961 in a speech welcoming Sierra Leone to membership of this Organization. Again, Mr. Nyerere, speaking for Tanganyika in December last year, said:

"It goes against my grain as a nationalist to say thank you to anybody for the achievement of our independence except to the people of Tanganyika. But I would not be honest if I did not admit openly and graciously that the fact that we have been a Trust Territory under British administration has greatly helped us to achieve our independence in the way in which we have achieved it." [1078th meeting, para. 137.]

36. And on the day when the great Federation of Nigeria reached independence the Prime Minister of Nigeria said:

"Each step of our constitutional advance has been purposefully and peacefully planned with full and

open consultation not only between representatives of all the various interests in Nigeria but in harmonious co-operation with the administering power which has today relinquished its authority."

37. I could, if I had the time, quote many similar statements by other well-known and respected leaders in Africa, but I am confident that this Assembly will prefer to accept the evidence of these and those other leaders of Africa, who have worked with us for the attainment of self-government and independence, rather than the malicious falsehoods which certain delegations have thought fit to put before the Assembly.

38. Even after our Asian and African colonies have achieved independence, these noisy, self-appointed spokesmen of democratic freedom have told this Assembly that the British continue to interfere in the internal affairs and station troops upon the territories of our former colonies against the will of the peoples concerned. These hypocritical accusations were primarily made, as will doubtless have been noticed, by the representative of a country which is notorious for having used its armed forces to install and maintain its own political nominees in power in a number of nearby countries.

39. Nor can I allow to pass without comment the impassioned and cynical call by a certain representative for an amnesty for all so-called political prisoners; for freedom for all political parties; for free and universal suffrage by secret ballot; for the creation of representative organs of administration and Government; for freedom of speech and of the press; for political freedom for trade unions and social organizations.

40. These proposals were made by the representative of a political system which has been responsible, as everyone in this hall knows well, for the arrest and disappearance of untold numbers of political prisoners—many of them innocent, as is now officially admitted. This is the country which has the effrontery to lecture the United Kingdom on democratic principles. This particular delegation to which I refer is never at a loss for a proverb. Let me give them one for the occasion. It is this: "Those who live in glass houses should never throw stones." And in case this is not fully understood, let me add a quotation which the Soviet delegation at least, and some others too, may recognize. It is from Turgenev, who was a Russian, and it is admirably short and to the point: "If you desire to put your enemy in the wrong or even to damage his reputation, blame him for the very vice which you feel in yourself."

41. Again, this Assembly was told that the policy and practice of the Government of Southern Rhodesia "is based upon racial discrimination". In fact, as we have already pointed out on previous occasions, Sir Edgar Whitehead and his Government have systematically reviewed all Southern Rhodesian legislation and removed virtually all those features which discriminate unfairly against Africans. The present Government of Southern Rhodesia has not only taken a number of important steps expressly designed to eliminate racial discrimination, it has also pledged itself, if Sir Edgar Whitehead wins the next election, to go further and remove all remaining discriminatory legislation, including the Land Apportionment Act, which, incidentally, was originally designed to ensure that the African inhabitants of the Territory did not become a landless peasantry. There has been no sufficient acknowledgement here of the fact that the present

Government of Southern Rhodesia has set a course directed at the elimination of racial discrimination from the territory and at building a truly multiracial society based upon tolerance and goodwill. My Government supports this ideal and has faith in the genuine intention of the Southern Rhodesian Government to achieve it.

42. There has been too little recognition, also, of the fact that the new Constitution, which won the approval of all parties except the extreme right-wing European party, provides a Declaration of Rights similar to that in that present Constitutions of several newly independent States which were once dependent territories under our administration.

43. In my submission, the record of Sir Edgar Whitehead shows incontrovertibly that there is no basis for the fear that the Southern Rhodesian Government is backward-looking. He has himself said that the policy of maintaining white supremacy is no longer possible in Southern Rhodesia, if ever it was. He has stated—and rightly—that there is no precedent to follow; that Rhodesians are faced with devising a new approach which has never been tried before. Are those really the words or the actions of a "racist" or of an intransigent government determined at all costs to preserve the power and supremacy of a European minority? I hardly think so.

44. I turn back now to the central theme of this debate, which has found expression in a draft resolution sponsored by a large number of African and Asian delegations [A/L.386/Rev.1 and Add.1-4].

45. The debate has oversimplified the problems. For instance, to claim that the United Kingdom Government should impose immediately majority rule in Southern Rhodesia on the pattern adopted in other territories in Africa, even assuming for the moment that the United Kingdom Government were in a position to do so, would not solve the difficulty of the relationship between the two racial groups in the territory. And that is the essence of the whole problem. It not only is valueless, but also may be dangerous, to pretend that the simple formula that has been successfully applied in very different conditions in other African territories which have recently become independent can also be applied in Southern Rhodesia without account being taken of the complex situation there and without consideration of the consequences.

46. Peaceful progress and stability should be the main aim of the United Nations for Southern Rhodesia as for elsewhere. I appeal most solemnly, and with the whole benefit of our experience, to all delegations not to jeopardize the chances of a successful outcome of this multiracial experiment, which could have great consequences both in Africa and elsewhere, merely for the sake of conforming to a pattern—even a successful pattern—which has been set elsewhere and in quite different circumstances. My delegation fears that action taken in the United Nations can only increase the difficulties, harden the attitudes and widen existing divisions, thus creating the very explosive and critical situation about which we have heard so much.

47. Let us consider for a moment the situation in the territory and the effect that the debate in this hall may well have upon it. Those who are pressing this debate have described the situation as "explosive", "abnormal", or—more simply—"very grave". This is dangerous exaggeration. Nevertheless, it is not too

difficult to discern two extreme tendencies in the local situation. Both of these will inevitably react to what is being done here, and in each case their reaction is likely to be to pursue more extreme courses and adopt harder attitudes than they would otherwise have done. Both may in this way be forced into positions from which they may not find it easy to retreat.

48. A number of speakers in this debate have put forward suggestions for positive action that might be taken in Southern Rhodesia. I recognize that most of these suggestions have been advanced in a genuine spirit of friendship and out of a desire to do good, and I gratefully acknowledge this.

49. Too many points have been made for me to answer in a single statement, but I would like to refer particularly to the positive approach to the problem given in the statement of Mr. Wachuku, Foreign Minister of Nigeria [1112th meeting].

