

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

EIGHTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1449th
MEETING

Wednesday, 16 October 1963,
at 3.10 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Requests for hearings (continued)</i>	
<i>Requests concerning Aden (agenda item 49) . . .</i>	105
<i>Requests concerning Southern Rhodesia (agenda item 75) (continued)</i>	105
<i>Agenda item 75:</i>	
<i>Question of Southern Rhodesia: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (continued) Hearing of petitioners (continued)</i>	105

Chairman: Mr. ACHKAR Marof (Guinea).

Requests for hearings (continued)

REQUESTS CONCERNING ADEN (AGENDA ITEM 49)

1. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that a request for a hearing had been received from the Secretary-General of the South Arabians League, Aden. He suggested that, in accordance with the usual procedure, it should be circulated as a Committee document.

It was so decided.^{1/}

REQUESTS CONCERNING SOUTHERN RHODESIA (AGENDA ITEM 75) (continued)

2. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that a request for a hearing had been received from Mr. George Silundika, Secretary for Publicity of the Zimbabwe African Peoples Union (ZAPU). He suggested that, in view of the advanced stage the Committee had reached in its consideration of the question of Southern Rhodesia, and of the fact that Mr. Silundika was already present, the Committee might grant him a hearing without waiting for the request to be circulated.^{2/}

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 75

Question of Southern Rhodesia: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (A/5446/Rev.1, chap. III; A/5448 and Add.1-5; A/C.4/603; A/C.4/606) (continued)

HEARING OF PETITIONERS (continued)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. T. George Silundika, representative of the Zimbabwe African

Peoples Union (ZAPU), took a place at the Committee table.

3. Mr. SILUNDIKA (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that he wished to stress certain features of the Southern Rhodesian problem to which reference had been made but which deserved special attention, both by the United Nations and by the United Kingdom authorities.

4. Two recent developments had rendered the situation increasingly dangerous. The first was the attempt of the settler régime in Southern Rhodesia to create the necessary conditions to facilitate the dovetailing of Southern Rhodesia with the Republic of South Africa led by Mr. Verwoerd. The United Kingdom claimed that the course being followed by Southern Rhodesia was different from that followed by South Africa. The fact was, however, that the security laws in Southern Rhodesia were more stringent even than those in South Africa. The Southern Rhodesian régime had an extradition agreement with South Africa so that freedom fighters crossing the border either way would be returned. Many of the Southern Rhodesian laws restricting political activities and freedom of expression were identical with those in South Africa. A military agreement between South Africa and Southern Rhodesia provided for co-operation between the two countries in the event of an African uprising. Such developments were a threat to the Africans and to peace in Africa as a whole, and the United Nations should put pressure on the United Kingdom to see that the situation was restored to normal. Measures were being quietly introduced in Southern Rhodesia to create a "Bantustan" system similar to that established in South Africa. The Southern Rhodesian Minister of Internal Affairs, Local Government and African Education, who was the Minister responsible for affairs affecting the Africans, had spent three weeks with the South African Minister for Bantu Administration discussing regionalization on the basis of ethnic groups. The Southern Rhodesian so-called community development scheme was in fact based on the same principle. The best land was already assigned to the Europeans under the Land Apportionment Act, and the Government's goal was now to place the Africans in settlements on a tribal basis. Such a system would inevitably perpetuate racial separation and hence racial conflicts. The Field Government had also decided to introduce a decimal coinage identical to that in South Africa. The intention was clearly to consolidate the defence of the white settler interests south of the Zambesi.

5. It was suggested by those who looked with favour on the prospect of a union between Southern Rhodesia and South Africa that the situation was improving in Southern Rhodesia. It should be made clear that African representation in the legislature under the present Constitution was of no more significance than the

^{1/} See A/C.4/612/Add.1.

^{2/} The request was subsequently circulated as document A/C.4/605/Add.1.

