

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1368th  
MEETING**

Wednesday, 31 October 1962,  
at 3.20 p.m.



**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	Page
<i>Agenda item 56:</i>	
<i>Question of Southern Rhodesia: report of the Special Committee established under General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVI) (continued) . . . . .</i>	255
<i>Consideration of draft resolution A/C.4/L.750 (concluded). . . . .</i>	255
<i>Hearing of petitioners (continued) . . . . .</i>	257

**Chairman:** Mr. Guillermo FLORES AVENDAÑO  
(Guatemala).

**AGENDA ITEM 56**

**Question of Southern Rhodesia: report of the Special Committee established under General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVI) (A/5238, chap. II; A/C.4/560, A/C.4/561, A/C.4/564, A/C.4/565, A/C.4/568, A/C.4/569; A/C.4/L.750) (continued)**

1. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that no decision had been taken concerning the request made by Mr. Enoch Dumbutshena for an additional hearing. Since the Committee had already decided to hear explanations of votes at the beginning of the meeting, he suggested that Mr. Dumbutshena should be heard after those explanations had been given.

*It was so decided.*

2. Mr. BOEG (Denmark), speaking on a point of order, proposed that the full text of the statement by Sir Edgar Whitehead, Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia, at the previous meeting should be circulated as a Committee document.

*It was so decided. 1/*

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION A/C.4/L.750 (concluded)**

3. Mr. BARATA (Portugal) said it had been solely out of a desire to co-operate with the Chairman that his delegation had not protested immediately against certain improper statements made by some persons whom the Committee had heard in the capacity of petitioners. While his delegation appreciated their special circumstances, the emotion by which they were inspired and their necessarily limited knowledge of matters outside their immediate experience, it did not think that those factors justified the abusive language they had employed. He hoped that the views of some representatives regarding the respect which petitioners owed to the Committee would in future be shared by all.

<sup>1/</sup> See A/C.4/571/Add.1.

4. Some of the persons heard in the capacity of petitioners had tried to implicate Portugal in the policies pursued in Southern Rhodesia, and certain representatives had made reference to what they had described as an "unholy alliance" between Portugal and other countries in Africa. Their inability to furnish details bore witness to the irresponsibility of their statements. In order, however, to dispel any possible doubt, his delegation wished to state categorically that the assertions made in the Committee were wholly without foundation and that Portugal and its neighbours in central and southern African merely had normal and cordial relations, as was fully understandable in view of their common frontiers.

5. His country, which was resolutely opposed to all forms of racial discrimination, endorsed the principle of non-racialism and of government by the ablest—which had been defended by most of the speakers in the general debate. The draft resolution approved by the Committee at the previous meeting (A/C.4/L.750, as revised) had, however, contained ideas which did not accord with the goal which his delegation considered the United Nations should pursue in the light of the provisions of the Charter; it had therefore been unable to vote in favour of that proposal.

6. Mr. GONZALEZ CALVO (Guatemala) observed that his country's stand in the matter of colonialism and neo-colonialism was well-known and did not require restatement.

7. The general debate and the information supplied by the petitioners had shed light on the manner in which Southern Rhodesia was being governed and on the disenfranchised status of the indigenous inhabitants. It had been shown beyond the shadow of a doubt that Southern Rhodesia was a Non-Self-Governing Territory and that the United Kingdom was responsible for its administration. His delegation therefore thought that the draft resolution approved by the Committee had quite properly included a request to the United Kingdom to take certain steps to improve the condition of the African inhabitants and enable them to take part in the public life of the country. He hoped that there would be no recourse to desperate acts in Southern Rhodesia and that the relevant General Assembly resolutions, in particular resolution 1514 (XV), would be applied in the Territory so that its people could attain freedom and independence.

8. It was for those reasons that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution.

9. Mr. McINTYRE (Australia) said that although the sponsors had admittedly made a genuine effort to avoid extreme demands, the text approved by the Committee was not the kind of resolution needed to meet the present situation in Southern Rhodesia.

