



UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



Distr.  
GENERAL

A/5800/Add.1 (part II)\*  
30 December 1964

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Nineteenth session

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\*\*

Rapporteur: Mr. K. NATWAR SINGH (India)

CHAPTER III (PART II)

SOUTHERN RHODESIA

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
VII. ACTION ARISING FROM THE REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON SOUTHERN RHODESIA (concluded) . . . . .	525	3
VIII. LATEST DEVELOPMENTS CONCERNING THE TERRITORY . . . . .	526	3
The question of independence . . . . .	527 - 531	3
Visit by Mr. Ian Smith to South Africa . . . . .	532	5
Commonwealth Prime Ministers Meeting . . . . .	533 - 536	5
Motions of no confidence in the Southern Rhodesia Government . . . . .	537 - 539	6
Resolution adopted by Cairo Conference of Heads of African States and Governments . . . . .	540	7
Visit by Mr. Smith to Portugal . . . . .	541 - 542	7

\* This document contains an addendum to the chapter on Southern Rhodesia, which was previously issued under the symbol A/5800/Add.1. The general introductory chapter to the report of the Special Committee will be issued under the symbol A/5800. Other chapters will appear as addenda.

\*\* Item 21 of the provisional agenda.

# CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
Discussions between Sir Alex Douglas-Home and Mr. Ian Smith . . . . .	543 - 545	8
Plans for testing public opinion on the question of independence . . . . .	546 - 550	9
Political parties . . . . .	551 - 558	10
Results of recent by-elections . . . . .	559 - 560	12
Other developments . . . . .	561 - 568	13
IX. CONSIDERATION BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF RECENT DEVELOPMENTS . . . . .		14
Introduction . . . . .	569	14
Written petitions . . . . .	570	14
General statements by members . . . . .	571 - 614	15
X. ACTION TAKEN BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE IN THE LIGHT OF LATEST DEVELOPMENTS . . . . .	615 - 624	26
XI. ACTION ARISING FROM THE FURTHER REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON SOUTHERN RHODESIA . . . . .	625 - 636	29
APPENDIX I: MEETING OF COMMONWEALTH PRIME MINISTERS, JULY 1964; EXCERPT FROM FINAL COMMUNIQUE . . . . .		33
APPENDIX II: RESOLUTION CONCERNING SOUTHERN RHODESIA ADOPTED AT THE FIRST ORDINARY SESSION OF THE ASSEMBLY OF HEADS OF AFRICAN STATES AND GOVERNMENTS . . . . .		34
APPENDIX III: TEXT OF THE JOINT COMMUNIQUE AT THE END OF DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED KINGDOM PRIME MINISTER, SIR ALEC DOUGLAS-HOME, AND THE PRIME MINISTER OF SOUTHERN RHODESIA, MR. IAN SMITH, IN LONDON, 7-11 SEPTEMBER 1964 . . . . .		35
APPENDIX IV: STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF SOUTHERN RHODESIA IN THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ON 15 SEPTEMBER 1964. . . . .		36

### CHAPTER III (PART II)

#### SOUTHERN RHODESIA

#### VII. ACTION ARISING FROM THE REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON SOUTHERN RHODESIA (concluded)

525. At its 278th meeting on 3 July 1964, the Special Committee adopted its report to the General Assembly, covering its consideration of Southern Rhodesia up to that date (A/5800/Add.1). In accordance with a decision taken by the Special Committee at the same meeting, the report was transmitted to the President of the Security Council on 28 July 1964 (S/5856).

#### VIII. LATEST DEVELOPMENTS CONCERNING THE TERRITORY

526. At its 286th meeting, on 5 October 1964, the Special Committee decided to request the Secretariat to prepare a working paper giving information on the latest developments concerning Southern Rhodesia. This information accordingly furnished to the Special Committee is set out below.

##### The question of independence

527. The question of independence for Southern Rhodesia under the present Constitution has remained a major preoccupation of the Government of that Territory. During May and June 1964, statements made by the Prime Minister, Mr. Ian Smith, and some of his Ministers led to a widespread feeling that the Southern Rhodesia Government was seriously contemplating a unilateral declaration of independence and was accordingly preparing the ground for the event.

