

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1346th
MEETING**

Monday, 15 October 1962,
at 3.15 p.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Requests for hearings (continued)</i>	
<i>Requests concerning agenda item 56 (Question of Southern Rhodesia) (continued)</i>	93
<i>Agenda item 56:</i>	
<i>Question of Southern Rhodesia: report of the Special Committee established under General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVI) (continued). Hearing of petitioners (continued)</i>	93

Chairman: Mr. Guillermo FLORES AVENDAÑO
(Guatemala).

Requests for hearings (continued)

REQUESTS CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 56 (QUESTION OF SOUTHERN RHODESIA) (continued)*

1. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that requests for hearings had been submitted by the Pan-African Socialist Union of Southern Rhodesia. Since it was important for the Committee to decide at once whether to grant the hearings, he proposed that the Committee should dispense with the usual procedure of having a request circulated as a document before taking a decision on it.

It was so decided.

It was further decided to grant the requests.^{1/}

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) (continued)

HEARING OF PETITIONERS (continued)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. W. A. F. Burdett-Coutts, Mr. A. D. Butler, Mr. J. Dombura, Mr. J. M. Gondo and Mr. T. J. Hlazo, representing an independent multiracial group, took places at the Committee table.

2. Mr. EBAGNITCHIE (Ivory Coast) recalled that it had been decided at the previous meeting, on the proposal of India, that the petitioner, Mr. Hlazo, could be asked questions concerning his statement. The petitioner had endeavoured to answer the various questions put to him, and by now the Committee had surely formed an opinion on the basis of his replies. There were, however, another dozen or so representatives

who had expressed a wish to question the petitioner. The Committee would be wasting time if it continued in that way. He therefore appealed to representatives who had put their names on the list to agree that the Committee should proceed immediately to hear the other petitioners, in the hope that they might have some fresh information to give. Any questions which delegations might have wanted to ask could with advantage be put to the other petitioners.

3. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) supported the suggestion made by the representative of the Ivory Coast. The Committee should first hear all five petitioners and should then question them, either individually or as a group.

4. Mr. RIFAI (Jordan) agreed that the Committee should first hear all the petitioners and then question them, either one by one or collectively.

5. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) said that he did not share that view. The Committee was being asked for the second time to depart from the procedure it had adopted by a majority vote. The first petitioner had raised fundamental questions; he had mentioned political, economic and educational inadequacies, which could not be used as a pretext for retarding the granting of independence. It would be useful to question him without any further delay.

6. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika), too, felt that it was essential that each of the petitioners should be questioned immediately after his statement. The Committee should adhere to the procedure agreed upon.

7. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) suggested that, in order to avoid a vote, each representative who had put down his name to question Mr. Hlazo should be asked whether he still wanted to do so. He himself was prepared to withdraw his name and he appealed to his colleagues to do likewise.

8. The CHAIRMAN, after consulting the delegations which had expressed their intention of questioning Mr. Hlazo, noted that the delegations concerned, with the exception of Indonesia, Somalia and Tanganyika, had agreed to withdraw their names but reserved the right to question the petitioner after the five members of the independent multiracial group had finished their statements.

9. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) recalled that Mr. Hlazo had wondered what could be done to encourage the inhabitants of Southern Rhodesia to register as voters. He pointed out to him that, if the prescribed ratio of representation—fifty representatives elected mainly by the "A" roll voters, as compared with only fifteen elected by the "B" roll voters—were changed, the petitioner would no longer have cause to complain of his countrymen's apathy. He then asked the petitioner whether he had a mandate from any organized group to represent it before the United Nations. He had, of course, mentioned "men and women of goodwill", but

*Resumed from the 1340th meeting.

^{1/} The requests were subsequently circulated as document A/C.4/557/Add.5.

that was very vague and the Committee would like him to say exactly who those people were.

10. Mr. HLAZO replied that they were people of all racial groups.

11. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) said that his question had not been answered; he would like to know the name of the organized group which had asked the petitioner to represent it.