African presence in the common voters' roll of South Africa prior to the proclamation of the independence of the Union of South Africa in 1910. Nor was the Southern Rhodesian régime likely to be influenced by persuasion from the United Kingdom. The Southern Rhodesian Minister for Mines had said that nothing short of force would prevent the Southern Rhodesian régime from obtaining independence. The Government of the United Kingdom, which was the sovereign Power with respect to Southern Rhodesia, had not protested against that claim. It had confined itself to vague declarations of a desire for a broadening of the franchise, but had not said when or how such a broadening of the franchise was to be brought about. The fact was that the United Kingdom had never favoured political advancement for the Southern Rhodesian Africans and there was no reason to believe that the recent United Kingdom declarations had any practical substance. It was for the Africans themselves to gain freedom and it should not be assumed that negotiation was the only course for them to follow.

6. The second new development on which he wished to dwell was the proposal for the transfer of military powers to the Field régime. It was proposed that most of the military equipment in the hands of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland should go to the Southern Rhodesian Government. At a conference of inhabitants of Southern Rhodesia held in August 1963, a communication had been sent to the United Kingdom urging that the transfer of power to the majority should precede the transfer of Federal powers to the Territorial Government. The United Kingdom, however, had ignored that appeal. At the time of the adoption by the General Assembly of its resolution 1883 (XVIII), on Southern Rhodesia, the régime had announced the introduction of compulsory military training for the settler youth.

7. The Southern Rhodesian police and armed forces included many South Africans in their ranks, as well as recruits from England. It was worth noting that the South African régime, too, had compulsory military training for the settlers.

8. It was for the United Kingdom to take steps to remedy the situation. Unless there was a positive indication of hope for a settlement, the African people could not be expected to remain idle. With regard to the fiction that Southern Rhodesia was self-governing, it was obvious that the United Kingdom Government was not entitled to set its own constitutional conventions above the claims of human rights.

9. The United Kingdom representatives in the United Nations had said that the forces being transferred to the Southern Rhodesian régime would be used solely for purposes of internal security. In the view of the Africans, that meant they would be used for the suppression of the political aspirations of the people. The United Kingdom had also said that it remained responsible for the external defence of Southern Rhodesia. In other words, the United Kingdom would ward off all attempts by neighbouring States to restore justice in Southern Rhodesia. That assumption was confirmed by the fact that the United Kingdom Government was taking over the military forces of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland. It was clear that the United Kingdom's aim was to protect the Field régime and to entrench the position of the settlers.

10. In conclusion, he wished to draw attention to a recent request by the Southern Rhodesian régime for approximately £15 million from the International

Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The money was ostensibly for development projects but his party was convinced that it would be used not for the good of the Africans but for strengthening the régime. He would appeal to those States which contributed to the Bank to ensure that such funds were not granted to Southern Rhodesia.

11. The CHAIRMAN invited representatives to put questions to the petitioner.

12. Mr. NGANDO-BLACK (Cameroon) said that the United Kingdom continually claimed that it could do nothing to alter the situation in Southern Rhodesia. He wondered whether, in the petitioner's view, the United Kingdom could in fact exert influence which it was not exerting at present.

13. Secondly, with regard to the petitioner's statement that there was a military agreement between Southern Rhodesia and South Africa, he wondered whether there was an explicit agreement or whether the petitioner meant that events suggested the existence of some kind of understanding.

14. Thirdly, he would appreciate more details regarding "community development" in Southern Rhodesia; many African countries pursued a policy of community development but the Southern Rhodesian policy was presumably something quite different.

15. Fourthly, he wondered to what extent United Kingdom interests in Southern Rhodesia influenced the policies of the administering Power and whether the commercial undertakings operating in the Territory realized the necessity of a change in policy to take into account changed conditions.