528. On 2 May 1964, Mr. Smith was reported as stating that his Government reserved the right, in the event of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain

and Northern Ireland reneging on the promises, obligations and contracts it entered into at the time of the 1961 referendum, to take matters into its own hands. On 12 May 1964, he called for a united approach throughout the country to the independence issue. The Government, he said, must sever its apron strings and create its own conditions; otherwise, the country would never be able to build a unified nation. The country must live in the hope that negotiations with the United Kingdom Government would succeed; but if they failed, the Government would make up its mind as to what decision to take. The people, in their turn, would have to decide whether to side with those who wanted appeasement and lowering of standards or to make a stand with the Government.

529. On 5 June 1964, Mr. Smith was quoted as saying that it was wishful thinking for anyone still to believe that there was much hope of negotiating independence on the lines desired by his Government. As long as there was even a thread of an apron string attaching Southern Rhodesia to the United Kingdom Government, foreign politicians would continue to press that Government to exert its influence on Southern Rhodesian affairs; this was one reason why his Government could not relinquish its pursuit of independence.

530. In another speech on 15 June 1964, he reiterated that he was not hopeful of the outcome of his efforts to negotiate with the United Kingdom Government. There was, he added, a limit to the time his Government could go on negotiating and drifting, and that limit, in his view, was not very far off. The time was not distant when his Government would be able to give the people of Southern Rhodesia what had been promised them for years and was their right.

531. Following pressures from the Rhodesia National Party members of the Legislative Assembly and from other quarters, Mr. Smith announced in a broadcast, on 25 June, that his Government would not resort to a unilateral declaration of independence unless it had the substantial support of the electorate. The Government, he stated, was in the midst of independence negotiations with the

United Kingdom Government. If these negotiations failed, the Southern Rhodesia Government would consider and place before the people all the pros and cons of a unilateral declaration. That would be the time when, as never before in the history of the Territory, the people must stand together, and when their loyalty must be to Southern Rhodesia only.

#### Visit by Mr. Ian Smith to South Africa

532. Mr. Ian Smith paid a three-day official visit to South Africa on 1 July 1964 for talks with Mr. Hendrik Verwoerd, the South African Prime Minister. Mr. Smith was expected to seek assurances that South Africa would be prepared to back Southern Rhodesia economically if the Government of the Territory unilaterally declared its independence. He was also expected to discuss general economic relations, the trade agreement between the two countries and matters of common defence interest. At the end of his visit, Mr. Smith was reported to have stated at a press conference that his country was closer than ever to South Africa and that he knew where Southern Rhodesia stood with that country.

#### Commonwealth Prime Ministers Meeting

533. Southern Rhodesia was not invited to the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Meeting that took place in London during July 1964. The reasons put forward in official statements was that in the view of the United Kingdom Government, no non-fully-independent members of the Commonwealth should be invited to attend the Meeting without the general agreement of all the independent members. The consensus that emerged from consultations with these members was that, in view of the size of the modern Commonwealth, the meetings of Prime Ministers should be confined to the representatives of fully independent States. The United Kingdom Prime Minister, however, invited Mr. Smith to visit London for general talks on the question of independence for Southern Rhodesia before or after the Meeting.

534. The final communique issued by the Commonwealth Prime Ministers on 15 July 1964 (see appendix I of this report) welcomed the previous announcement by the United Kingdom Government, that, as in the case of other Territories, the existence of sufficiently representative institutions would be a condition of the grant of independence to Southern Rhodesia. It also contained a pledge that no

Commonwealth Government would recognize a unilateral declaration of independence by Southern Rhodesia. The communique also recorded views expressed during the Meeting, to the effect that all the detained African leaders should be released and that an independence conference should be convened, which leaders of all parties in Southern Rhodesia would attend, with the object of seeking agreement on the steps by which the Territory might achieve early independence on the basis of majority rule.