10. The petitioners' testimony and the statements by Sir Edgar Whitehead, the Prime Minister of

Southern Rhodesia, who could not have failed to impress the Committee with his obviously sincere belief in the rightness and ultimate success of his cause even though many members of the Committee might doubt his capacity to carry out the enlightened and liberal intentions he had proclaimed, went to show that that situation was considerably more complex than some members of the Committee seemed prepared to recognize. It was quite clear that opinion in Southern Rhodesia ranged from the extreme wing of European thought to extreme nationalism. The Zimbabwe African Peoples Union (ZAPU) clearly had a very substantial following among the Africans. His delegation could not escape the impression that the more extreme elements of that party, in their efforts to bring about complete conformity in African opinion, had resorted to methods which were anything but democratic. At the same time, there were other ZAPU leaders who had not yet abandoned hope of a peaceful and reasonable compromise. Although the members of the so-called multiracial independent group of petitioners had not made statements or answered questions in the way that many members of the Committee liked to hear, and although it was easy enough to dismiss them as Government stooges, his delegation felt that the courage displayed by the group, and particularly by its African members, in appearing before the Committee demonstrated that strength of conviction was not the monopoly of any particular group in Southern Rhodesia. The appearance of those petitioners before the Committee would also have served the useful purpose of demonstrating to them the strength of international opinion as reflected in the United Nations. His delegation was convinced that the members of the multiracial independent group were sincerely and genuinely anxious to overcome the deep mistrust which so plainly threatened peace and progress in their country. That mistrust was the most dangerous ailment from which Southern Rhodesia was suffering, and the main concern of the United Nations should be to determine whether a resolution would do anything to restore a climate of confidence.

11. Speaking on behalf of the delegation of a country which had played a major part in the drafting of Chapter XI of the Charter in 1945, he could say with confidence that the text approved by the Committee at its previous meeting went beyond not only the provisions but also the original intent of that Chapter in so far as the question of competence was concerned.

12. Furthermore, and apart from the question of the propriety of asking the Acting Secretary-General to intervene in the terms used in the draft resolution, his delegation had serious doubts as to whether the text as a whole would help to promote the mutual confidence which was so obviously lacking. He feared that in the prevailing circumstances the resolution might serve only to encourage extremism at both ends of the political spectrum and bring the parties in Southern Rhodesia closer to the point of no return which, he was convinced, had not yet been reached.

13. His delegation whole-heartedly endorsed the plea made by all schools of thought in the Committee that progress in Southern Rhodesia should take place without bloodshed. If the United Nations sought to intervene in the Territory, it should do so with a full understanding of the problems involved and of the consequences of its actions, and without risking any further embitterment of relations.

14. The petitioners representing ZAPU had given his delegation ground for hope that the present leadership of the party might be tempted back into the paths of negotiation. There were also many European settlers who had come to think in terms of enlightened progress and mutual respect between the races. Moreover, he could refer the Committee to the statements by Sir Edgar Whitehead and the assurance given by the United Kingdom representative at the 1360th meeting that no decisions had been reached nor had any circumstances arisen which could give rise to any further change in the constitutional relationships between the United Kingdom and Southern Rhodesia, and that no future change in those relationships could be brought about by unilateral action. That assurance should be borne in mind in connexion with the Southern Rhodesian Government's decision to promulgate the new Constitution on 1 November 1962. His delegation believed that it was on hopeful facts such as those that the Fourth Committee should have based its draft resolution.

15. Mr. PASCUCCI-RIGHI (Italy) expressed regret that his delegation, after having refrained from participating in the general debate in view of the urgency of the question, should have been denied the opportunity to explain its vote on the draft resolution before it was put to the vote.

16. As he had said at the time of the adoption of resolution 1755 (XVII), the Italian delegation considered that decolonization should proceed as speedily as possible. With regard to the constitutional relationship between the United Kingdom and Southern Rhodesia, it did not consider that convincing evidence had been given in support of the United Kingdom's argument that it no longer had powers of intervention. Consequently, his delegation endorsed the draft resolution in principle, but believed that the text could have been improved if time had been granted for the submission of amendments. As it stood, the resolution would not necessarily improve the situation, and that was why Italy had felt bound to abstain in the vote.