16. Mr. SILUNDIKA (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that the legal institutions of the United Kingdom had been established by that country itself; moreover, the United Kingdom had sovereignty with respect to Southern Rhodesia and sovereignty implied power. The United Kingdom's attitude was really dictated by a concern for the interests of the European inhabitants. The United Kingdom did not claim to be prevented from intervening by a law, but merely by a convention, and that convention was allowed to prevail over the wishes of the majority of the inhabitants of the Territory. The United Kingdom Attorney-General had admitted that the United Kingdom had the power to make and unmake the Southern Rhodesian Constitution.

17. In answer to the second question, he would say that there was at least a military understanding with South Africa. South African troops had been seen in Southern Rhodesia, having been brought in to assist in dealing with disturbances. Some days previously, Sir Roy Welensky, the Prime Minister of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, had said that no immediate political arrangement was possible with South Africa but that economic and other arrangements could certainly be entered into, particularly with a view to ensuring the security of the region south of the Zambesi. The South African authorities had contributed £5 million to the funds of the Rhodesia Front and there was information that they had made it clear that up to £20 million would be available if required to assist the Southern Rhodesian régime in strengthening its armed forces.

18. With regard to community development, the Southern Rhodesian régime's object was to deceive international opinion by using that term for what was

really a confirmation of the division of land under the Land Apportionment Act. One of the aims of the scheme was to make use of tribalism as a factor for social cohesion. The result would be tension and conflict between areas and races. Whereas community development in other countries was carried out by popular Governments, in Southern Rhodesia the Africans had no control over the scheme and it was designed to assist the régime in its repressive measures.

19. British investments in Southern Rhodesia were nearly as substantial as those in South Africa. Many leading members of the Conservative Party in the United Kingdom had substantial interests in the Territory, among them Mr. Patrick Wall, who had defended the régime vigorously as a member of the United Kingdom delegation at the previous session. Most of the companies operating in Southern Rhodesia were United Kingdom companies. Those companies knew that their huge profits depended on the maintenance of the settler régime; they also had a major influence on policies since they paid the taxes on which the Government depended.

20. Mr. BUDU-ACQUAH (Ghana) recalled that at the previous session his delegation had adduced evidence to prove that it was due to the influence of certain powerful financial interests in the United Kingdom and elsewhere that the legitimate aspirations of the indigenous inhabitants of Southern Rhodesia were being denied.

21. In his reply to the representative of Cameroon, the petitioner had referred to Mr. Patrick Wall, a member of the United Kingdom Parliament who had been with the United Kingdom delegation at the seventeenth session and had spoken in defence of the white settler régime in Southern Rhodesia. According to the petitioner, that gentleman owned land in Southern Rhodesia and had large economic interests there. He would like to know to what political party Mr. Patrick Wall belonged and how influential he was.

22. Mr. SCOTT (United Kingdom) questioned the propriety of a dialogue between the representative of Ghana and the petitioner concerning an individual member of the United Kingdom delegation. Representatives on the Committee spoke for their Governments and not for private interests. He considered the attempt that was being made to probe into the private interests of individual representatives to be entirely out of order.

23. Mr. BUDU-ACQUAH (Ghana) pointed out that political parties were based on individuals and that individuals' views therefore had a bearing on the government of the country concerned. Furthermore, he maintained that modern governments were based on pressure groups.

24. The CHAIRMAN ruled that the petitioner should be asked to comment in greater detail on the influence of economic interests on the political situation in Southern Rhodesia. If the representative of Ghana would accept that formulation, he would consider it to be in order and would ask the petitioner to proceed.

25. Mr. SILUNDIKA (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that a large number of members of the United Kingdom Conservative Party had controlling interests in the economy of Southern Rhodesia. That was not a mere unsupported allegation; it was a fact that was known to all Africans in Southern Rhodesia. The very fact that there was no political advancement in Southern Rhodesia was sufficient evidence that economic interests were operating to the detriment of the

Africans. A number of clubs or groups had been established by Members of Parliament in the United Kingdom and used their influence to obstruct political progress in Southern Rhodesia.