12. Mr. HLAZO said that his group was called a multiracial group; it was opposed to any distinction based on colour and it favoured equal opportunities for advancement for all the inhabitants of the country, whatever their race.

13. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) said that he presumed it was an organized group and he asked the petitioner to give some idea of its members.

14. Mr. HLAZO replied that his group had no official system of registering its members, but it was composed of people who did not wish colour to be a source of division between the races.

15. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) then asked the petitioner whether he could say who had paid the travelling expenses of the five petitioners.

16. Mr. HLAZO replied that their travel had been financed by men and women of goodwill.

17. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) asked the petitioner whether he was a member of the party which supported Sir Edgar Whitehead's policy.

18. Mr. HLAZO said that the independent multiracial group included people who belonged to parties and people who did not, but all of them wanted changes in the situation.

19. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) pressed for a reply to his question. Was the petitioner a member of the party led by Sir Edgar Whitehead or was he not?

20. Mr. HLAZO replied that the petitioners were not appearing as members of any given party. The independent multiracial group remained aloof from such questions. It welcomed members of any party, provided that they agreed with its non-racial doctrine. If he departed from that policy, he would be going against the principles of the group to which he belonged and which, incidentally, was not satisfied with the attitude of the Government.

21. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) asked the petitioner whether, in view of the political, educational and economic inadequacies to which he himself had referred, he considered that the situation prevailing in the Territory was indicative of a genuine democracy.

22. Mr. HLAZO said that the group to which he belonged could not take the view that there was genuine democracy in Southern Rhodesia so long as the number of Africans registered as voters formed so small a percentage of the population. Nor was it enough to have Africans appearing on the register of electors; they must also have representatives who were really qualified to perform their duties.

23. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) asked the petitioner why such countries as Nigeria and Ghana were already free, whereas Southern Rhodesia was not. The inhabitants of Southern Rhodesia were certainly no less competent than the citizens of those countries, which were already independent.

24. Mr. HLAZO replied he had never been to those countries. The matter of concern to the multiracial group was that the people should be represented by men who were equal to their task. Such ability had already been demonstrated. The country's school population was increasing and the day of independence was not far distant; it was a matter of a few years.

25. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) noted that the petitioner had mentioned Europeans of goodwill who were in sympathy with the aspirations of the people. Did he include Sir Roy Welensky in that category?

26. Mr. HLAZO said that he and his colleagues had not come to pronounce judgement on anyone. The men of goodwill to whom he had referred included representatives of all strata of the people, who advocated new principles and an improvement of the situation. If the situation was to improve, the level of education must be raised throughout the population, so that the representation of the interests of the people should not be the monopoly of a few individuals.

27. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia), speaking on a point of order, stated that the Committee had before it a hostile witness who was evading questions and wasting the Committee's time. If he could not give precise answers, it would perhaps be advisable to ask him to withdraw.

28. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) repeated his question. The petitioner had spoken of men of goodwill; did he consider that Sir Roy Welensky came into that category?

29. Mr. HLAZO said that he was unable to answer that question, since Sir Roy Welensky was not a member of the group to which he belonged.

30. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) said that he must regretfully state that he had been frustrated by the petitioner's answers.

31. Mr. ARTEH (Somalia) announced that, having heard the petitioner's replies to the representative of Indonesia, he for one would refrain from putting any questions to him, but he reserved the right to do so later, on the understanding that direct answers would be given to direct questions.

32. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika) asked the petitioner to which tribe he belonged.

33. Mr. HLAZO replied that he was of the Nguni race, to which the Matabele of Nyasaland also belonged.

34. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika) asked the petitioner whether he could cite some of the past achievements of his tribe before the coming of the Whites.

35. Mr. HLAZO replied that it was difficult to speak of what the Africans had achieved before the arrival of the Whites, for the activities of the former had been limited to tribal warfare.

36. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika) asked the petitioner whether he had heard of the ruins of Zimbabwe.