50. For the reasons that I have explained, my delegation agrees with Mr. Wachuku that it is impossible immediately and at one blow to reduce to nothing the political power and influence of a substantial white population which for many years has played a major role in the development of resources and services of that country. The United Kingdom Government cannot at this stage enter the political arena in Southern Rhodesia to hold the balance between the two main racial communities, but there is no doubt that the present trends will lead before very long to the sort of situation which Mr. Wachuku envisages.

51. It will be at that stage that co-operation between the races will be put to the severest test if the country is to continue its forward march. The new Constitution is intended to prepare the way for just this eventuality. It is for this reason that the voting arrangements are so designed as to favour candidates drawing their support from both the major racial elements, so that when majority rule comes about the political parties are not divided on purely racial lines. In an ascent as difficult and dangerous as this, it is desirable fully to test one foothold before essaying another. That is why the most sensible course is to give each stage a fair trial before looking ahead to the next.

52. The essence of the position in the territory is the need to compromise and conciliate. Debate on the territory now, and even more resolutions, can hardly fail to add to the difficulties. If, as my delegation believes, tensions are heightened by the action of the General Assembly, subsequent negotiations and a satisfactory solution will be made far harder. We believe that the United Nations would do all the peoples of Southern Rhodesia better service by refraining from further debate and from resolutions at this time, and by encouraging the parties concerned to work together in harmony and peace through the machinery that exists towards the objectives we all wish to see achieved. Only co-operation of this kind can bring lasting results in conditions of peace.

53. There is an additional and very important reason why this Assembly should at the present time avoid any action which might serve to create or heighten tensions or add to the task of those who are responsible for the political evolution of the territory. When I spoke in the debate on the inscription of this item, I reminded the Assembly that the whole future of the Central African Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland was at present under scrutiny. I said that here was a

complex of questions, political, economic and constitutional, which was 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. For this reason Mr. R. A. Butler, who is the most senior Minister after the Prime Minister in the cabinet, has been personally charged with responsibility in this regard and is devoting much of his time to these problems.

54. As the Assembly knows, Mr. Butler has only recently come back to London from a visit to the territories in question. He has reported to Parliament. Time is now needed for further study of these highly complex problems and their interrelation one with another.

55. Several speakers have said that to adopt a draft resolution of the character of the one now before us would, in their view, be helpful in the consideration of these problems and of assistance to my Government.

56. If my delegation accepts that these views are held in good faith, I must at the same time assure this Assembly that they are invalid. Consideration of this complex of problems will not be helped by resolutions, however well-intentioned, adopted by this Assembly at the present time. My Government believes that it is entitled to expect the support of the United Nations in trying to solve, in conformity with the realities of the situation, the more difficult problems of the territories which are still dependent on it.

57. I have said enough to make it clear that my delegation is, for the reasons I have given, opposed not only to the principle of a resolution by the General Assembly, particularly at the present time, but also to this particular draft resolution contained in document A/L.386/Rev.1 and Add.1-4. I therefore do not need to say too much about the specific provisions of this draft resolution or the reasons for our dissatisfaction with it. What must be said is this. For the reasons which I have explained in some detail, the draft resolution takes no account whatsoever of the constitutional limitations on my Government's power to bring in by itself changes in the constitutional position in Southern Rhodesia. It asks us to do things, such as the convening of another constitutional conference, that we cannot do alone. It asks all parties to participate fully in such a conference and yet specifies conditions which would make agreement at a conference impossible. It ignores the fact that the Constitution drawn up last year represents a considerable political advance for the African population. It calls for the release of political prisoners whereas in fact, and contrary to the statements made by several delegations, there are none. There are at present only six persons whose movements are restricted to a certain area of the country. At this point I must, with regret, refute one of the more gross inaccuracies propounded during the course of the debate. The representative of Ghana told the Assembly [1110th meeting] that more Africans had been killed in Southern Rhodesia as a result of police action over the past two years than in South Africa. I am certainly not going to follow the representative of Ghana into such unhappy statistics and comparisons. That anybody should have been killed, either in Southern Africa or in Southern Rhodesia, is a matter of regret. All I need say is that the statement gives a false picture of the situation and is based on distorted statistics.

58. The draft resolution also entirely ignores the substantial steps already taken by the Southern

Rhodesian Government, which I have described, to review and revise all legislation which might have the effect of discrimination between the races. I realize that many of those who have sponsored or supported this draft resolution sincerely believe that the action proposed in it is right and will help towards a solution. It is because I respect their sincerity that I must ask them to believe that to adopt a resolution of this kind, which wholly disregards the realities of the situation, is not only unnecessary, but also can only do no good in the territory and certainly no good to the reputation of the United Nations. In truth, the situation in Southern Rhodesia is exceedingly complex. It cannot be solved merely by adopting sweeping resolutions and applying rule of thumb tests. Procedures and methods which have worked successfully in other parts of Africa or in Asia cannot with prudence be applied to the different situation in Southern Rhodesia. To call for independence this year, as the Soviet representative has done, can certainly do no good in circumstances like these.

59. As we have carefully and frequently explained, United States intervention in the administration of dependent territories in circumstances precluded by the Charter is objectionable in principle and dangerous in practice. It is on the basis of the Charter of the United Nations itself—and what better basis could there be?—that I have to say that my Government is unable to accept the conclusions regarding Southern Rhodesia reached by the Special Committee of seventeen members and reflected in the draft resolution. My delegation regards the draft resolution before us as ultra vires, unacceptable and impracticable. Its adoption would, in our opinion, do harm rather than good. My delegation would normally have expected to vote against this draft resolution, but because we disapprove not only of the resolution itself, but also of the whole of the proceedings here as well, we shall take no part in any voting, whether on this draft resolution or on any amendments to it.

60. I have one final thing to say. The issues at stake in this Assembly are very grave. They affect both the principles by which our Organization should exercise its functions and the practical effects which the decisions taken here at this time will certainly have on peoples and Governments far distant from this place. I cannot stress too much the results for good or ill of the action which this Organization takes on this item. This is not the time for meticulous assessments of immediate self interest—"the nicely calculated less or more". There is on this occasion a duty on all delegations, including my own, to act with the fullest sense of responsibility of all that is at stake. That duty, in my submission, can only be to refuse to adopt the draft resolution which has been placed before us.

61. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I give the floor to the representative of Ethiopia in exercise of his right of reply.

62. Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia): I realize that the hour is late and that I should not take up the time of the Assembly before the vote. However, I felt it my duty to correct certain statements that were made in the course of the speech of the representative of the United Kingdom. In the first place I am bound to say, since the representative of the United Kingdom made such a lengthy statement, that all the points which he advanced were put forward both in the Fourth Committee and in the Special Committee of seventeen members and they do not really bring forth anything

new; he simply reiterates the position which the United Kingdom has previously taken.

63. Since we, and many others indeed, have already given detailed answers, I do not think it is necessary for me to go over them again. There are one or two points, however, which I think need correction. The first one was to this effect: do not push anything now because it may hamper what we wish to do in Southern Rhodesia. In regard to this point, I have very carefully studied the draft resolution [A/L.386/Rev.1 and Add.1-4] and it does not contain any time-limit. The view seems to be that if we do something now we may spoil what is in process. Certainly that is not the intention of the draft resolution and there is no time-limit of any kind there. It simply brings certain matters to the attention of the United Kingdom and I do not really believe that there is any ground for objection to that.

64. The second point which I thought I should bring to the Assembly's attention is the following: At the beginning of his statement the representative of the United Kingdom spoke about the matter of competence and he said that his participation and the participation of his delegation in the Fourth Committee and in the Special Committee of seventeen members, if I understood him correctly, was based on the explicit understanding that there would be no interference in the internal affairs of Southern Rhodesia, that is to say in the administration of that territory. I hope I have misunderstood him, but, if I have not, may I say that this is not the case. What we did say in the Fourth Committee and in the Special Committee was that the United Kingdom is certainly responsible for the administration of the territory, but that by virtue of the Charter there is an international accountability which the United Nations must exercise.

65. Therefore, if the objection is to being accountable, that should be stated quite explicitly. But if the objection is that there has been interference in the internal administration of Southern Rhodesia, that most certainly is not the case.

66. Then there is the next point which I think needs correction. In the entire statement of the representative of the United Kingdom, he did not speak of the obligation of the United Kingdom towards the 3 million members of the African population. He spoke instead of the fact that there is a Government and therefore the obligation which the United Kingdom has undertaken in the Charter, and even in the sense of its being an administrator, somehow disappears and that we must concentrate on the fact that there is a Government in the territory and, since it does not wish to co-operate, matters must be left in that way. That, of course, is a wrong conception of the obligation of the United Kingdom, and the General Assembly cannot accept it. First and foremost the obligation of the United Kingdom under the Charter is towards the 3 million Africans. The obligations are many and varied, but most important of all there is the obligation to lead them to independence. If that is not accomplished then it is the duty of the United Nations to see to it that it is done.

67. Another misleading point is that under the new Constitution somehow—although it is not explained, and is contrary to the facts—the Africans will have the majority rule in the near future. The truth is that there are sixty-five seats. Out of the sixty-five seats, fifty are given to the European settlers. It is also a fact that the Constitution can only be amended by

three-fourths of the deputies in Parliament. Since the record shows that it has taken about thirty-nine years, from 1923 to 1962, to make a change, is there an illusion in anyone's mind here that within five or six years, for example, the Africans will somehow convince twenty-five out of fifty European deputies to change the government into a government of an African majority? Most certainly that is an illusion which cannot be realized. If the record had shown the existence of a process of bringing more and more Africans into the government, that argument would have been more valid. As it stands, this is the first time, from 1923 until the present, that fifteen seats are supposed to go to Africans. But even as regards that point, it is not so. When one analyses the qualifications required in order to be able to vote it is not true that all fifteen seats will go to Africans. That being the case, I do not believe it is a fair argument to say that very soon Africans will have the majority government in their territory and therefore it is not necessary to do anything now. This would have been a fair argument if the Africans had thirty-five seats and the Europeans had twenty. One could then say that perhaps in another two or three years this would come about. But it is exactly the other way round. Therefore, before we take a vote, I believe it is very important to take these points into account.

68. As regards the argument that because the United Kingdom had a good record in West Africa and in other parts of Africa the difficulty in Southern Rhodesia would somehow disappear, I submit that that argument would have been a good one if it had been made in a relative way. For example, if Kenya were to become independent in two months' time and if there were no further difficulties, one could fairly cite that argument in regard to another territory of a similar nature. But to say that because the United Kingdom has a good record in Nigeria—which is totally different from Southern Rhodesia—because it has a good record in Ghana and because it has a good record in India or in other parts of Asia nothing should be said here and no criticism should be offered with regard to the matter, that again is not really a fair argument. No one has said that the records of the United Kingdom in these territories are not good. What we say is that in this particular case the measures taken are not in accordance with the obligations assumed under the Charter. That being the case, the argument that "our record in other territories has been good and that in another fifteen, twenty, thirty or two hundred years it is going to be good in this territory, and therefore nothing should be said" is really an argument which we cannot accept. These are the observations which I wished to make. I am convinced that the draft resolution which we have the honour to co-sponsor contains nothing radical; indeed it is drafted in such a way as to help the situation and not to endanger it in any way whatsoever.

69. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I give the floor to the representative of Bulgaria in exercise of his right of reply.

70. Mr. TCHOBANOV (Bulgaria) (translated from French): I am fully aware how late it is, and do not wish to prolong our debate, considering how very tired all members of the Assembly are after the considerable amount of work they have had to dispose of during the past three weeks. I shall therefore merely say a few words in reply to a number of allegations the United Kingdom representative made in his statement.

I shall try to do so without allowing myself to be carried away by emotion and without employing extreme language of the kind the United Kingdom representative indulged in so freely. So I shall use no words similar to those which we have heard and no expressions such as, for example, cynicism, hypocrisy, effrontery, etc.; a balance will thus be restored.

71. I shall start by protesting against the United Kingdom representative's new attempt to make us believe in the myth, the legend that the colonialists, in their generosity, have granted independence of their own free will to a number of their colonial possessions. A most thankless task, surely, since it would mean wiping out the entire history of the colonial peoples' struggles for national emancipation with a single stroke of the pen.

72. Let me tell you of an experience of mine. About fifteen years ago, in 1948 if I remember rightly, I was attending an international conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union. A representative of the United Kingdom tactlessly tried to propound the theory of the generous colonialist granting independence, ostensibly as an act of charity, to a colonial people. The representative of India, an old man of some seventy-five years of age at the time, mounted the platform to reply, and said the following: "Look at me, Gentlemen; I am seventy-five years old, and started fighting for the independence of my country against British domination when I was sixteen. So I have fought this fight for about sixty years; and during that period I spent twenty-five years in British prisons."