535. Commenting on the Meeting in the House of Commons on 16 July 1964, the United Kingdom Prime Minister stated that the final communique recognized two essential facts: that the responsibility for decisions on the progress of Southern Rhodesia towards independence rested with the United Kingdom Government, and that there were certain basic prerequisites, on which the whole Commonwealth agreed, before a Territory moved towards full independence. It was on this basis that the United Kingdom Government had agreed to give full consideration to the views expressed by the other Governments represented at the Meeting.

536. On 16 June 1964, Mr. Smith declared that he had no intention of adhering to the proposals made at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers Meeting that there should be new constitutional talks on the future of the Territory. He characterized these proposals as interference in Southern Rhodesian affairs, which he would brush aside and treat with the contempt it deserved. His Government would continue to press for a negotiated independence based on the present Constitution.

#### Motions of no confidence in the Southern Rhodesia Government

537. On 28 July 1964, Sir Edgar Whitehead, the Leader of the Rhodesia National Party proposed to the Southern Rhodesia Legislative Assembly a motion of no confidence in the Government. The motion asserted that the Government had forfeited the confidence of Parliament which, it said, deplored statements implying that the Government was contemplating seizing independence. The motion called on the Southern Rhodesia Government to state categorically that it would not initiate unconstitutional action on the independence issue.

538. Another motion of no confidence was proposed the same day by Mr. Ahern Palley, an independent European member of Parliament, to the effect that the Government

had refused to acknowledge the urgent need to make the franchise available to an increasing number of Africans, had failed to establish good race relations and had continued to deprive people of their personal liberty by arbitrary restriction.

539. These motions were defeated. On 25 August, another motion was carried by 31 votes to 24, expressing the full support of the Assembly for the Government in its approach to the United Kingdom for independence on the basis of the 1961 Constitution, and deploring statements from certain Opposition spokesmen which implied that the Government was contemplating a unilateral declaration of independence.

Resolution adopted by Cairo Conference of Heads of African States and Governments

540. The Assembly of Heads of African States and Governments, meeting in Cairo from 17 to 21 July 1964, adopted a resolution (see appendix II of this report) requesting the African States to take a vigorous stand against a unilateral declaration of independence by the Southern Rhodesian Government, and to take appropriate measures, including the support of an African nationalist government in exile, should such an eventuality arise. The resolution also requested the United Kingdom to convene immediately a constitutional conference, in which representatives of all political groups in Southern Rhodesia would participate with a view to preparing a new constitution on the basis of "one man, one vote". Further, it called for the immediate release of all political prisoners and detainees, and it designated the Governments of Malawi and the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar to offer their good offices to the nationalist parties in Southern Rhodesia so as to bring about a united front for the attainment of their common objective of independence.

Visit by Mr. Smith to Portugal

541. Mr. Smith paid a two-day visit to Lisbon on 4 September 1964 for talks with the Portuguese Government. He denied on arrival an allegation that he had come to conclude a secret pact with the Portuguese Government in order to assure Southern Rhodesia of Portuguese support should his Government unilaterally declare its independence. He emphasized however that Portugal was one of

Southern Rhodesia's oldest and most trusted allies and friends and that friendly relations must accordingly be maintained with that country. He also alluded to the common frontier between Southern Rhodesia and Mozambique and to the importance of Lourenço Marques as an outlet for Southern Rhodesian trade.

542. According to reports, the talks between Mr. Smith and the Portuguese Government touched on such matters as closer economic and political relations, mutual defence measures and an exchange of intelligence.

Discussions between Sir Alex Douglas-Home and Mr. Ian Smith

543. In response to an invitation by Sir Alec Douglas-Home, Mr. Ian Smith went to London on 6 September 1964 for discussions concerning the question of independence for Southern Rhodesia. He told the Press on his arrival that he had come not to demand, but to negotiate for independence. He added that if the Southern Rhodesia Government eventually got to the position where it believed there was no alternative, then it was firm in its resolution unilaterally to declare its independence.