17. Mr. ROS (Argentina) said that at the previous session of the General Assembly his delegation had abstained on resolution 1747 (XVI), because it had had confidence in the ability of the United Kingdom to find a just solution to the problem. However, the situation had since deteriorated. If progress was to be made, it was essential that all citizens should be able to participate in political life. Argentina had therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution approved at the previous meeting.

18. He attributed the greatest importance to operative paragraph 4 of that text. He was sure that the Acting Secretary-General would be able to contribute towards bringing about a just solution, and operative paragraph 4, as now worded, would give him sufficient freedom of action. He hoped that the Acting Secretary-General would receive full co-operation from the Governments of the United Kingdom and Southern Rhodesia as well as from the leaders of ZAPU.

19. Mr. ROBERTS (New Zealand) said that he had intended to give his delegation's views on the appropriateness of the draft resolution before the vote was taken. Having been denied the right to do so, he saw no purpose in setting out those views at the present stage.

20. Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Ireland) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because, on the whole, it agreed with the principles stated therein

and believed that it was on the basis of those principles that the problem of Southern Rhodesia would eventually be solved. However, his delegation reserved its position on the use of the expression "Administering Authority" in the final preambular paragraph and on the use of the word "immediate" throughout operative paragraph 3. The use of the term "Administering Authority" tended, in the Irish delegation's view, to obscure the constitutional and political realities, realities which must be taken into account if any effective and lasting solution was to be achieved. The use of the word "immediate" in operative paragraph 3 seemed to his delegation to be wholly unrealistic. Major political changes could only be brought about progressively and with the exercise of care and patience; they could not be made all at once without the risk of an upheaval which might do untold harm to the future of the Territory and the welfare of all its inhabitants. In view of the somewhat precipitate conclusion of the Committee's proceedings at the previous meeting, he would like the statement of his delegation's reservations to be fully reproduced in the summary record and to be reflected in the Committee's report to the General Assembly.

21. He had listened with considerable sympathy to the statement of Sir Edgar Whitehead. He believed that all races had a stake in the future of Southern Rhodesia, and he was satisfied that Sir Edgar and his supporters were sincere even if many of their policies were mistaken. He had also been impressed by the statements of the representatives of ZAPU. In view of the essential goodwill which was evident on both sides, he felt confident that the draft resolution approved by the Committee, especially with the revision of operative paragraph 4, would lead the way to favourable developments in the situation.

22. Mr. IBE (Nigeria), Rapporteur, explained that it would not be possible at the present stage to include the Irish delegation's reservations explicitly in the Committee's report. However, he had noted the statements of several representatives that they would have expressed reservations regarding the draft resolution had time allowed, and that position would be reflected in the report.

23. Mr. KNUDSEN (Norway) said that his delegation, as it had stated during the discussions on Southern Rhodesia at the previous session, was in favour of the introduction of a new constitution in Southern Rhodesia which would ensure the rights of the majority of the people in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter, and would be free from any form of racial discrimination. The Norwegian delegation had accordingly voted for resolution 1755 (XVII) as well as for the draft resolution adopted at the previous meeting. However, his delegation had certain reservations concerning the latter resolution. It believed that operative paragraph 4, even in its revised form, would not give the Acting Secretary-General the maximum opportunity for rendering useful assistance.

24. Mr. SAULNEROND (Gabon) said that his delegation was distressed at the situation in Southern Rhodesia and at the refusal of the United Kingdom, which was known for its liberal policies, to make any serious concession on the present issue. The delegation of Gabon firmly supported the principle of self-determination and wanted to see that principle applied in the territories still under colonial rule; that was why it supported the demand for the immediate implementation of the General Assembly's ear-

lier resolutions and the decision to keep the question of Southern Rhodesia on the Agenda agenda. He welcomed the changes which had been made in operative paragraph 4 in order to give the Acting Secretary-General a freer hand in promoting the peaceful settlement of the question.