73. There are a number of champions of national independence against colonial domination, not only in India and Asia in general, but also in Africa, and in Black Africa in particular. You will remember, for example, the events of about ten years ago in Kenya. I therefore consider defending this untenable theory to be a very thankless task, and do not understand how people can still try to do it. I am very sorry they do.

74. Secondly, the United Kingdom representative's statement sounded a number of cold war notes: it was a new attempt, and a somewhat clumsy one in my view, to justify the oppression inflicted on millions of inhabitants of colonial possessions under United Kingdom domination. In true cold war style, the United Kingdom representative tried to pull the wool over our eyes; when he speaks of Central Europe or Eastern Europe, for example, one might wonder whether even if what he says were true it would justify the colonial oppression practised by the United Kingdom imperialists. I think everyone would answer no. According to this cold war cliché, the establishment of a socialist social and economic system in a number of Eastern European countries was due only to military action by the Soviet armed forces.

75. So far as my own country is concerned, I should like to remind the United Kingdom representative and the members of this Assembly of a number of facts which are recorded in the archives of the Foreign Office and are therefore accessible to the United Kingdom representative. If he examined these archives, he would see that the political force now guiding my country's life, the Bulgarian Communist Party, won a very high percentage of votes over a period of almost forty years, until the last constitutional elections held before the fascist coup d'état at that time. In 1932, thirty years ago, when it was still underground, it managed to participate indirectly in the electoral campaign, and won a majority in the capital of Bul-

garia. Thus there is one thing which, in cold war style, attempts are made to ignore: the fact that socialist régime in Eastern European countries came as the product of a struggle which lasted for decades and which brought to power strong popular movements that had been fighting for more than a quarter of a century to achieve the régime established in these countries after the Second World War.

76. The Soviet army made a great contribution to the liberation of these countries from Nazi domination; but that applies not only to the socialist countries of Eastern Europe. Did the Soviet armed forces not make some contribution to the liberation of Norway and Denmark? Has it been forgotten that at the critical moment when the second front was finally opened in 1944, after several years of delay, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Churchill, made a desperate appeal to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, asking him to accelerate the offensive in order to extricate the British troops from a very difficult situation? That, I think, was in August 1944. This, then, I repeat, is an established fact: Soviet armed forces made a great contribution to the liberation of many European countries from Nazi occupation; and that applies not only to the socialist countries of Eastern Europe, but also to Norway, Denmark, and even, to a large extent, to the United Kingdom.

77. The socialist social and economic systems now established in our countries were set up after a struggle carried on by powerful popular movements for several decades. I would also mention that in 1923 my country had the privilege of being the scene of an armed uprising—the first such uprising—against the fascist régime being established there. We were thus the first—allow me to boast of it—to oppose rising fascism with armed resistance.

78. That is all I have to say in reply to certain allegations made by the United Kingdom representative.

79. Since I am at the rostrum—I am perhaps taking advantage of the time allowed me—I should like to explain our draft amendments. We have withdrawn the second of these amendments.

80. The first amendment was open to misunderstanding, because of the translation into the other official languages. We therefore used an English expression—"one man, one vote"—which is employed as a slogan in political struggles. What is the meaning of the expression "one man, one vote" in our draft amendment? As I said in my earlier statement, we are using this expression to mean equality of voting and representation. There may perhaps be some difficulty in translating this English expression accurately into the other languages—French, Spanish and Russian. For this reason, I state now that it refers to the principle of equality of voting and representation. It is in this sense that we have used the expression in question.

81. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I ask the Assembly for its co-operation. I propose to call on the last speaker on the list of those wishing to exercise the right of reply, after which we shall pass on to explanations of votes.

82. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika): Mr. Nyerere has been quoted as paying a tribute to the way in which the United Kingdom Government has led its former dependencies, peacefully and without bloodshed, to independence. Be that as it may, my delegation craves the patience and indulgence of the General Assembly while

I quote at length Mr. Nyerere's statement on the situation in Southern Rhodesia. The situation in Southern Rhodesia is different from that which obtained in Tanganyika and also from that which obtained in Nigeria and Sierra Leone. It would be interesting to speculate on the line of action which Mr. Nyerere himself would have taken had he been faced with a situation such as obtains in Southern Rhodesia. Possibly the quotation that I am going to read may throw some light on his possible line of action. The quotation is from the Tanganyika Standard of Saturday, 28 April 1962. The headlines read: "Nyerere tells African nations 'Death better than humiliation'"; "United Kingdom action or bloodshed"; "Rhodesia leaders must be given rights". I shall now quote from the text of the article:

"An appeal to the British Government to support Mr. Kenneth Kaunda, Mr. Joshua Nkomo and Dr. Banda in obtaining their rights without being forced to resort to bloodshed was made by Mr. Nyerere, President of TANU, in Dar es Salaam yesterday. Mr. Nyerere told the TANU delegates in the conference that neither Mr. Kaunda, Mr. Nkomo nor Dr. Banda wanted war. They did not wish to shed blood and hoped they would obtain their rights without resorting to this. But if the British shattered these hopes and there was no other way of obtaining their rights, then 'if these brothers of ours do not shed blood they are cowards'. 'And if other countries of Africa do not help them get their independence, then they are countries of cowards. If a human being cannot obtain his personal rights it is better to die than remain in humiliation.'

"Mr. Nyerere said the British knew Mr. Kaunda. 'When did he ever say he would like to fight a war?' he asked. 'Why should they force him to?'

"Mr. Nyerere went on: 'I appeal to the British not to force Kenneth Kaunda, Joshua Nkomo and Dr. Banda. I do not think there are many Europeans in Central Africa who want to shed blood.' Then he continued: 'There is one drunken, crazy man down there, Roy Welensky, who is shouting vainly and who is almost the same as those Frenchmen in the OAS. My hopes are that if Roy Welensky is following the OAS the British will hunt him down as the French are hunting the OAS.'

"Earlier Mr. Nyerere had said he was glad the British had now agreed that the problems of Southern and Northern Rhodesia should be brought before the United Nations, where he hoped Tanganyika would be of some help. But the fact that these problems were going to be brought before the United Nations in itself was not sufficient. 'It is no good for my friends the British to continue with their day-to-day sweet words if their actions themselves can bring danger', he declared. 'The British have one bad habit. In a place where there are no Europeans they are not worried, but if there are Europeans in a country the Britisher divides himself, particularly if the Europeans are many.'