544. The joint communique issued at the end of the discussions on 11 September 1964, (see appendix III of this report) noted that Mr. Smith did not feel bound by any of the statements made at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Meeting which had been conveyed to him by Sir Alec Douglas-Home. The communique also stated that while the United Kingdom Government looked forward to Southern Rhodesia becoming independent as soon as practicable, it must and had yet to be satisfied that the basis for such independence was acceptable to the people of the country as a whole. Further, the communique recorded Mr. Smith's conviction that the majority of the population supported his request for independence on the basis of the present Constitution; he would accordingly consider how best this could be demonstrated, so that independence could be granted. Further, the communique made it clear that the United Kingdom Government, while ready to take account of any views freely expressed by the population on this issue, reserved its position.

545. Following the release of the communique, Mr. Smith told a press conference that he hoped Southern Rhodesia would attain independence by agreement this year and that the possibility of a unilateral declaration of independence had been ruled out for the time being. He hoped to arrange in a couple of months for



opinion in the Territory to be tested. According to him there had recently been a dramatic change in African thinking, which had been antagonized by the use of intimidation and extortion on the part of African nationalist leaders. He was confident that he could get a mandate from the majority of the population, including the mass of Africans, in favour of independence under the present Constitution and franchise. With this mandate, he would obtain independence for the Territory.

Plans for testing public opinion on the question of independence

546. On 15 September 1964, Mr. Smith announced to the Southern Rhodesia Legislative Assembly his plans for testing public opinion on the question of independence for the Territory on the basis of the present Constitution. Asserting that the rural Africans did not support the extreme African nationalists, who, owing to their resort to violence, had lost most, if not all, of the little support they commanded, he said he hoped to obtain their views within the framework of the tribal structure. To this end he would use the Chiefs and Headmen as a means of consultation with the people. He stressed that the consultation would be as wide as possible but that it could not and would not mean "one man, one vote". Over and above this consultation, a referendum would be held of all registered voters.<sup>1/</sup>

547. He also informed the Assembly that after discussion, the Leader of the Opposition had agreed to co-operate with him to find the best means of carrying out this exercise. Finally, he emphasized that the success of the exercise would mean independence for Southern Rhodesia by the end of the year, "on the present Constitution and franchise, and with no lowering of standards". The text of Mr. Smith's statement appears in appendix IV of this report.

548. In a subsequent statement on 17 September 1964, Mr. Smith notified the Legislative Assembly of the formation of a committee of Government and Opposition members to investigate the best means of testing public opinion. He added that the greatest guarantee of fairness which people outside the country could have was that the Southern Rhodesians were the only people who would continue to live with the country's problems.

1/ The numbers of voters registered on the two rolls as at April 1963 were as follows:

	<u>"A" Roll</u>	<u>"B" Roll</u>
Europeans	88,256	570
Africans	2,251	10,214
Asians	1,193	107
Coloured	1,275	166
Total	92,975	11,057

/...

549. Commenting in the Legislative Assembly on Mr. Smith's announcement, Mr. P.H.J. Chanetsa, an African member (Independent)<sup>2/</sup> stated that the only machinery for consultation that would be acceptable to the Africans was one which gave every man an opportunity to express an opinion. He deplored the detention and restriction of African nationalists as a device for preventing them from canvassing public opinion on the issue. Further he rejected the idea that chiefs and headmen in any way represented African opinion, particularly as they were salaried officials and virtual "stooges" of the Government. Finally, he urged that the proposed consultation of public opinion be held under the independent chairmanship of either a United Kingdom Cabinet Minister, or a personality from Tanganyika or from the United Nations. Similar views were expressed by another African Member (Independent), Mr. P.E. Chigogo, who also remarked that the chiefs and headmen could not be relied upon to express independent political judgement. Their bias, he added, could be inferred from statements they had made during their recent Government-sponsored tour of the Transkei in South Africa.

550. On 18 September 1964, Mr. Smith announced that the Secretary for Internal Affairs was touring the country in order to collect views to put before the committee which had been appointed to advise on the testing of public opinion. He said he would welcome United Kingdom Members of Parliament to witness the opinion-testing process.

#### Political parties

551. On 31 July 1964, the Government extended the ban on meetings of the Peoples Caretaker Council (PCC) for a further three months. The reason given was that violence was likely to increase if the Peoples Caretaker Council was allowed to hold meetings.