37. Mr. HLAZO replied that the ruins of Zimbabwe had long been a riddle for the most eminent scientists; he thought that they were one of the wonders of the world but he was not competent to speak about them.

38. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika) asked the petitioner whether he had heard of the Empire of Monomotapa.

39. Mr. HLAZO said that he was unable to reply, since the question had no bearing on the petition that he had come to submit.

40. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika) asked the petitioner whether he had heard of the Matabele risings.
41. Mr. HLAZO replied that he had heard of them and of a large number of other risings in which different races had taken part.
42. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika) asked whether the people of Southern Rhodesia had fought to defend their rights when their country had been invaded.
43. Mr. HLAZO replied in the affirmative.
44. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika) noted that the petitioner had been a Christian for a long time and asked him whether he believed that God had created man in his image.
45. Mr. HLAZO replied that he most emphatically did.
46. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika) asked the petitioner whether he believed in the divine rights of man as a human being.
47. Mr. HLAZO replied in the affirmative.
48. The CHAIRMAN requested the representative of Tanganyika to confine his questions to problems having a bearing on the item before the Committee.
49. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika) replied that the questions that he had just asked were of fundamental importance and were not unrelated to the item before the Committee.
50. He asked the petitioner whether he considered that someone who knew how to read and write was better than someone who did not.
51. Mr. HLAZO replied that it all depended. On the plane of achievements, such a person was certainly superior, for illiterates would have to depend on him to write and to read their own letters for them.
52. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika) asked whether that was a sufficient reason for depriving an illiterate person of his divine rights as an individual.
53. Mr. HLAZO replied that it was not a sufficient reason, but he pointed out that the Government of Tanganyika would not choose a person who could neither read nor write to act as its representative to the United Nations.
54. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika) recalled that in the course of the debate reference had been made to multiracialism, non-racialism and partnership. Could the petitioner explain the difference between those concepts?
55. Mr. HLAZO replied that he himself was very much attached to the idea of non-racialism; that was why he was why he was now appearing before the Committee. He did not think that it was within his province to give a definition of the three terms just mentioned.
56. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika) said that Tanganyika, too, claimed to follow a non-racial policy. All its adult citizens had the vote and could stand for election, regardless of race, sex or religion. He asked whether that was the policy the petitioner advocated.
57. Mr. HLAZO replied that that was the case, except for the fact that literacy must be considered a key factor. In all events, everybody should be allowed to take part in political life, which should not be the monopoly of those who enjoyed the privilege of learning.
58. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika) asked the petitioner whether he believed in Pan-Africanism.
59. Mr. HLAZO said that it was difficult to believe in a doctrine with which he had never been in contact, except through reading. He would believe in Pan-Africanism if that doctrine coincided with his own philosophy.
60. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika) noted that the petitioner had stated several times that if the Africans in Southern Rhodesia would agree to take part in the implementation of the new Constitution, there would eventually be an African majority in power in the country. Was he quite certain that that was the case?
61. Mr. HLAZO replied that he was certain that that would come about sooner than expected, provided the Africans registered as voters. An African majority was a certainty, because an increasing number of educated Africans would be leaving school.
62. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika) asked the petitioner whether he realized that most educational facilities open to Africans provided primary education only.
63. Mr. HLAZO replied that he would not say that was the case. With regard to primary education, the State was doing its utmost to ensure that every child received some instruction, but there were also several secondary schools where African pupils could prepare themselves for the university.
64. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika) replied that, as a teacher, he had studied educational facilities in Southern Rhodesia and found that they were incapable of fulfilling the petitioner's hopes.
65. He asked the petitioner whether he trusted the Government of Sir Edgar Whitehead to put the Constitution into effect.
66. Mr. HLAZO said that it was difficult for him to say. That was precisely the reason why he and his colleagues were appearing before the Committee. He wanted the Africans to take part in the Government; there had to be a beginning for everything and it was wise to take what was given and make use of it until they got what they wanted.
67. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika) recalled that in December 1961, in backing the amendment of the electoral law, the Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia had said that he was as strongly opposed as any other member of Parliament to the principle of "one man, one vote." He would like to know whether the petitioner agreed with that view.
68. Mr. HLAZO replied that he did not quite understand the question. He believed that the principle of "one man, one vote" should be applied but should be qualified by considerations of literacy.
69. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika) recalled that in February 1961 Sir Edgar Whitehead had said that if the new Constitution were adopted by a referendum, there would be no more constitutional conferences in Southern Rhodesia. He wondered how that statement was to be interpreted.
70. Mr. HLAZO replied that the Government of Southern Rhodesia had an office in New York that would be able to reply to such questions. He did not feel that it was within his competence to advance an opinion on that point.
71. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika) asked the petitioner whether he was aware that Sir Edgar Whitehead had expressed his determination to ensure that the control of Parliament would remain in the hands of the voters