"Mr. Nyerere said he was asking his brothers the British to stop hesitating over human rights just because Europeans were involved. 'It makes us think that Europeans are not human beings like others', he said. He said that the separation of European and non-European rights had caused a great deal of trouble in Algeria. There had been bloodshed there for

years, and he appealed to the British not to make another Algeria in Central Africa."

83. The United Kingdom should not try to shirk its moral leadership and constitutional responsibility in Southern Rhodesia. Precisely because the United Kingdom has been the champion of human freedom we hope that it is still a champion of fundamental human rights. That is why it is all the more astonishing that the United Kingdom should take the present kind of attitude with regard to the situation in Southern Rhodesia. It is precisely because of that that those of us who are friends of the United Kingdom would like to see it continue to play the role of a champion of freedom and of respect for fundamental human rights.

84. Most of the white settlers in Southern Rhodesia are kith and kin of the British and the United Kingdom can therefore undoubtedly influence the situation there in a constructive manner to a considerable extent. It is obvious that Southern Rhodesia is not yet an independent and sovereign State and, because it is not represented here, the United Kingdom delegation is defending its position there. Therefore, without attempting to unravel the intricacies of the constitutional practices and conventions that have been presented to the Assembly, it takes no great amount of imagination to see that the United Kingdom has a tremendous amount of constitutional responsibility in Southern Rhodesia.

85. There is no doubt that the United Kingdom is faced with a complex situation. In a sense, it is perhaps the gravest in all its history as a colonial Power. In another sense, it is also a magnificent opportunity. If I may so suggest, this can be the finest hour of British history, one in which the United Kingdom can demonstrate that it remains a champion of human freedom and that it will continue to support fundamental human rights.

86. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We have now heard all those wishing to exercise the right of reply, and we shall go on to hear explanations of votes before the voting. If the Assembly has no objection, in order to expedite our work, I shall call only on the six speakers who may wish to explain their votes.

It was so decided.

87. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The USSR delegation has not so far had an opportunity to explain its position on the draft resolution recommended for consideration by the Assembly [A/5124, annex III]. In the general debate it dealt with a number of important points, but did not express its position with respect to this proposal. It, therefore, thought it necessary to explain its vote both on the draft resolution and on the proposed amendment.

88. The USSR delegation considers that the draft resolution submitted by a number of African and Asian countries on the question of Southern Rhodesia is very moderate and, one might even say, mild in its terms. This document, taken by itself, does not give even an inkling of the whole picture of colossal tension, of the seething nationalist movement in the country and of the desire of the peoples of Southern Rhodesia for liberation, which have been described from this rostrum by the representatives of Southern Rhodesia's brother nations—the African States, by a number of Asian representatives, and just now so expressively and persuasively by the speaker who

has just left this rostrum, the representative of Tanganyika.

89. Thus, if we consider the draft resolution in the light of the situation in Southern Rhodesia as we find it, and as we must find it here in the United Nations, it is evident that a number of points and ideas could be introduced into the draft that would lend the practical proposals made in it greater force and significance.

90. After carefully examining the document and studying the statements by the representatives of the African countries, in particular, at plenary meetings of the Assembly, we have come to the conclusions that, although a number of the provisions in this draft resolution are not worded as they should be and as the situation in the country would demand, this document nevertheless represents a highly important step which, as the representative of Tanganyika has just said, to quote that representative once again, the General Assembly and the United Nations should take in a last attempt to make the United Kingdom Government understand that our Organization will not tolerate the situation which has now arisen there, that it will not overlook the situation and that, whether the United Kingdom co-operates and carries out a number of measures with a good will or whether it withholds its good will, it will take the necessary steps to compel the Government of that country through force of public opinion—that moral force which our Organization possesses—to liquidate this bastion of colonialism, one of the last that remains in Africa.

91. We interpret the provision in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution under which the Special Committee is requested to continue its constructive efforts towards the earliest implementation of resolution 1514 (XV) with regard to Southern Rhodesia in order to ensure its emergence into an independent African State as a directive to this Committee not to relax its efforts to enable Southern Rhodesia to become a new independent African State by the end of 1962.

92. Realizing that these problems cannot be fully solved at this time and that the question of Southern Rhodesia will have to be considered again by the Special Committee and by the General Assembly at its seventeenth session, the USSR delegation is prepared to support this draft resolution at the present time. It does not share the misgivings or objections which have been expressed with regard to this proposal here in the present Assembly.

93. I need hardly say that the provisions of the draft resolution do not endanger or in any way adversely affect the national liberation of the people of Southern Rhodesia, as the United Kingdom representative has tried to claim. On the contrary, the adoption of this proposal and the execution of these measures should lead to the national liberation of the people of Southern Rhodesia and the establishment of a new African State in accordance with the programme outlined in the document.

94. We do not and cannot agree at this late stage with the assertions that have been made that the Assembly is not competent to take decision in the matter. The question of competence is very important, of course, if it arises and if it has the slightest foundation in fact.

95. We must point out that, as the Ethiopian representative said a moment ago, the arguments put forward on this issue contain nothing new. We might add that we have heard the same ideas concerning com-

petence over and over again during the consideration of many colonial problems in plenary meetings of the General Assembly and, in general, within this building. The same arguments have been repeated many times by the representative of South Africa, by the representative of France in connexion with Algeria, by the representative of Portugal, and on other occasions when the General Assembly and the United Nations have begun to take a vigorous line on colonial problems.

96. Since the Soviet delegation analysed all the legal arguments at length in its principal statement [1110th meeting], in view of the fact that no new points have been made, it need not now go into that part of the statement in question which was designed to shake the determination of the USSR and other delegations to vote for this draft resolution.

97. In passing, I should like to say that the USSR delegation greatly appreciates the touching interest shown by Sir Patrick Dean in the Russian classics. It is confident that the United Kingdom representative's interest will extend not only to Russian literature but also to some forms of Russian fine art. After the conclusion of the debate on the question of Southern Rhodesia, when the United Kingdom representative will have more time at his disposal, we recommend him to take a look at the pictures of some Russian artists which (in contrast to his quotations from Russian literature which are irrelevant to the question under consideration) have a direct bearing on what we might describe as our theme. We would like to draw the United Kingdom representative's attention to a picture by a very talented Russian artist, Vereshchagin, who on one of his unforgettable canvases depicted reprisals taken by the British against the heroes of the national freedom movement in India. Many representatives know this canvas: it depicts living people bound to cannon and awaiting execution solely because they rose in defence of their fatherland and their national liberation.