<sup>2/</sup> The 65-member Southern Rhodesian Legislative Assembly is composed as follows:

	<u>Rhodesia Front</u>	<u>Rhodesia Party</u> (which has superseded the Rhodesia National Party)	<u>Independent</u>
European	37	12	1
African	-	12	2
Coloured	-	1	1
Total	37	25	4

/...

552. Sir Roy Welensky, the former Prime Minister of the dissolved Central African Federation, announced on 12 August 1964 that he would lead a newly formed political group, the Rhodesia Party, which would be a party of national reconciliation. It was expected to include most of the members of the Rhodesia National Party led by Sir Edgar Whitehead, as well as many other supporters of Sir Roy Welensky before the dissolution of the Federation. The Party's basic policy would be to obtain independence for Southern Rhodesia by negotiation as well as continued membership in the Commonwealth and sterling area. It would uphold the present Constitution until independence could be negotiated on a basis acceptable to Southern Rhodesia. It was firmly opposed to any unilateral declaration of independence.

553. Following a call for unification addressed by the Foreign Ministers of Malawi and the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar<sup>3/</sup> to the Peoples Caretaker Council (PCC) and the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU), Mr. James Chikerema, the Vice-President of the Peoples Caretaker Council, was reported to have issued a statement on 18 August 1964 that his movement could not consider a united front under any circumstances. At the same time, the leaders of ZANU were reported to have called on all Africans to resist offences which they claimed were being committed by the PCC.

554. Following the declaration of a state of emergency in the Salisbury African township of Highfield on 26 August 1964, the PCC and ZANU were declared illegal by proclamation. Explaining this ban, the Southern Rhodesia Minister of Law and Order, Mr. Lardner-Burke, stated that Highfield had been the scene of considerable lawlessness for some time and that the two rival organizations had indulged in intimidation and violence against each other and against law-abiding Africans.

555. The formation of a new party, the Zimbabwe African Democratic Union (ZADU) was announced on 31 August 1964. The leaders of this party, most of whom were executive members of the proscribed ZANU, stated at a press conference that the party would aim at uniting African nationalists in Southern Rhodesia in an attempt to secure majority rule. The party, however, would not accept the leadership of Mr. Joshua Nkomo, the President of the PCC. On 2 September 1964, the new party was also banned under the Unlawful Organizations Act which prohibits the formation of a party in succession to a proscribed organization.

---

<sup>3/</sup> See paragraph 540 and appendix II.

556. In a letter addressed to Sir Alec Douglas-Home on 15 September 1964, Mr. Joshua Nkomo said that while he agreed with the principle of early independence by consent, he categorically rejected Mr. Smith's assessment that the African people wished to have independence under the present Constitution. He reiterated his previous demands for the convening of a conference to work out a constitution based on majority rule, and asserted that he and his supporters had been detained, restricted and imprisoned because of the massive support they commanded from the African people.

557. On 5 October 1964, the formation of a multi-racial group to challenge the Southern Rhodesia Government's assessment of opinion on the independence issue was announced at a press conference by Mr. Enoch Dumbatshena, a supporter of Mr. Joshua Nkomo. The group was to be known as the Majority Rule Independence Committee (MRIC) and its object would be to present the views of those opposed to independence under the present Constitution. Members of the Committee included Mr. Garfield Todd, former Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia.

558. Meanwhile the annual congress of the Rhodesian Front adopted a resolution pledging its full support to the Prime Minister, even to the extent of a unilateral declaration of independence.

#### Results of recent by-elections

559. By-elections were held on 1 October 1964 for two vacant seats in the Legislative Assembly which had previously been held by members of the Opposition. Mr. Clifford Dupont, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs, who had resigned his own seat in order to contest one of these elections, defeated Sir Roy Welensky by a vote of 1,079 to 633. The second seat was won by Mr. J.W. Pithey, another Rhodesian Front candidate, against Mr. Sydney Sawyer, a supporter of Sir Roy Welensky, by a vote of 1,042 to 416.