25. Mrs. MENESES DE ALBIZU CAMPOS (Cuba) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the revised draft resolution in accordance with Cuba's policy of opposition to all colonialism. The draft resolution was fully in accord with the principles of the United Nations Charter, especially with Chapter XI, under which Members administering Non-Self-Governing Territories recognized the principle that the interests of the inhabitants were paramount and undertook to ensure their political, economic, social and educational advancement. She welcomed the first two preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution, which unmasked the United Kingdom's manoeuvres to avoid the implementation of the General Assembly's resolutions on Southern Rhodesia. She supported the third preambular paragraph, and did not consider that there were any grounds for delaying the exercise of the people's right to form an independent African State. She fully agreed with the statement in operative paragraph 2 that the imposition of the 1961 Constitution would aggravate the situation, and supported the demand for the abandonment of that Constitution. She also agreed that it was for the United Kingdom to carry out the measures listed in operative paragraph 3. She believed that the mission entrusted to the Acting Secretary-General in operative paragraph 4 would be very useful. Finally, she agreed that the item should be kept on the Assembly's agenda and that the United Nations should not lose sight of the Southern Rhodesian situation until the legitimate demands of the people had been met.

26. Mr. HOUAISS (Brazil) said that, in the opinion of his delegation, the United Kingdom was the Administering Authority for Southern Rhodesia. The United Kingdom was responsible for Southern Rhodesia's external affairs; its delegation must have been aware that the 1961 Constitution was to come into force on 1 November 1962 and should have informed the Committee of the fact. Such an action would not have implied interference in the domestic affairs of the so-called self-governing colony. The United Nations was now faced with a fait accompli whose consequences were incalculable. It was therefore essential to take action without delay. In normal circumstances, his delegation would have wished for more time to study the draft resolution and to obtain instructions from the Brazilian Government, but in view of the urgency of the matter, it had decided to vote in favour of the text, which it regarded as being entirely in accordance with the spirit of the Charter.

#### HEARING OF PETITIONERS (continued)

*At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Enoch Dumbutshena, representative of the Zimbabwe African Peoples Union (ZAPU), took a place at the Committee table.*

27. Mr. DUMBUTSHENA (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that he had asked to address the Committee again because of what he considered to be the dishonesty of Sir Edgar Whitehead's statements at the two previous meetings. He had heard similar statements over and over again: in 1959, when the African National Congress had been banned, although no

violence had taken place; in 1961, when the National Democratic Party had been banned, although again there had been no violence; and in 1962, when ZAPU had been banned. It had been painful to hear Sir Edgar Whitehead claim that there was no political crisis in Southern Rhodesia. The Prime Minister himself had gagged the Press in the Territory; it was forbidden to report incidents of violence, for fear of terrifying the people, or to report the activities of African politicians who were connected with ZAPU. Over 300 people had been placed under restriction and there were over 1,000 African political prisoners in Sir Edgar Whitehead's goals. It was well known that Sir Edgar could not enter an African township without a bodyguard of soldiers and armed police.

28. Sir Edgar Whitehead had stated that, under the present Constitution, Africans would be in the majority in the Legislative Assembly in fifteen years' time. Any honest man must admit that to be an impossibility, since it would mean that in fifteen years the average wage of an African worker would have risen from £9 10s per month to £96 per month, and because it would mean the replacement of European workers by African workers, which Sir Edgar Whitehead himself did not intend. It was inconceivable that in a country where so few African students passed through secondary school there would be as many Africans qualified to vote in fifteen years as there were white voters at present registered. Sir Edgar Whitehead had said that there were 2,000 African voters on the upper roll, while in 1957 there had been 1,000; hence it had taken five years to add some 1,000 Africans to the upper roll, which meant that in fifteen years there would be some 15,000 and by that time there would be some 200,000 Europeans on the upper roll. The speaker had been a journalist and at the time of the banning of the African National Congress in 1959 he and his colleagues had been the only people who had been bold enough to say that they disagreed with the Prime Minister. They had been to see him and he had given them his promise that legislation in the country would be liberalized. In 1962 he had introduced the most Draconic laws on any statute book—the amendments to the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act and the Unlawful Organizations Act. He had claimed that ZAPU had not been banned for its political views, but, under the Unlawful Organizations Act, any organization that advocated the opinions and policies of a banned organization was outlawed. There was no mention of violence. For example, any organization that advocated the principle of "one man, one vote" would be declared unlawful.