98. We commend such an example of Russian national art to the attention of the United Kingdom representative. Because of the great talent of the artist who created it, this unforgettable picture does not belong to the Russian nation alone.

99. We should like to say a few words about the amendment [A/L.387] introduced by the Bulgarian representative to the draft resolution [A/L.386/Rev.1] before the Assembly. We believe that all representatives of States present here who uphold the policy of universal and equal suffrage—an idea which is not the property of any one State system or nation but the universal property of mankind and which contributes undoubted evidence of the progress mankind has achieved as a result of its political and social development—will support the principle of universal and equal suffrage enunciated in the short phrase: "one man, one vote", and that not a single hand will be raised in this hall against this democratic principle.

100. We appeal to all delegations here to see that this important phrase is added to the draft resolution before us, because—and I wish to conclude on this point—we cannot agree with the doctrine of racial discrimination which has been openly preached from this rostrum in an endeavour to prove to us that it is necessary to take gradual steps, a first, second, third, fourth and so on. And no one knows how many steps and how much time are needed (if, indeed, any term

is insight) to put the indigenous inhabitants, the matters of their own country, on a footing of equality with the newcomers who, making use of their strength and the advantages this gives them, have enslaved the overwhelming majority of the people of this country.

101. We cannot agree with such an approach, with the adoption of one attitude for one category of people, and a different attitude for another category. That is why we consider that the requests made by the political parties of Southern Rhodesia and supported here by many African and Asian countries will be met by the adoption of this amendment to the draft resolution. We shall vote for the Bulgarian amendment.

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

102. Mr. GARCIA DEL SOLAR (Argentina) (translated from Spanish): During the general debate on Southern Rhodesia, a number of Latin American speakers have expressed their point of view on the problem before us. Those speakers treated the question from different standpoints, but they were all clearly and unequivocally in agreement on the substance of the question. Latin-American solidarity with the concerns of the African peoples is absolute, and Argentina, like the other countries of our area, views Africa's struggle for the independence of its peoples and the complete abolition of practices conflicting with the full exercise of human rights as though it were its own. This feeling prevails throughout America as a legacy of its own historical development.

103. The general debate on Southern Rhodesia has been constructive in its scope and conclusive in its outcome. A great majority of Member States have confirmed that, in general, the conclusions reached by the Special Committee in its report [A/5124] correctly reflect developments in Southern Rhodesia.

104. It is only necessary to read the Constitution of 6 December 1961 to see that it hampers the democratic process of that Territory's accession to full independence and that it also has features involving blatant recognition of an inadmissible practice: racial discrimination.

105. But this debate has also shown us that the constitutional development of Southern Rhodesia cannot take the course we desire without the active cooperation of the United Kingdom. The requests made in the draft resolution presented by some forty countries [A/L.386/Rev.1] are addressed to that country alone. Since we must come to an understanding with the United Kingdom, the Argentine delegation feels it proper to say that the representative of that country has maintained an honourable attitude throughout this debate. While firmly defending his Government's legal position, he has also succeeded in giving us the feeling that the United Kingdom is fully aware of its immense responsibility, its inescapable responsibility to exert its influence by every means in its power with a view to ensuring that the Southern Rhodesian authorities grant every one of that Territory's inhabitants without exception his inherent rights, as called for by a great majority of the United Nations.

106. This is not the first test of the United Kingdom's willingness to assume the obligations imposed by the historic times in which we live. Evidence of its wise support of the cause of decolonization is to be seen in this hall, where the representatives of many countries

which have attained full independence with its co-operation are seated.

107. The draft resolution will be approved by a large majority. The Argentine Republic welcomes this fact, and hopes that the provisions of the resolution will be implemented without delay.

108. Freedom cannot be delayed. However, in the belief that it can only be achieved at this stage of events with the participation of the United Kingdom, my delegation has decided to abstain from voting in order to give the sole executor of the draft resolution a deserved vote of confidence and a stimulus to fulfil the task assigned to it by this Assembly.

Mr. Mongi Slim (Tunisia) resumed the Chair.

109. Mr. USHER (Ivory Coast) (translated from French): My delegation, which took part in preparing the draft resolution, wishes to explain its vote, not on the draft resolution, but on the amendment in document A/L.387. The draft resolution is in fact a moderate one which nevertheless expresses our fundamental concern, namely, the application of democracy and universal suffrage in Southern Rhodesia. The proposed amendment to insert the words "on the basis of 'one man, one vote'" may be regarded as strengthening that idea. The problem with which we are faced still is the difficulty caused by the new Constitution of Southern Rhodesia, which provides some fifty seats for one-tenth of the population and only fifteen seats, or even less, for the other nine-tenths of the population.

110. In those circumstances, the question my delegation asks is how a country like the United Kingdom, which we readily recognize as an old democracy, can even consent to be a party to the discussion of such a Constitution—I would even say, how it can grant such a Constitution.

111. The United Kingdom representative has told us that it represented a step. So far as I am concerned, that only confuses me even more. How indeed can the country whose Prime Minister coined that now historic phrase "the wind of change is blowing through Africa" speak of a step? Does he think that the wind which is blowing is a mere breeze, and not a hurricane? I think that those who persist in this idea should consult the weather bureau again, for they will be unpleasantly surprised if they thought that it was only a breeze.

112. Do you think that Africans in 1962 can be contented with a mere step? I believe this is an error which may have very serious consequences. We have spoken of universal suffrage in the draft resolution recommended by the Special Committee [A/5124, annex III]; it may be thought that the phrase "one man, one vote" is repetitious, but my delegation feels that it should be accepted because it reinforces the idea of universal suffrage. It is also found in many constitutions where the authors wish to emphasize the importance of universal suffrage. Thus, the statement that consultations will take place by universal suffrage on the basis of "one man, one vote" lends added weight to the Constitution.

113. I deeply regret that the second proposed amendment has been withdrawn because I feel that the United Kingdom cannot disclaim responsibility in the matter. If the United Kingdom really says that it is not responsible, I shall be compelled to think that the United Nations should assume that country's role. It would indeed be impossible to leave three million unarmed

Africans at the mercy of a minority of settlers which controls a parliament and an army, as was confirmed just now by the United Kingdom representative himself, and which intends to form an autonomous State not belonging to any international community and not observing international law. It is quite obvious to anyone familiar with the history of colonization and with the mentality and psychology of the settlers, who offered fierce resistance to the abolition of slavery and even fiercer opposition to the abolition of forced labour and who continue to oppose any decolonization in a truly diabolical manner through a policy of extermination and of systematic destruction of the basic social structure and everything connected with culture, that to leave a people in the hands of such hot-headed settlers can lead only to disaster and utter desolation. The United Kingdom must not and cannot abandon these people; it must not evade its responsibility.