of the upper roll and that the Government would continue to be run by civilized persons. He asked the petitioner whether he considered that the fact that a person could read and write proved that he would be aware of his responsibilities as a voter.

72. Mr. HLAZO pointed out that a number of Africans were already registered on the upper roll. If the Africans educated their children, the latter would one day be able to fulfil the required conditions and would swamp the upper roll.

73. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika) noted that the petitioner had expressed belief in the philosophy of non-racialism and in a qualification of the principle of "one man, one vote". Did he consider that a change in the present franchise system was necessary?

74. Mr. HLAZO replied that that was the very reason why he and his colleagues were in New York; there were some things in the present system that should be improved, and others that should be removed.

75. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika) quoted an excerpt from a brochure entitled "Breakthrough to Nationhood", published by the United Federal Party, and asked the petitioner whether he thought that it would be possible to amend the regulations governing the franchise.

76. Mr. HLAZO pointed out that a large number of Africans already fulfilled the conditions required for registration as voters. They should prepare themselves to qualify for registration in the upper roll, so that by the weight of their combined votes they might sway policy in the direction they wanted.

77. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika) asked the petitioner whether he was aware that a number of voters had been downgraded and were to be placed on the lower roll.

78. Mr. HLAZO said that he was aware of that point but he also knew that a considerable number of qualified Africans were registered on the upper roll. The Africans should be encouraged to acquire knowledge; there were at present thousands of children attending school who would later be able to qualify for the upper roll.

79. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika) pointed out that, according to the brochure that he had quoted, the new Constitution would keep control of the Government in the hands of the voters on the upper roll, whereas under the present system those on the lower roll would eventually take over. He regretted that the petitioner had made no attempt to study the provisions of the 1961 Constitution. His hopes would certainly be disappointed, failing a miracle in Southern Rhodesia.

80. The CHAIRMAN called upon the second petitioner, Mr. Butler, to make his statement.

81. Mr. BUTLER thanked the Committee for granting him a hearing. Before going into the problems which he considered to be of great importance to Southern Rhodesia, he earnestly requested the members of the Committee not to make fun of the representatives of his country, for such an attitude would be resented by the people of Southern Rhodesia.

82. Mr. KHOSLA (India), speaking on a point of order, asked whether the petitioner was speaking as a representative of his country or as a petitioner.

83. Mr. BUTLER said that he was speaking on behalf of his friends in Southern Rhodesia and of the people in that country who shared his views. He was also speaking in an individual capacity and, if the members

of the Committee allowed him to do so, he would renew his appeal, since any attempt to ridicule the people who appeared before the Committee might be resented in Southern Rhodesia.

84. Mr. KHOSLA (India), speaking on a point of order, asked for details about the group, party or people represented by the petitioner.

85. Mr. BUTLER replied that he merely wished to state opinions.

86. Mr. KHOSLA (India) explained that he had never intended to ridicule anybody; his delegation had no desire to stay the proceedings.