29. He denied the assertion that the majority of Africans in Southern Rhodesia were on Sir Edgar Whitehead's side. The groundlessness of that assertion was shown by the fact that, despite Sir Edgar Whitehead's ban on political meetings in the rural areas, where ZAPU leaders had not been allowed to go, the Africans had obeyed Mr. Nkomo, the President of ZAPU, and had boycotted the election. Although ZAPU leaders had not been allowed to visit the reserves, the Prime Minister had been able to get only 10,000 African voters, and those were Africans who had been intimidated by their employers and had had to register on pain of dismissal. He had talked with African police reservists and he knew that most of them had enrolled because they were unable to get other employment and that they were unhappy because even their children were made to feel the disapproval of their fellow

Africans. It could hardly be disputed that if a Government employed such a large number of reservists and soldiers to maintain law and order, the political situation could not be as rosy as it had been depicted by Sir Edgar Whitehead.

30. Unless the United Kingdom Government acted immediately, the conditions prevailing in Southern Rhodesia would become even worse than at present. In his view, Sir Edgar Whitehead was incapable of effecting any acceptable changes; even in his two statements before the Committee he had not said that the Constitution would be improved in order to bring more Africans into Parliament. He was depending on the Africans acquiring more education and higher wages, a process which could not take place in the period of time he had predicted. He had stated that the referendum carried out by Africans and conducted by the National Democratic Party had not been worthwhile, but reports on the referendum in the English newspapers showed how much impressed the reporters had been. The speaker had not been in Southern Rhodesia at the time of the referendum, but he had read the reports and seen photographs of Africans queuing up to vote. He had not seen any photographs of children voting and the palms of people who had cast their votes had been marked with indelible ink, as had been done in the recent elections in Northern Rhodesia. A large number of people had voted in the referendum, not against white rule but against the Constitution. It was clear that the Africans did not like the Constitution and they could not be forced to accept it. In the past three years, Sir Edgar Whitehead had a number of times summoned the Federal army to keep law and order in Southern Rhodesia. No peaceful country could progress, even economically, in such conditions. The members of ZAPU felt that those conditions would continue as long as the Africans were dissatisfied with the Constitution, and that to promote the most favourable conditions for political, educational and economic development a new constitution must be framed. It was illogical that in Southern Rhodesia, where Africans had had the right to vote since the beginning of the century, there were still only 13,000 registered voters, whereas in Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland, where the right to vote had been granted only some two years previously, there were respectively over 90,000 and 100,000 registered African voters. The only reasonable conclusion was that the qualifications in Southern Rhodesia were so impossible that many people could not register. Sir Edgar Whitehead was not in control of the party's policy or in touch with the mass of the people. He could not force the United Federal Party to adopt the liberal policies he hoped to put into effect in fifteen years' time.

31. In conclusion, he expressed regret for having attacked the Prime Minister in his absence, but explained that he could not tolerate dishonesty from a Prime Minister, who was responsible not only to one section but to all sections of the community.

32. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) requested that Mr. Dumbutshena's speech should be reproduced very fully in the summary record.

33. The CHAIRMAN said that that would be done.

*Mr. Dumbutshena, representative of the Zimbabwe African Peoples Union (ZAPU), withdrew.*

34. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had concluded its consideration of the question of Southern Rhodesia for the time being. The item would, however, remain on the agenda of the General As-

sembly, as was provided in the draft resolution approved by the Committee at the previous meeting.

The meeting rose at 4.40 p.m.