26. Mr. BUDU-ACQUAH (Ghana) recalled that the United Kingdom representative had assured the Committee that his Government would retain control over the use outside the Territory of the armed forces about to be transferred to the settler régime in Southern Rhodesia. Assuming that the United Kingdom Government was not privy to the negotiations between the Field régime and the Portuguese authorities, he asked the petitioner whether he thought that the United Kingdom Government would be able to control the external use of those forces when it had had no say in the negotiations between Portugal and the Field régime.

27. Mr. SILUNDIKA (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that that statement by the United Kingdom representative, far from constituting an assurance, was a matter of concern to the African people. Any outbreak of violence inside Southern Rhodesia was bound to spread beyond its borders. If the United Kingdom Government controlled the external use of Southern Rhodesia's forces it would be doing so against forces coming to the rescue of the people in the Territory.

28. Mr. BUDU-ACQUAH (Ghana) recalled that Mr. Adoula, the Prime Minister of the Republic of the Congo (Leopoldville), had made a statement in which he had referred to an impending invasion of his country by Portuguese forces. He asked the petitioner whether the settler authorities in Southern Rhodesia were working hand in hand with Portugal in planning the invasion of the Congo (Leopoldville) or other African territories.

29. The CHAIRMAN observed that since the petitioner did not represent the Republic of the Congo (Leopoldville), it would be difficult for him to speak of that country. He should therefore confine his remarks to Southern Rhodesia.

30. Mr. SILUNDIKA (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) drew the Committee's attention to the fact that on his way to the United States Sir Roy Welensky had visited Portugal, where he had had talks with its Prime Minister, Mr. Salazar. Both before his departure and in New York Sir Roy Welensky had said that Africa was likely to experience its first war of colour over Southern Rhodesia. That was an alarming statement which, *inter alia*, indicated that co-operation between the settlers and the Salazar régime was not confined to any particular territory. With reference to the tragic situation in the Congo, he knew that troops had been sent to the borders of that country on a number of occasions and had been stationed along those borders in the middle of September. The mercenaries in the Congo had also included settlers from Southern Africa. It was easy to see that, if a serious situation arose in the struggle for freedom, the settler régime could make common cause with Portugal. It was also noteworthy that at a time when the United Kingdom had been responsible for the external defence of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, a British warship, HMS *Leopard*, had visited Angola to assist the Salazar authorities against the African people.

31. Mr. MGONJA (Tanganyika) asked whether the armed forces of Southern Rhodesia included South

African personnel and whether recruiting was carried out in South Africa and in the United Kingdom for military personnel for those forces.

32. Mr. SILUNDIKA (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that members of his party had seen South African troops detraining at Bulawayo. Moreover, according to a recent report in The New York Times, the Field régime had admitted that continuous army training was going to be undertaken for settler youth, which had always been drawn from the United Kingdom and South Africa. That was also true of the police force.

33. Mr. HASHIM (Sudan) observed that his attention had been attracted by a statement in the document "Southern Rhodesia: some facts and figures" (A/C.4/606) to the effect that the country had been conquered by the ancestors of the present indigenous inhabitants a short time before the arrival of the Europeans. He asked how much currency that opinion had in Southern Rhodesia and what was the attitude of the African population in the matter.

34. Mr. SILUNDIKA (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) replied that claims of a similar type had been made in many parts of Africa, but whatever the truth of the assertion might be, the fact remained that any fighting there might have been before the arrival of the white settlers had been between Africans and that Southern Rhodesia rightly belonged to the Africans.

35. Mr. HASHIM (Sudan) asked whether any white settlers in Southern Rhodesia were openly siding with the African majority and were being prosecuted by the authorities for their stand, and what the attitude of the white missionaries was.

36. Mr. SILUNDIKA (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that the number of Whites who sympathized with the plight of the Africans was negligible. Some of them had been prosecuted. For example, Mr. Peter Makay, a journalist resident at Salisbury, was serving a six months' sentence for having refused to enlist in the army on the grounds that that army was being used solely for internal purposes. About 0.02 per cent of the settlers were fairly well disposed towards the African cause, but many of them were a dangerous element who were seeking to join the struggle in order to compromise its principles and secure the survival of dominant economic interests.