87. Mr. BUTLER welcomed the statement just made by the representative of India, which would give heart to a large number of people in Southern Rhodesia.

88. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia), speaking on a point of order, said that the petitioner seemed to be criticizing the conduct of the Committee's work. The petitioner should not forget that he had requested a hearing and that he must be polite in his statement.

89. Mr. NGANDO-BLACK (Cameroon), referring to the petitioner's remarks about the Committee's attitude towards the first petitioner, said that the members of the Committee represented sovereign States and could not permit statements such as those just made by the petitioner.

90. Mr. EOUAGNIGNON (Dahomey) said that at the preceding meeting he had already protested against the attitude of the first petitioner. As the representative of India had emphasized, petitioners could not represent their countries. If the Chairman allowed the petitioner to continue his statement in the same vein, the Dahoman delegation would be obliged to leave the Committee room.

91. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika) said that, in view of the incident which had just occurred, he would like to know whether or not Mr. Butler was a petitioner and whether he was prepared to make a statement and to reply to questions. The matter should be clarified before the debate was resumed.

92. Mr. RIFAI (Jordan) thought that the incident should be closed. The petitioner had been granted a hearing; he had made some remarks which were out of order and had been amply answered. He asked the Chairman to authorize the petitioner to continue his statement.

93. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika) said that he must know whether the petitioner would agree to answer subsequent questions.

94. Mr. BUTLER said that he would do his best to reply to all questions put to him. He was sorry that his words had been misinterpreted.

95. Mr. KHOSLA (India), speaking on a point of order, protested against the petitioner's use of the word "misinterpreted", as applied to the Committee.

96. The CHAIRMAN invited the petitioner to continue his statement, which should be confined to the item before the Committee.

97. Mr. BUTLER said that he had come to request United Nations support for the creation in Southern Rhodesia of a non-racial State, freed from colonialism. That was what he wanted for his country, and he was sure that one day it would be achieved.

98. He emphasized that, in many ways, he was in the same position as the American Negroes—since all the Whites in Southern Rhodesia could not be sent back to their country of origin, any more than all the Negroes in the United States could be sent back to Africa.

99. He was an ordinary citizen and not a professional politician. He ran a small air transport company at Salisbury. He had come to New York as a result of the spontaneous wish expressed by several people in Southern Rhodesia, who thought that the petitioners who had already appeared at the United Nations had not accurately depicted the situation existing in the Territory. He was proud to be a member of the United Federal Party (UFP), which was in power in Southern Rhodesia. He had not been sent by UFP or by the Southern Rhodesian Government; he himself, and the people in Southern Rhodesia who thought that the Committee had not been given a true picture of the situation, had paid his fare and that of his colleagues.

100. Neither the Southern Rhodesian Government nor the United Kingdom Government admitted that the United Nations had the right to intervene in the internal affairs of Southern Rhodesia; and he, for his part, agreed with that view. However, since the Committee had decided to consider the problem he thought that the Southern Rhodesian Government and the United Kingdom Government had been wrong not to send to the United Nations representatives of the Territory's people—persons who lived in the country, knew what was happening there and were able to express the feelings of the majority of the Territory's population and reply to some of the scandalous statements which had been made both in the United Nations and elsewhere.

101. In order to state the truth, he had come to the United Nations with his friend Mr. Josiah Gondo, and both were resolved to act to the best of their ability in the interests of their country. Their decision to come to New York had been greeted with enthusiasm by a large number of Rhodesians, of all races and from all walks of life, who had given them encouragement and financial assistance. Since their arrival in New York, he and his friends had received more than seventy cables of encouragement from a large number of individuals and groups that had very varied interests in different parts of the country. Members of the Committee could, if they wished, see those cables and press photographs showing the demonstrations of sympathy which had accompanied his and his friends' departure from Salisbury Airport.

