

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1340th
MEETING**

Wednesday, 10 October 1962,
at 3.15 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>	
<i>Hearing of petitioners (continued)</i>	57
<i>Requests for hearings (continued)</i>	
<i>Requests concerning agenda item 56 (Question of Southern Rhodesia) (continued)</i>	63

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/L.4/560) (continued)

HEARING OF PETITIONERS (continued)

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

1. Mr. HAMDANI (Pakistan) expressed his delegation's deep appreciation of the statements made by the petitioner at the three previous meetings and of the replies he had given to questions.

2. Referring to a news item published in the *London Times* about a campaign called the Tell the People Campaign, organized by the Government of Southern Rhodesia on the pretext of informing the Africans living in rural areas of the reasons for the banning of ZAPU, he asked whether that campaign was an attempt to intimidate ZAPU or was intended to make more Africans register for the elections.

3. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that the Government had launched that campaign because it knew that ZAPU represented the real aspirations of the African people. By means of that campaign the white settler Government hoped to justify itself in the eyes of the Africans and allay their apprehensions and their anger. It probably hoped also to intimidate them and to force them, by hook or by crook, to register in greater numbers for the elections, which would enable it to apply the Constitution of 1961 with some semblance of legality.

4. Mr. HAMDANI (Pakistan) asked whether the ZAPU leaders wished to leave the way clear for so-called liberal elements or whether they intended to retain their influence over the African people and found a new nationalist party. He would also like to know whether, in order to continue the struggle for liberation, ZAPU

intended to resort to violence and civil disobedience, or to have recourse to passive resistance, which had succeeded in some countries.

5. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that in Southern Rhodesia the word "liberal" or "moderate" was applied to Africans who accepted white supremacy; anyone who did not was classed as an extremist. In that sense it could be said that there was no middle of the way, and hence no intermediate solution.

6. The Africans of Southern Rhodesia were determined to do everything in their power to prevent the elections planned by the Government, and thus to prevent the application of the 1961 Constitution. As for the methods to be employed, he recalled that ZAPU advocated non-violent methods. The party leaders had decided to encourage civil disobedience as a means of action, but there was no guarantee that the situation would not lead to bloodshed. Indeed, it was difficult to prevent the masses from meeting intimidation with intimidation and force with force. As was well known, oppressed peoples would resort to any means when they were desperate, and it was impossible to guarantee that the masses would abide strictly by the instructions which the party was trying to impress upon them.

7. Mr. HAMDANI (Pakistan) asked for information about the formation of a Southern Rhodesian Government in exile, which had been mentioned in the United Kingdom Press.

8. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that when ZAPU had been banned, on 20 September 1962, Mr. Nkomo had announced that a committee of the party would be set up in exile so that the Africans could continue the struggle. It had been then that the newspapers had talked about the establishment of a government in exile. Mr. Nkomo had set the matter right and had explained that, for the time being, it was only a matter of forming a committee in exile. That, however, did not rule out the possibility of forming a government in exile. If the situation deteriorated, the ZAPU leaders would be obliged to consider that solution seriously.

9. Mr. COOMARASWAMY (Ceylon) said that his delegation had been greatly impressed by the petitioner's brilliant analysis of the situation in Southern Rhodesia and by the convincing arguments he had put forward in his letters to Mr. Butler, which he had read to the Committee at its 1337th meeting.

10. Referring to the franchise provisions in the 1961 Constitution, the petitioner had said that they were very complex. He would like to know what percentage of adult English-speaking Africans would fulfil the language requirements if the system laid down in the Constitution was applied.

11. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that he did not know exactly what percentage of the African population of Southern Rhodesia spoke English. The majority of the young people of both sexes spoke English, but most of the older people spoke only very broken English, so that the percentage of persons fulfilling the language requirements would probably be very small.

12. Mr. COOMARASWAMY (Ceylon) asked what percentage of the Africans of Southern Rhodesia would fulfil the property and income requirements.

13. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) recalled that he had already told the Committee at the previous meeting that most of the Africans who owned property in the Native reserves could not qualify for registration on that basis since the land did not belong to them individually. The position of the Africans living in towns would not be much better, so that the number of Africans fulfilling the requirements would really be very small. In short, most Africans had not the slightest chance of qualifying for the franchise.

14. Mr. COOMARASWAMY (Ceylon) recalled that in one of the petitioner's letters to Mr. Butler reference had been made to four quotations from statements by Mr. Nkomo in the Government White Paper. He asked whether those were the only quotations from Mr. Nkomo in the White Paper.

15. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that, as far as he could remember, only those four passages were quoted in the White Paper.

16. Mr. COOMARASWAMY (Ceylon) recalled that in one of his letters to Mr. Butler the petitioner had stated that Sir Edgar Whitehead was trying to establish a puppet African party. Had he succeeded and, if so, how big was the party?

17. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that Sir Edgar Whitehead had repeatedly tried, through influential settlers, to have such a party established; it was intended to be an intermediate party between ZAPU and the parties led by Whites. The establishment of such a party was a dream that was dear not only to Sir Edgar Whitehead but to many of the white settlers. Many of his own friends had been approached, but they had rejected all the advances made to them. The Africans felt that it would be useless to establish such a party; what they wanted was to govern the country themselves. So far Sir Edgar Whitehead had always failed in his efforts whatever the Southern Rhodesian Press might say, as also in his attempts to stir up trouble between the different tribal groups.

18. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) asked the petitioner to give some information about the ZAPU leaders.

19. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) pointed out, to begin with, that the reason why the Africans were so angry about the banning of ZAPU was that it was aimed at removing qualified African leaders from political life.

20. One of the best-known members of ZAPU was Mr. Takawira, who had been a school-teacher and then a schoolmaster; he had later held an executive position in the Capricorn Africa Society and finally had worked for an insurance company. He had been well known in Southern Rhodesia for twenty years; he had six children and he was now in restricted resi-

dence. Mr. Mugabe, another ZAPU leader who was chief publicity officer, was a school-teacher; he had been educated in South Africa and was a Bachelor of Arts and a Bachelor of Education; he had taught in Ghana for four years. He too was at present in restricted residence. Dr. Pswarayi, who was a physician and restricted to Highfield, had three university degrees and was the father of two children. Mr. Chitepo, a lawyer, was ZAPU's legal counsel. Mr. Dumbutshena, ZAPU's London representative, was a journalist; he was a Bachelor of Arts (South Africa) and a Bachelor of Education and was at present studying law in London. Mr. Nyandoro, who had been the General Secretary of the African National Congress, was a trained accountant; he had been in prison for the past four years. Mr. Sithole said that he himself was a school-teacher and an ordained minister; he held the degrees of Bachelor of Arts (South Africa) and Bachelor of Divinity (United States) and he had written a book called African Nationalism. He had six children.

21. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) recalled Sir Edgar Whitehead's statement that the application of the 1961 Constitution would give the Africans a majority in the Legislative Assembly within twelve years. Sir Roy Welensky had said, on the contrary, that there would be no African majority in the legislature for another 200 years. He would like to know whether the petitioner thought that there was any justification for the former statement.

22. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that the 1961 Constitution gave promise of a more favourable future for the white settlers of Southern Rhodesia, whose privileges it would consolidate. African politicians gave no credence to Sir Edgar Whitehead's statement, the sole purpose of which was to induce the Africans to accept the 1961 Constitution. Many members of the present Parliament had welcomed the Constitution simply because it would make it impossible for the Africans to gain influence in Parliament.

23. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) asked the petitioner if he could provide any information on the equipment of the Federal armed forces, which, according to Mr. Dumbutshena, had been used to repress nationalist movements. Did the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland manufacture its own weapons or import them?

24. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) replied that the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland had a Federal army which had been used to repress the national liberation movements in Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia, and on several occasions in Southern Rhodesia. In Central Africa there was a Federal and a Territorial structure: questions relating to Whites—European education, the army and European agriculture, for example—were the direct responsibility of the Federal Government, whereas questions relating to Africans—African education and African agriculture, for example—were the responsibility of the Territorial Government. In the three Territories, the Federal organs always took precedence of the Territorial organs. That was why so many Africans were opposed to the Federation. The soldiers of the Federal forces were sometimes used to oppose the aspirations of the people. He did not possess any specific information on the relations there might be between the Federal army and the United Kingdom Government.

25. With regard to the question of armaments, as far as he knew there was no munitions factory in the Territory. The Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland imported arms and munitions from the United Kingdom and the United States and possibly from other countries as well.

26. Mr. BUDU-ACQUAH (Ghana) observed that there were many people in the United Kingdom who, while able to read and write, did not really know their political rights. He wondered, therefore, whether there was any justification for requiring the Africans of Southern Rhodesia to know English before they were allowed to vote.

27. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that, despite what was said by some Western people, the idea of freedom was not of European origin and did not have to be taught. The Africans did not need to know English in order to know the meaning of self-government or independence, and he did not see why the African inhabitants of Southern Rhodesia should be required to learn English before they could vote. It was obvious that the only reason why the Africans in Southern Rhodesia were required to have a knowledge of English before they could be entered on the register of electors was to prevent them from exercising their civil rights in their own country. He was absolutely opposed to the retention of that prerequisite.

28. Mr. BUDU-ACQUAH (Ghana) asked whether the petitioner thought that the United Kingdom would take a lesson from contemporary history, particularly the events in Algeria, and would change its attitude with respect to Southern Rhodesia and grant complete independence to the indigenous people of the Territory.

29. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) thought that the United Kingdom must be made aware of its responsibilities with respect to Southern Rhodesia. After what had happened in Algeria, Cyprus and elsewhere, the United Kingdom should understand that, even unarmed against armed white settlers, the Africans would eventually triumph. By sparing the Territory a bloody conflict, the United Kingdom would make it possible for a deeper friendship to be established between Whites and Blacks. It was to be hoped that the United Kingdom would intervene before it was too late, for it was impossible to halt the advance of the masses towards freedom.

30. Mr. BUDU-ACQUAH (Ghana) asked whether, in view of the percentage of white settlers in Southern Rhodesia and the percentage in Algeria before independence, the petitioner saw any basic differences between the two countries. As France had granted independence to Algeria, his delegation did not see why the United Kingdom would find it difficult to do the same with respect to Southern Rhodesia.

31. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that the presence of a large number of settlers in a Territory created a certain political atmosphere. It had been said that in Africa the greater the number of white settlers in a colonial country, the more difficult it was for the indigenous inhabitants to obtain independence. In that connexion, it was interesting to note that South Africa had the highest percentage of white settlers in Africa; Algeria came next and Southern Rhodesia third. An additional factor which complicated the situation was that Southern Rhodesia was in many respects highly industrialized and that

the Europeans had industrial and commercial interests there.

32. The Africans had no objection to the white colonists who came to Southern Rhodesia with the intention of settling there permanently, but their attitude was entirely different towards Europeans who came to their country temporarily and they were prepared to oppose the industrialization of Southern Rhodesia if it would prevent them from attaining independence.

33. He, for his part, did not see why the United Kingdom could not intervene in Southern Rhodesia and convene another constitutional conference, to be followed by general elections, after which the Territory could be proclaimed independent.

34. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia), referring to the reserved powers mentioned by the petitioners, said that in his view the most important provision of the 1923 Constitution was that reserving to the United Kingdom Government the power to impose a veto in legislative matters. He would like to know whether the 1923 Constitution included provision for reserving other powers to the United Kingdom Government.

35. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) replied that the reserved powers of the United Kingdom Government were inscribed in the Constitution of 1923. The most important provision was actually the one which reserved to the United Kingdom Government the power to veto any law which was discriminatory or likely to prejudice the interests of the inhabitants of the Territory. That provision had been included in the 1923 Constitution, but since that date the Parliament of white settlers had enacted a great many discriminatory laws, all of which had received the Royal assent—forty such laws had been enumerated at the national convention held at Salisbury in 1960. So far the United Kingdom Government had never exercised its right of veto; hence the Africans were apprehensive and felt that constitutional safeguards would not suffice to protect their interests. They considered that the only solution was the transfer of power to the African people by the introduction of universal suffrage and a majority government.

36. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) asked if the petitioner knew of any other provisions of the 1923 Constitution reserving powers to the United Kingdom.

37. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that he would prefer to reply to that question at a later date.

38. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) asked how the African population had been represented at the Constitutional Conference held at Salisbury in 1961.

39. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) replied that the National Democratic Party—the Africans' party—had been represented by two delegates. The United Federal Party had been represented by eleven delegates, and the Central Africa Party by two delegates; the white opposition party, or Dominion Party, had also been represented. By force of numbers the United Federal Party had been able to impose its views.

40. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) said that he understood that the African representatives, who should have represented the will of the African people, had been duped. He would like to know whether the Government of Southern Rhodesia had made any attempts to propose a policy of association or compromise to the African parties.

41. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) replied that it was necessary to realize that the European settlers thought that they knew the needs of the Africans: they established their own plans and then asked the Africans to co-operate, on the assumption that the Africans did not know what they needed. Such ideas as consultation, compromise and so forth were still foreign to them and they were prepared to impose their plans by force if necessary. The reason ZAPU was treated so mercilessly was that it did not accept plans laid down without the consent of the African population. There was no spirit of compromise or association in the United Federal Party.

42. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) asked what had happened to the European members of ZAPU when the party had been banned.

43. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that Dr. Ranger, for instance, had been assigned to forced residence at Salisbury, where he was teaching; that the same action had been taken with respect to Mr. Reed, another teacher; and that Mr. Lichtenstein had been obliged to leave the country and go and live in England.

44. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) asked what reasons had been given for banning the two parties which had preceded ZAPU.

45. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) replied that, in the case of the African National Congress, the pretext had been the growing resistance to the enforcement of the Land Husbandry Act; that resistance had been attributed to the party, but had in fact been due to the natural opposition of the population. It had also been alleged that the behaviour of the young members of the African National Congress constituted a danger to public order. A similar argument had later been used with regard to the National Democratic Party: it had been claimed that its youth organizations represented a disorderly element. The real aim was to prevent the Africans from expressing their views.

46. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) asked why the authorities had alleged that acts of violence had been committed in both cases.

47. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that the African National Congress had been accused of preparing for a massacre of the European population, but that there had in fact been no violence. The National Democratic Party had been prohibited after 500 African women had organized a protest demonstration against the new Constitution. They had assembled in front of the Prime Minister's offices and had been ordered to disperse. Tear gas and police dogs had eventually been used. The demonstration had been laid at the door of the National Democratic Party, which had been banned.

48. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) asked whether the workers who went to neighbouring territories did so voluntarily or whether the Government pursued a policy of forced labour.

49. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) replied that, to the best of his knowledge, there was no policy of forced labour in Southern Rhodesia, where people were free to work wherever they saw fit. The Government did not undertake any recruitment on behalf of other territories, but famine conditions prevailed in the Native reserves, and there was a floating population of Africans who were obliged to go and work

on European farms, for which they provided a source of cheap labour. An African agricultural worker was paid between 15 and 18 shillings a month.

50. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) asked whether there was a law prohibiting the sale of fire-arms to Africans.

51. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that most Europeans could buy fire-arms, but that there was a ban on the sale of such weapons to Africans, with the exception of some members of the United Federal Party. The reason was that the settlers did not trust the African population and feared the possibility of an uprising if the Africans were provided with weapons.

52. Mr. LORINC (Hungary), referring to the petitioners' statements with regard to the "unholy alliance" which was said to exist between the settlers of Southern Rhodesia, the Portuguese colonies, Katanga and South Africa, asked the petitioner to provide details of the connexions between the Government of Southern Rhodesia and the Republic of South Africa.

53. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that people living in Southern Rhodesia were impressed by the evidence of collusion between Southern Rhodesia, South Africa and Mozambique. At the outset of the present crisis, South African troops had been seen on the Southern Rhodesian side of the frontier and according to some reports, a number of Federal soldiers had gone to South Africa for additional training. He believed that there was a close military alliance between Southern Rhodesia and South Africa. At the time of the disturbances in the Congo, South African troops had been given the right of free passage through the territory of the Federation.

54. Mr. FOURIE (South Africa) said that no South African military force had ever been sent to Katanga or to the Congo.

55. Mr. LORINC (Hungary) said he reserved the right to reply to that remark in the general debate.

56. He asked the petitioner what his party thought were the conditions that should be fulfilled before the Territory could attain its independence.

57. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) replied that the first condition would be the release of the political leaders and the lifting of the ban on ZAPU. The second would be the convening of a new constitutional conference to draw up a constitution acceptable to the majority. The third condition would be free elections to enable the country to attain independence.

58. Mr. LORINC (Hungary) assured the petitioner that his delegation would do everything in its power to help ZAPU to attain its objectives.

59. Mr. KHOSLA (India) expressed the hope that those objectives might be attained by non-violent means. The Indian delegation welcomed the fact that it had not been necessary to use force practically anywhere in Africa; moreover, the petitioner had stated that his party hoped to attain its aims without using violence and that Mr. Nkomo and other Southern Rhodesian leaders had always advocated peaceful methods. It was nevertheless easy to understand the feelings of the people of Southern Rhodesia, who saw so many other African countries enjoying freedom while they were subjected instead to the provocative measures of a reactionary Government. It was also easy to understand their irritation at the fact that the

United Kingdom was doing so little to protect their rights, and the temptation to resort to force must be strong. He hoped that the African leaders would use their influence to advocate patience. In their fight for independence Indian political leaders had also been in favour of non-violence. But whenever wholesale arrests of political leaders took place and people were left leaderless, there was danger of violence and on occasions it did break out. The Indian delegation hoped that the draft resolution adopted by the Committee at its 1336th meeting would prove effective and that the Southern Rhodesian authorities would release Mr. Nkomo and others and thus prevent any regrettable increase in violence. He asked the petitioner whether he thought that violence would be intensified if the people continued to be deprived of their leaders.

60. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that the reason why he and his colleagues had requested a hearing by the Committee was to persuade the United Nations to use its influence with the United Kingdom Government with a view to that Government intervening to secure the lifting of the ban on ZAPU and the release of the political leaders. As long as those leaders remained in prison or were assigned to forced residence, violence could only spread. The people must be given back their leaders.

61. Mr. MARSH (Jamaica), observing that Sir Edgar Whitehead seemed to rely on tribal chiefs to fill the gaps left by the banning of ZAPU, asked how those chiefs were appointed in Southern Rhodesia.

62. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) replied that chiefdoms had originally been hereditary, but that the chiefs were now appointed and paid by the Government and were responsible to it. They were therefore obliged to apply the Government's policy and no longer represented the needs and wishes of the people; although the Government asserted that they were the natural leaders of the people, the people's answer was that that was no longer so and that the chiefs now represented only the will of the Government.

63. Mr. MARSH (Jamaica) referred to a statement by the Prime Minister of South Africa to the effect that there could be no question of association between his country and Southern Rhodesia as long as the Government of the latter country showed any interest in securing African support, and asked to what extent Sir Edgar Whitehead was prepared to meet Mr. Verwoerd's conditions.

64. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that 40 per cent of the white settlers wanted an association between Southern Rhodesia and South Africa, but the rest were opposed to it. The settlers favouring such an association believed that their only chance of survival lay in a policy of apartheid. It was difficult to reply to the Jamaican representative's question, since the pressure of the nationalist movement in Southern Rhodesia was very strong; accordingly, all the factors involved tended to prevent Sir Edgar Whitehead from going all the way along the path taken by South Africa, for fear of provoking new and more serious disturbances.