114. The United Kingdom is said to be a country which bases itself on practices and conventions rather than on rigid laws. That maybe so, but there are some bad conventions, and this is one that should not be perpetuated.

115. South West Africa is not a success. I shall not speak of South Africa, Mr. President, to avoid giving anyone occasion to exercise his right of replying and prolonging the debate. But I think the example is instructive. It is a case where this convention has failed, and the United Kingdom should not consent to its perpetuation. It is an abominable convention; the United Kingdom must renounce and abandon it, if it truly believes that it should not continue to follow it.

116. Nevertheless, I shall not reintroduce the amendment, for the sole reason that the United Kingdom would be left little time to call another constitutional conference and to report to us about it in September. But we rely on the United Kingdom and believe it will understand the difficulties and anxieties of Africans.

117. Mr. WACHUKU (Nigeria): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on the amendment [A/L.387] submitted by the delegation of Bulgaria. In order to give a true and accurate picture of the position in the light of the discussion that has taken place in this august Assembly, I shall also comment on the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom, since he referred specifically to something which was said by the Prime Minister of Nigeria.

118. First, I would say that the co-sponsors of the draft resolution now before the Assembly [A/L.386/Rev.1 and Add.1-4] formulated paragraph 2 (a) after very careful consideration. It will be remembered that the Special Committee of seventeen members appointed a Sub-Committee on Southern Rhodesia. That Sub-Committee made a report, which is annex I to the report of the full Committee [A/5124]. I should like to read out the following from the Sub-Committee's report:

"The Sub-Committee considers it necessary, in the larger interests of Southern Rhodesia and in the interests of peace and freedom in Africa and on a broad consideration of the United Kingdom's own responsibilities and record, that the same processes which went into the making of the proposals now embodied in the constitutional enactment of 6 December 1961 should be initiated again without delay to bring about the necessary reconsideration of these proposals in full consultation with the leaders of all political parties. Only thus can emerge a constitu-

tion for Southern Rhodesia guaranteeing full democratic freedom and equality of political rights and ensuring constructive and harmonious co-operation between the various elements of the Southern Rhodesian population"—

and this is a very relevant portion of the report:

"It is not for the Sub-Committee to say what the basis of an agreed constitution should be, but so that any constitutional advance may have a chance of success, it must be based on the acceptance of the principles of equality and non-discrimination and must secure the agreement of the majority of the population." [A/5124, annex I, para. 43.]

119. I think that it is our purpose in this Assembly to make proposals that stand a chance of being accepted by all concerned, proposals that all elements involved in the matter will be able to accept as a basis of compromise. It is not our purpose to make the price so high that those concerned may not be prepared to pay it. Hence, to spell out things in the way proposed in the present amendment may not, in my considered opinion, achieve the objective intended by the sponsor of the amendment.

120. I should like to express to the Bulgarian delegation our appreciation of its sincerity in putting forward the amendment. However, I would call attention to the existing factors, to the opinion of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution, and to the portion of the Sub-Committee's report which I have read out. Surely there must have been a reason why the co-sponsors of the draft resolution did not think it necessary to spell out these matters in the way proposed in the Bulgarian amendment. I ask the Bulgarian delegation to have confidence in the good sense of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution and in their sincerity. I am sure that everyone knows full well that the nationalism of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution can never be in doubt in matters of this kind. I would appeal to the Bulgarian delegation, taking full account of the statements that have been made here, to withdraw its amendment so that the Assembly may proceed to the vote and adopt the draft resolution.

121. We have all heard the statement which has been made by the United Kingdom delegation on the matter now under debate. Although that delegation has said that the General Assembly has no right to interfere and that its proposals could not be implemented, we know full well on the basis of the United Kingdom's tradition that it will examine the documents very carefully and will weigh the opinions expressed here. I am sure that certain changes will be made, changes that will improve conditions. I therefore do not attach too pessimistic an importance to the remarks made by the representative of the United Kingdom. He made a case for his Government; he was bound to do so; no one would have expected him to come to this rostrum and accept everything that had been said, like a lamb being led to the slaughter.

122. I remember, as I am sure other representatives do, that at one stage in this debate we were told that the United Kingdom Government had no responsibility in the matter, that conditions in Southern Rhodesia were an internal affair and that, therefore, there could be no interference. But I should like to refer Members of the Assembly to a very interesting report which appeared in the The New York Times on Sunday, 24 June 1962. This was a report of a statement made by Mr. R. A. Butler, the Minister now responsible for

Central African Affairs, in which he said that the United Kingdom has the responsibility in Southern Rhodesia. The article in The New York Times is headed "Britain is adamant on Central Africa", and it reads as follows:

"London, June 23. Britain in effect told the United Nations General Assembly today that she had no intention of delegating her responsibilities in Central Africa to 'any outside body'.

"Replying to the Assembly's debate over the constitutional status of Southern Rhodesia, R. A. Butler, the Home Secretary, said: 'It is our responsibility and we have the knowledge and experience to discharge it.'

"Mr. Butler, who is the Minister responsible for Central African Affairs, spoke firmly in a speech in his own constituency at Saffron Walden, Essex, of Britain's role in Central Africa, especially Southern Rhodesia.

"As you know,' he said, 'I have just been there myself.'

"Mr. Butler declared that the special problem in the Rhodesias was the presence of long-established European populations.

"We cannot and should not ignore the claims of these minorities,' he said, 'and it is Britain's job to find how best to reconcile the obvious differences of colour and race and to build contented multiracial communities where individual merit alone is the criterion for man's advancement.'

"I do not underrate the difficulties,' he added, 'but we will brook no intimidation or violence by political extremists.'"

123. It is quite clear that even now, after having gone to Southern Rhodesia, Mr. Butler is in line with us. Mr. Butler's statement is consistent with what we have been saying throughout this debate.

124. I repeat that I listened carefully to the statement of the United Kingdom representative. He had to make a case for his Government. He has to be consistent with the arguments which were put forward in the Special Committee. But changes are already taking place. There is a recognition that the situation cannot be static; it must change—and I am certain that it will change. I am sure that everyone will take into account that the majority of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution represent African States, that the African continent is ours, and that we cannot shirk our responsibilities.