37. The missionaries had taught that the African people should be patient and that their reward would come in heaven. The Africans had now discovered the emptiness of that insistence. Although the missionaries might have been expected to take an interest in the righting of wrongs, they took no concerted action. He did not wish to minimize their efforts in the educational field, but in the political field they remained aloof. They benefited from the present régime and could thus be said to be implicitly supporting it.

38. Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Ireland) asked the petitioner whether he thought that political activity was properly a part of the functions of missionaries or whether he would agree that their functions lay more in the educational field.

39. Mr. SILUNDIKA (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that education went to build up a citizen and, in that respect, contributed to the political stability of a country. He felt that in teaching all the sections of the population, the missionaries were obliged to impress the benefits accruing from the

existence of good relations both in private life and in politics. A moral issue was involved and the missionaries could not wash their hands of it.

40. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) asked whether the petitioner could produce any evidence of co-operation between the authorities of Southern Rhodesia and the Governments of South Africa and Portugal other than in the military field. There had been reports in the Press that South African nationalists had been arrested in Southern Rhodesia and in Mozambique and deported to South Africa.

41. Mr. SILUNDIKA (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) replied that those reports were true. The fact that there was military co-operation had been proved by the visit of the commander of the Portuguese forces to Southern Rhodesia to hold talks with Sir Roy Welensky, the so-called Minister for Defence of the Federation. The movement of Africans between Mozambique and Southern Rhodesia was under surveillance by the intelligence services of the three countries. The Portuguese intelligence organization, PIDE, had been allowed to operate freely within Southern Rhodesia. Africans who had gone to the Territory from Angola or Mozambique and had advocated political advancement for the Africans had been kidnapped by PIDE with the connivance of the white settler Government. Furthermore, refugees from South Africa to Southern Rhodesia had frequently been handed back to the South African authorities under an extradition agreement.

42. Mr. DIALLO Seydou (Guinea) recalled that the petitioner had referred to a projected loan of £15 million to the Southern Rhodesian Government. He would like to know where, how and when the request had been made.

43. Mr. SILUNDIKA (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that he could not give the exact date when the negotiations had begun. His organization had learned from reliable sources as far back as August that the negotiations were proceeding; they had therefore coincided with the establishment of the so-called Development Corporation approved by the Southern Rhodesian Parliament a few months previously.

44. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) observed that according to the petitioner the Portuguese military commander had visited Southern Rhodesia to discuss matters of common interest. He understood, however, that external affairs were within the competence of the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom Government must therefore have been informed of any negotiations between the authorities in Southern Rhodesia and those of South Africa and Portugal which would engage its responsibility as administering Power for the external relations of Southern Rhodesia. He would like to hear the comments of the petitioner and any of the parties concerned in that connexion.

45. Mr. SILUNDIKA (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that the United Kingdom itself decided what it chose to regard as within its competence. The United Kingdom Government must have been aware of the talks to which he had referred, since they had taken place openly and with the knowledge of the British High Commissioner in Salisbury.

46. Whatever claims might be advanced by the Governments concerned, ZAPU maintained that everything to do with Southern Rhodesia was the responsibility of the United Kingdom Government.

47. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) explained that by singling out one field of competence of the United

Kingdom Government he had not intended to imply that he accepted the argument that there were matters concerning Southern Rhodesia with which it was not competent to deal.

48. Mr. EL-SHAFEI (United Arab Republic) asked the petitioner when he had last been in Southern Rhodesia.

49. Mr. SILUNDIKA (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) replied that it had been about six weeks previously.

50. Mr. EL-SHAFEI (United Arab Republic) asked whether the views of the Africans had been ascertained in connexion with the United Kingdom Government's approach to the Southern Rhodesian authorities with regard to possible amendments to the franchise qualifications.