102. Attempts had been made, both in Rhodesia and in New York, to discredit his group, before it had been able to do anything. He was referring more particularly, in that connexion, to the cable from the Southern Rhodesia African Trade Union Congress which had been circulated by the Secretariat (A/C.4/561). He felt it necessary to say a few words about that organization.

103. The trade union movement had been encouraged in Southern Rhodesia for a number of years; and he himself had acted as the chairman of various industrial boards, which were boards set up to study all aspects of problems of wages and working conditions in the different industries, until such time as the workers in those industries had formed trade unions strong enough to represent adequately the interests of their members in relations with the employers. When trade unions of that type were formed, as they already

had been in a number of industries, the industrial board was dissolved and the trade unions formed an industrial council, in which they negotiated directly with the employers.

104. The majority of the trade unions were members of the Southern Rhodesia Trade Union Congress which, under the leadership of Mr. Jamela, had defended the interests of its members so successfully that it had set a number of employers against it. Mr. Jamela had been the first African leader in Southern Rhodesia to condemn the new Constitution, and he had always been known as an ardent African nationalist. When Mr. Nkomo had begun publicly to recommend the destruction of industrial plants in Southern Rhodesia, on the pretext that industry was preventing the population from gaining access to political power, and when he had decided to use the trade union movement to put into effect that particular part of his policy, the workers had opposed the idea, since they were resolved not to destroy their livelihood merely in order to help a particular group of politicians to obtain power. Displeased by that opposition, the leaders of the Zimbabwe African Peoples Union (ZAPU) had expelled from their organization Mr. Jamela and his principal officials and had then founded the Southern Rhodesia African Trade Union Congress. That organization was in fact merely a branch of ZAPU. If anyone had been anybody's "stooge", it could be said that the leaders of the African Trade Union Congress were the "stooges" of the leaders of ZAPU, to whom they were bound hand and foot. Southern Rhodesia would not be helped by insults such as those contained in the cable from the African Trade Union Congress, and he did not see why he should accept absurd accusations. He and his friends were not afraid to reply to questions or to refute allegations, whenever that was necessary in the interests of their country.

105. He then described briefly the political parties existing in Southern Rhodesia at the time when ZAPU had been banned. The Rhodesia Front combined various right-wing European groups; its 2,000 active members, almost all Whites, believed in white domination but had not used violence to gain acceptance of their policy. The only white racist group which had used anti-constitutional methods had been the Rhodesia Republican Army, which had immediately been banned. Three other political parties were supported by Europeans and Africans: the Central Africa Party, a small group of intellectuals without any effective organization, in which all races were represented; the New Africa Party, formed by Mr. Garfield Todd and a handful of friends; and finally, the United Federal Party, which was the party in power and had about 20,000 members from all sectors of the population, almost half of the membership being African. At the time when it had been banned, ZAPU had about 6,000 active members, of whom only a handful were white. Other petitioners of his group, who were well informed about the activities of the party, could give an exact idea of what it represented. The Zimbabwe National Party, which was numerically small and entirely African, was split by internal dissension; there had accordingly been formed another group, the Pan-African Socialist Union, which was no more effective.

106. Thus there was no group or political leader representing the whole of the population, nor was there any political party which really represented the interests of a particular group of that population.

Accordingly, no one could claim to speak for all the Africans or for all the Europeans.

107. It was a great tragedy for the population of Southern Rhodesia that the country was now exposed to subversion. Young Rhodesians, lured, by promises, to leave their country and to receive training in subversive activities, had returned to commit acts of sabotage there. The laws in force gave individuals so much liberty that it was impossible to stop those people from leaving the country, returning, and receiving considerable sums of money to help them in the organization of subversion. But the racialists' attempts to provoke incidents between races, and to terrorize or assassinate those who did not agree with their advocacy of immediate racial domination, met with strong resistance from the population. The police had not originally been trained to combat saboteurs, but the latter's activities had led all racial groups to demand that citizens be protected. The reserve police force had therefore been considerably expanded in strength, and at present it consisted of about 14,000 men, all volunteers. Its members represented all shades of political opinion, but were all convinced that reforms must be carried out in an orderly way and that no section of the community, financed and organized from abroad, should be allowed to commit crimes against law-abiding citizens. In that connexion it should be stressed that the great majority of political crimes in Southern Rhodesia had been committed by Africans against Africans—which tended to refute Mr. Nkomo's claim to represent all the Africans of Rhodesia.