125. The continent is ours, and it should also be a haven for all friendly countries, all friendly States. We cannot come to this Assembly and say that that continent is not ours. The Africans own the continent, they are to determine ultimately the future of that continent. If all of them have decided that this line of action should be taken, I am positively certain that the United Kingdom will not fail to heed the views of the African States, if it does not heed anyone else.

126. Again we were told by the United Kingdom representative here that the real issue is whether the United Kingdom can interfere in the internal affairs of Southern Rhodesia or not. He then went on to tell us what the United Kingdom had done. But the fact that it had had to interfere in the changing of the Constitution shows us that constitutional changes are not internal affairs, but are in fact external affairs. Therefore,

all that the draft resolution is asking is that the United Kingdom, in bringing about changes in the constitutional structure, should have a certain regard for certain views, principles and policies. We are not asking it to interfere in the day-to-day working of Southern Rhodesia; we are here telling it to do what in fact it has the right to do under the law and the Constitution, and not to transfer that right because the new documents want to transfer this very power to the Southern Rhodesian Government, which is a Government of the minority. That is the objection of the Nationalists, "Do not give them this responsibility unless you associate us fully in the whole process of change; that is all we are asking for". We are not asking the United Kingdom to do what it has no competence to do. This is in fact within its competence, and that is why we are pressing that it should be done.

127. When the United Kingdom representative spoke, he laid emphasis on the changes that had been made by Sir Edgar Whitehead—the Government of Sir Edgar Whitehead—and on the theme that if he wins the next election he will not look back. But I wanted to hear the United Kingdom representative say that the Government that would be elected by the people of Southern Rhodesia—it may be Sir Edgar Whitehead's of Mr. Nkomo's—would be the Government, but no reference at all was made to Mr. Nkomo or to the African Nationalists. That is why we object. Why should it be Sir Edgar Whitehead and no one else? What right has he to be the only one to be considered there? He is the leader of the minority, and that is what we object to in this Assembly. Why should the United Kingdom Government assume that Sir Edgar Whitehead will win the election if the Constitution is put in its proper form? That is what we object to.

128. I now come to the reference to my country that was made in the particular case. That is why I have been saying that the British should now live up to their traditions. In my country at no time were political parties banned; but Mr. Nkomo's party was banned. He has had to change his name many times. They banned and confiscated the property of one party. Mr. Nkomo changed his name, they chased him around, he became a gypsy, a wanderer going from one country to another soliciting aid. There was no such situation in our country. That is exactly why such a situation, which now exists in Southern Rhodesia, should be abolished and abrogated; this should be done so that the normal process may be applied. Let us be consistent. If Nigeria is to be used as a pattern, if the tribute that the Prime Minister of Nigeria has paid to the United Kingdom is to be mentioned, then everything that follows it must be acknowledged; that is what we are saying. The pattern that existed in Nigeria must also exist in Southern Rhodesia. Otherwise we are compelled and forced to say, "Thus far and no further". The Prime Minister of Nigeria stood at this rostrum in all sincerity, and in truth he paid a deserved tribute to the United Kingdom Government. I myself, as the Foreign Minister of Nigeria, representing that same Government, have come to this rostrum in all sincerity and truth in this similar sense, to point out to the United Kingdom things that we think are wrong; and we have suggested a way out. I should like the United Kingdom—in the same way that our Prime Minister was quoted and a tribute paid to him—because the United Kingdom believes in the truth, sincerity and honesty of his purpose—to have confidence in us, have confidence that we are sincere, that we are

genuine, that we are truthful and that we understand what we are talking about.

129. We have not come here just to make a statement for the sake of making one; we have not come here just to please anyone. We have submitted a concrete proposal that we think will work. Some people are afraid to declare friendship for what they call colonial Powers and imperial Powers. We are not afraid of that. We know what is good and, when we find a thing that is good, we say that it is good; if we find anything is wrong, they we say that it is wrong. That is the essence of our independence, and we are not going to be led by the nose by anyone.

130. I take this opportunity to appeal once again to the representative of the United Kingdom to advise his Government to heed the plea of representatives in this Assembly. Otherwise, if this appeal is not heeded and something else happens, the United Kingdom Government will have itself to blame. Our position in Nigeria was different politically. We had no settled minorities, we were quite different economically. You have to visit Nigeria today to see the conditions under which the Nigerians live; economically different levels of life were established. But that is not the position in Southern Rhodesia. Educationally and socially, the Southern Rhodesians cannot produce the same number of persons that we can produce in Nigeria or in west Africa. We are asking that the same climate that was created in west Africa should be created in Southern Rhodesia and that it should be possible for the two divergent elements to come together. The reason why we ask the United Kingdom Government to continue to interfere is because we wish it to be a guiding light, to bring about a balance, to try to bring the parties together. What is wrong with that? Nothing at all. But if we come here to play politics for the sake of playing politics and forget the realities of human nature and the day-to-day occurrences in this place, we have ourselves to blame. I think that the British are mature enough to appreciate the points that are being made in this Assembly. This is not the time to forget the future. I think that we should think of the years ahead, not what might have happened in the past. We do remember those things and we take them as part of history, but we do not want to inculcate these things and put them into the souls of the younger generation. But if it is the wish of the British to continue with that old practice and subject themselves to abuses and insults by a people, one way or the other, and forget and harden the hearts of would-be friendly countries, particularly on the African continent, they have themselves to blame.

131. My own purpose in making the statement I have made here is to let the United Kingdom representative know that Nigeria is 100 per cent behind the nationalists of Southern Rhodesia. We will not falter in discharging our responsibility to the Africans, but we are not going to be dragooned by anyone because of ideological differences. We recognize the human factors, human frailties and human failure, and we intend that there shall be peaceful and orderly development in that part of the continent. We still stand by our proposals and hope that the United Kingdom delegation will heed them.

132. I take this opportunity once more to appeal to the Bulgarian delegation to withdraw its amendment [A/L.387]. If, in spite of this appeal, it does not do so I regret that my delegation will be obliged to abstain from voting on the amendment because those who drafted the original resolution [A/L.386/Rev.1 and

Add.1-4] did so after careful consideration, with deep thought and with a desire to achieve the objectives which all of us have as our purpose here. I sincerely hope that no delegation will do anything to obstruct the adoption of this draft resolution.

133. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I have two more speakers on my list who wish to explain

their votes before the voting. However, in view of the late hour and in response to a number of requests I have received, I declare this meeting adjourned. The next meeting of the General Assembly will be held at 3 p.m.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.