51. Mr. SILUNDIKA (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that the Africans were aware that discussions had been going on but had no first-hand knowledge of what had transpired. The purpose of those discussions was to enable the United Kingdom Government and the settlers to reach a private accommodation to which the seal of approval would subsequently be given at a constitutional conference. The Africans would thus be faced with an accomplished fact. By contrast, what the Africans wished the United Kingdom to do was to convene a constitutional conference at which all the parties concerned would be represented and the purpose of which would be the transfer of power to the true owners of the land of Zimbabwe.

52. Mr. EL-SHAFEI (United Arab Republic) asked whether, if a constitutional conference was held at an early date and ZAPU was invited, it would accept the invitation.

53. Mr. SILUNDIKA (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that he was not aware of any intention to convene a constitutional conference in the near future. ZAPU would welcome an invitation provided it was to a conference which would be concerned not with the granting of independence to the settlers in Southern Rhodesia but with the transfer of political authority and of control over the armed forces to the majority of the people.

54. Mr. EL-SHAFEI (United Arab Republic) observed that he gathered from the petitioner's reply that, if invited, ZAPU would agree to attend a conference convened for the purpose of drafting a new constitution for the Territory. He asked whether ZAPU would insist that the principle of "one man, one vote" should be applied, or would be content with African majority rule.

55. Mr. SILUNDIKA (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) replied that his party's objective was to ensure that elections to every seat in Parliament should be on the basis of the "one man, one vote" principle. It would never accept either a government of stooges or a weighted constitutional set-up.

56. Mr. HAMDANI (Pakistan) drew the petitioner's attention to a statement in The Economist of 12 October

1963 that even Sir Edgar Whitehead, if his latest utterances could be taken at their face value, might no longer be counted as whole-heartedly favouring the strengthening of the present Salisbury Government's military arm. He asked Mr. Silundika whether that feeling was wide-spread among all sections of the people of Southern Rhodesia.

57. Mr. SILUNDIKA (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that he had not been aware of those utterances. The Economist subscribed to the point of view which the United Kingdom Government was trying to establish, namely that a solution in Southern Rhodesia depended on individual settler personalities and not on the majority of the people, the real owners of the land. The Field régime was proceeding along a dangerous course to which Sir Edgar Whitehead conformed, while the United Kingdom Government was saying nothing about the matter. At the moment, the Field régime was not giving any prominence to its demands for independence, in order to obtain control of the armed forces. Before making any further moves, the settlers wished to be in control of the means which would enable them to suppress any political uprising. Sir Edgar Whitehead had lost all influence among the settlers; the latter were in favour of moves towards the establishment of a Verwoerd-type régime.

Mr. T. George Silundika, representative of the Zimbabwe African Peoples Union (ZAPU) withdrew.

58. Mr. DE MIRANDA (Portugal) recalled that, in the course of the hearing, the petitioner had referred to the relations between Portugal and Southern Rhodesia and had mentioned incidents such as kidnapping. His delegation would study those allegations carefully and would make a statement to the Committee later in the debate. At that stage he merely wished to repeat that the relations between his country and Southern Rhodesia were those of good neighbourliness, of the same kind as Portugal would wish to maintain with all its neighbours. They were directed against no third party and to that extent his delegation repudiated the implications in the petitioner's statements.

59. Mr. HATTINGH (Republic of South Africa) recalled that it had not been the first occasion on which allegations had been made concerning the presence of South African troops in Southern Rhodesia. In the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (135th meeting), Mr. Nkomo had made a similar statement, which at the time had been denied by the United Kingdom representative. Similar assertions had been made at the current session of the General Assembly. Those allegations were untrue. The allegation concerning the use of what the petitioner called South African mercenaries in the Congo was also untrue. It was regrettable that the petitioner should have used his hearing by the Committee in order to spread information that was known to be untrue.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.