108. One of the most extraordinary aspects of the question of Southern Rhodesia was the insistence of certain racist leaders in demanding that the United Kingdom should intervene, if necessary without the agreement of the Government of Southern Rhodesia, in connexion with the new Constitution and the right to vote. Southern Rhodesia, however, was no longer a colony but a country which managed its own affairs and was responsible for its own fate, and it was impossible to change that situation except through armed aggression, with bloodshed, by military forces from outside the country. In Northern Rhodesia and in Nyasaland—as had been the case in almost all other African countries before their accession to independence—the Governor was appointed by a Parliament whose seat was outside the African continent, and he was responsible to that Parliament; in such Territories, when the foreign authority transferred power to the indigenous population, the words "grant independence" assumed their full meaning. In Southern Rhodesia, on the other hand, the Governor was appointed on the recommendation of the Prime Minister, and had no more power than the Queen in England currently had; all the officials were Rhodesians, paid by the Rhodesian Government and entirely responsible to it. It was necessary to understand fully and to acknowledge those facts if there was to be any useful discussion of the question of Southern Rhodesia.

109. The United Nations should also realize that the great majority of the population of Southern Rhodesia was perfectly well aware that the two separate racial groups depended, and would in the future continue to depend, entirely on each other. Most of the statements so far made to the United Nations by petitioners from Southern Rhodesia suggested that democratic electoral methods had not been used sufficiently widely, particularly among the Africans, to ensure that the opinions of all were known before various measures concerning Southern Rhodesia's development were taken.

Those statements were wrong in that they attempted to compare events which had taken place in the past with the norms of democracy as it was understood today. He emphasized that the right to vote had existed in Southern Rhodesia since 1898; at that time, in order to be an elector, it was necessary to be a British subject, to have taken the oath of allegiance, to reside permanently in the colony, to be able to write, and to possess an annual income of more than £50, or property worth £75, or mining title-deeds. Since 1898, no obstacle of a racial character had prevented a citizen from obtaining the right to vote; even women had received the right to vote, with no restriction based on race, before women had obtained that right in the United Kingdom.

110. The referendum of 1923 had been criticized before the Committee, on the ground that it had been the vote of a relatively small number of electors, mostly Europeans, which had given the country self-government. According to the standards of the period, however, the granting of that self-government had been a very liberal act on the part of the United Kingdom Government, and the world had not then considered it reprehensible that the power given to the inhabitants of a dependent territory should be exercised principally by those best organized and best equipped to assume it. Moreover, there had been no sign of resistance or objection on the part of the Africans to that decision. In his opinion, the real significance of the 1923 referendum was that the Europeans had refused to unite with the Union of South Africa and had thus avoided being dragged along the disastrous path followed by that country. On the contrary, they had later decided to enter the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland and had preferred co-operation, exchange and development with the African masses to the doctrine of white supremacy. Incidentally, Mr. Nkomo had played a large part in that decision and had been one of the architects of the Federation.

111. Similarly, in the referendum on the 1961 Constitution, which had sprung from a new concept of non-racialism, the electors of Southern Rhodesia had definitively rejected the idea of racial domination and had accepted a positive and firm evolution towards the concept—entirely new in Africa—of a non-racial society. Apart from some hysterical outbursts of racialism on the part of white and black extremists, the great mass of the Rhodesian people saw this new concept as an ideal to be realized, because it was a better guarantee for the future than any constitution. That ideal had arisen, not at the order of the United Kingdom or the United Nations, but from the spontaneous desire of the peoples of all races to profit from the best that each had to offer for the good of the country and of all its inhabitants.