65. In reply to another question by Mr. MARSH (Jamaica), Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) pointed out that his party was essentially a political party, which had set itself the primary aim of securing the freedom of the majority of the population. All Africans believed in God, but not all of

them approved of Christianity; ZAPU consisted not only of Christians, but also of Moslems, Buddhists and even atheists. Its religious policy was that of freedom of religion. In Southern Rhodesia education was run by the Government and by missions from the United States, the United Kingdom, Sweden, New Zealand and Australia, among other countries; since, in order to run their schools, those missions had to interpret the policy of the Government, which was unpopular, and since they were often the targets of political attack, some Africans believed that they were in collusion with the Government. In any case, the allegation that ZAPU was anti-Christian was pure propaganda.

66. Mr. DELISLE (Canada) recalled that at the previous meeting, in reply to a question about the New Africa Party established in Southern Rhodesia by Mr. Garfield Todd, Mr. Sithole had said that ZAPU and Mr. Todd's party were in agreement on the aims to be achieved. He asked what was the membership and size of the New Africa Party and whether ZAPU contemplated active co-operation with that party or even the possibility of a merger.

67. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) replied that the New Africa Party, which so far consisted only of a few Africans and a few Europeans, could not be compared numerically with ZAPU or the United Federal Party. There was no plan for a merger between the New Africa Party and ZAPU, but its members were free to join ZAPU. As far as co-operation between the two parties was concerned, the leaders of the two parties freely joined in discussing questions which were of great importance to the country. Mr. Garfield Todd was doing his utmost to demonstrate to the Europeans that the Africans would inevitably accede to power and the activities of his party were designed to that end.

68. Mr. EBAGNITCHIE (Ivory Coast) noted the clear and firm attitude adopted by the petitioners. They had given a dramatic picture of the situation and Mr. Sithole in particular had shown that it would deteriorate still further if no solution were found to the present conflict. Certain people considered that it would be preferable to induce the African masses to bide their time and to give the Constitution a trial; he asked Mr. Sithole whether it would be possible in the present circumstances for ZAPU to advise the Africans to exercise patience and to use its great influence to dissuade them from violent measures. He was concerned at certain signs, such as the formation of a national liberation army by some elements of ZAPU, and recalled that the crises in Algeria and Angola had begun in the same way.

69. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) replied that to attempt to persuade the Africans to wait would be to ask the impossible. He recalled that the new Constitution of 1961 had three times been unanimously rejected by his party, that it had been rejected by an overwhelming majority in a special referendum and that a United Nations body had also rejected it. Any African political leader who endeavoured to persuade the Africans to accept the Constitution would be discredited, yet a number of European colonialists still hoped that that could be done.

70. The establishment of the Zimbabwe liberation army was the work of the most extremist members of ZAPU. In his opinion, the only way to eliminate violence would be to give the country a constitution which was acceptable to the majority of the people.

71. Mr. EBAGNITCHIE (Ivory Coast) suggested to the petitioner that in that case the solution lay not in an attempt of active conciliation by ZAPU but in an appeal to the United Kingdom's sense of moral responsibility.

72. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) expressed the view that unless the United Kingdom intervened, the situation would deteriorate. A passive attitude on the part of the United Kingdom would be interpreted by the present Government of Southern Rhodesia as encouragement. Moreover, the United Kingdom was legally and morally bound to intervene, since in the last resort it was responsible for the Territory. Doubtless it had substantial interests in Southern Rhodesia and felt obliged to support the Europeans there, but it should intervene in the present crisis because the Africans, who wished to see a reconciliation between the two racial groups and wished for a constitution that would restore peace, could not indefinitely continue to use peaceful means if they received no encouragement from the administering Power.

73. Mr. WOLNIAK (Poland) thanked the petitioner for having replied so clearly to the questions put to him and assured him that the just cause of the Africans in Southern Rhodesia had the fullest support of the Polish delegation.

74. He recalled that the Government of Southern Rhodesia was at present preparing for elections designed to perpetuate the domination of the white minority under a Constitution which had been rejected by the African population, and that the preparations for the elections had led to a recrudescence of repressive measures and in particular to the banning of ZAPU. He asked how Africans were registered on the electoral rolls and whether it was true that the some 10,000 Africans who were said to be already entered on the rolls would be sufficient to elect the fifteen African members for whom the Constitution provided.

75. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) recalled that in 1961, after the new Constitution had been drawn up, Sir Edgar Whitehead had assured the United Kingdom Government that between 50,000 and 70,000 Africans would be included in the electoral rolls and that once that figure had been reached, he would hold a general election. So far, however, only 10,000 Africans had been registered as voters and Sir Edgar had been obliged to postpone the elections which were originally to have been held in October 1962. Another member of ZAPU, who had just arrived from Southern Rhodesia where he had been at the time the party was banned, would be in a better position than he to say how the registration of Africans on the electoral rolls was proceeding and what steps had been taken by the Government to induce a large number of Africans to register.

76. In reply to a further question by Mr. WOLNIAK (Poland), Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that, in the opinion of his party, certain great Powers, and in particular the United Kingdom and the United States of America, were supporting the forces at work in Katanga, Angola and Mozambique; the United Kingdom Government had sent arms to the Portuguese forces in Angola which were fighting against the national liberation movement. Obviously,

if those two great countries refused to give direct assistance to those who were struggling for the observance of the principle of self-determination, the present situation in that part of Africa would continue. So long as the colonialists continued to be encouraged by the United Kingdom and the United States, they would violate that universally recognized principle. It was for that reason that ZAPU was appealing to the United Kingdom Government to assist in finding an early solution of the problem.

77. Mr. VLACHOS (Greece) referred to a question put by the representative of Haiti at the previous meeting and pointed out that the colonial policy of the United Kingdom was increasingly directed towards the progressive solution of problems; he asked whether ZAPU was prepared to accept a constitution which provided for equal national representation of the two racial groups as an interim measure.

78. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said he was well aware that progress towards independence must take place by stages. Nevertheless, the stages must provide reliable guarantees and must not be designed to sidetrack the question of the achievement of independence. In Nyasaland, for example, political power was now effectively in the hands of the Africans; that was also the case in Kenya and a similar process had taken place in Nigeria. ZAPU believed in the principle of guarantees.

79. Mr. ABDELLAH (Tunisia), referring to the constitutional conference which ZAPU was demanding, asked the petitioner whether he regarded the problem as a purely constitutional one or whether he thought that the problem of constitutionality should be settled with the United Kingdom Government before the question of the elections was discussed.

80. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) replied that the disturbances in Southern Rhodesia had been caused by the fact that the Constitution was not acceptable. There was therefore a tendency to describe the problem as a constitutional one, but it was equally linked with that of sovereignty, in other words, the question of who, in the last resort, would hold the power in Southern Rhodesia. ZAPU held that power should be transferred to the Africans.

81. Mr. ABDELLAH (Tunisia) asked whether there was a central trade union for African workers in Southern Rhodesia and whether the right to strike was recognized.

82. Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) replied that there were two African trade unions in Southern Rhodesia, but that whenever a strike occurred the police ordered the strikers to return to work, threatening to use, and in fact using, force. The African workers were therefore in no position to negotiate with their European employers.

83. In reply to a further question by Mr. ABDELLAH (Tunisia), Mr. SITHOLE (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) said that the Europeans enjoyed social advantages which were denied to the Africans, who, for example, were not covered by social security. That was one aspect of racial discrimination, which was also to be seen in the unequal representation in Parliament, where the new Constitution provided for only fifteen African members as against fifty white members.

Requests for hearings (continued)

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

84. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that Mr. Enoch Dumbutshena, on behalf of Mr. Chinamano and Mr. Shamuyarira, two other members of the Zimbabwe African Peoples Union (ZAPU), had requested that the Committee should grant those two ZAPU members hearings on the question of Southern

Rhodesia. Since it was important for the Committee to decide at once whether to grant the hearings requested, he proposed that the Committee should dispense with the usual procedure of having the request circulated as a document before taking action on it.

It was so decided.

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

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

*Resumed from the 1335th meeting.

^{1/} The request was subsequently circulated as document A/C.4/557/Add.4.