112. Southern Rhodesia also had a society more advanced and more complex than those of most other countries of the continent. Any upset in the administration and any halt in development would therefore have serious consequences for the population as a whole. That consideration was not in itself a reason to delay progress or political reform; but it was a warning, for if chaos were introduced into the country by forces from outside, the consequences for the inhabitants, and particularly for the Africans, would be absolutely disastrous. Anxiety among investors, due to the unstable situation in numerous regions of Africa, was not calculated to favour full employment, and it was of course from the young unemployed of all races that the extremist parties drew their most active support.

He therefore appealed to the Committee's members not to condone any act which might aggravate the employment situation, such as the acts of sabotage which the black extremists had promised to carry out against industry. Past policy could justly be accused of having been too paternalistic, but present policy was aimed at development of the communities, which themselves indicated the reforms, progress and aspirations to which they wished effect to be given.

113. Nearly half the land in Southern Rhodesia consisted of tribal trust land and was reserved for the communal use of the Africans who wanted to occupy it. In addition, 10 per cent of the land belonged to the nation (forests, national parks, etc.). In 5 per cent of the remainder, land could be acquired by all inhabitants, without racial distinction; he was certain that it would be the same, in the very near future, for all land.

114. Attempts were continually being made to convince the United Nations that the new Constitution and the electoral law of Southern Rhodesia were aimed at perpetuating white supremacy; it was stressed that fifty seats would be occupied by Europeans, who thus, since they had a two-thirds majority, could alter the conditions required for the exercise of the franchise, so as to prevent any increased participation by other races in the Government.

115. But the new Constitution prohibited any making of the conditions for the franchise more selective; moreover, the vast education campaign and the raising of wages ensured ever-increasing participation by the Africans in public affairs. The present electors were well aware that the new Constitution raised no obstacle to an African majority in Parliament; but that did not worry most of them, because they approved the idea of a non-racial State where a man sat in Parliament because of the policy which he represented and not because of the colour of his skin. In Southern Rhodesia, there could not be an entirely white or an entirely black Parliament, and it was already evident that the common interest was becoming more important than colour.

116. In the matter of education, Southern Rhodesia had followed a policy different from that of most of the under-developed countries. The urgent need to train an "élite" capable of taking over the administration after the granting of self-government had not been felt in Southern Rhodesia, because of the regular arrival

of Europeans with a relatively high level of education who had come to establish themselves permanently in the country. It had therefore been possible to devote attention to the education of the masses of the people and to arrive at a position, without any foreign aid, in which all children in the country received a primary education. The Rhodesian Government spend four shillings out of each £1 of its budget on education for Africans; for the last financial year the education budget amounted to more than £5 million, and the number of children at school had more than doubled in thirteen years. If it were sought to sacrifice the goal—universal primary education—simply in order to force a small black "élite" to replace the greatest possible number of Europeans in the shortest possible time, the African population as a whole would energetically oppose such an idea. That did not mean, however, that higher education had been neglected, and it was interesting to note that the creation of a non-racial university had caused no difficulty.

117. All those advances, as well as industrial expansion and the increase in wages—those of small wage-earners in particular had increased by more than 50 per cent in a few years, and were currently higher than in almost any other country of Africa—proved that the Government intended to place the greatest possible number of people in a position to occupy important posts and to qualify for the right to vote in the shortest possible time. That policy was in line with the ideals and principles of the United Nations; and consequently the Rhodesians sought the Organization's help in giving effect to their just concept of a non-racial society, which was what the people desired. He adjured the United Nations not to condemn the sincere desire of his compatriots to bring about a non-racial society, and asked it not to give its blessing to those who wished to excite racial passions in order to achieve their political ambitions. To condemn a non-racial society's faith in peaceful progress would surely be to condemn, at the same time, the future of all mankind.

118. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) proposed that the text of Mr. Butler's statement should be distributed in the usual way.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.