560. During the campaign preceding the elections, both Mr. Smith and Mr. Dupont had said that a victory in the elections would not be interpreted as a mandate for a unilateral declaration of independence. At the same time, Mr. Dupont had also stated that he would regard the results as a vote of confidence in the Government headed by Mr. Smith.

Other developments

561. On 13 August 1964, the Southern Rhodesia Appeal Court rejected a government appeal against a High Court decision of 27 June 1964 that the restriction of Mr. Nkomo and some of his followers was illegal. The Chief Justice remarked that to confine the restrictees virtually under guard in a small area and to cut them off from free contact with the outside world was a form of custody. This, he ruled, was not permitted under the Law and Order Maintenance Act. Following this judgement, the Southern Rhodesia Government announced that it would not release those restricted but would instead move them to another restriction area, also near the Mozambique border.

562. On 26 August 1964, a government motion was presented in the Southern Rhodesia Legislative Assembly calling for the banning of the Daily News, one of Salisbury's two daily newspapers. Speaking on the motion, Mr. Lardner-Burke, the Minister of Law and Order, stated that the newspaper had presented African nationalist propaganda of the most blatant kind and that its editorial policy had been designed deliberately to promote dissatisfaction and hostility towards the European. The Government, he said, could not permit the use of press freedom for supporting subversion. The motion was carried by 24 votes to 18.

563. On 8 September 1964, the Rev. N. Sithole, President of the banned ZANU, was sentenced to twelve months' imprisonment with hard labour, with six months of that sentence suspended for three years. He was convicted of subversion in calling on Africans to arm themselves with axes, bows and arrows, and other instruments, and to be prepared to use them if the Government seized independence. Earlier in the trial, the Judge had ruled that a unilateral declaration of independence by the Southern Rhodesian Government would be an illegal act.

564. On 11 September 1964, the Southern Rhodesia Government raised with immediate effect the financial qualification for voters in parliamentary elections. The announcement concerning this revision stated that because of the decrease in the purchasing power of money, the minimum financial qualification for people wishing to register had been increased by 10 per cent.

565. On 14 September 1964, an appeal court upheld a previous conviction for subversion against Mr. Nkomo and restored the original sentence of nine months' imprisonment. The charge arose from a speech allegedly made by him earlier this year. It was expected that Mr. Nkomo would accordingly be moved from his area of restriction to prison in order to serve the sentence.

566. It was reported on 17 September 1964, that, according to government sources, the number of Africans then detained, restricted or imprisoned for political offences, amounted to more than 2,000.

567. On 27 September 1964, it was also reported that the Chairman of the Southern Rhodesia Broadcasting Corporation had banned the reporting of a news item concerning a view expressed by the head of the Sociology and Anthropology Department of the University College in Salisbury. This view was to the effect that all Africans should be able to vote on the independence issue. The explanation given for the ban was that in broadcasting the statement to an unsophisticated audience at this juncture, the Corporation would have been lending its services to an undesirable exercise in political tactics.

568. On 7 October 1964, a three-month state of emergency was declared in the Salisbury African township of Harare, where it was reported that over 100 persons had been detained. As mentioned in paragraph 554 above, a similar state of emergency was declared in the Highfield African township on 26 August 1964.

#### IX. CONSIDERATION BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

##### Introduction

569. The Special Committee gave further consideration to the question of Southern Rhodesia at its 294th to 296th meetings between 26 and 28 October 1964, in the light of the latest developments concerning the Territory.

##### Written petitions

570. The Special Committee had before it the following additional written petitions concerning the Territory:

<u>Petitioner</u>	<u>Document No.</u>
The Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU)	A/AC.109/PET.189/Add.4
Messrs. E.F.C. Sithole, C.P. Mandizvidza and A.C. Mudzingwa on behalf of the restrictées in the Wha Wha area	A/AC.109/PET.322
Mr. Carl-Axel Valen, Secretary-General of the World Assembly of Youth (WAY)	A/AC.109/PET.327

/...

General statements by members

571. The representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland read out the following statement, which had been issued in London on the morning of 27 October 1964:

"The Prime Minister is deeply concerned about future relations between Southern Rhodesia and Britain, and particularly about any possibility of a unilateral declaration of independence on the part of the Southern Rhodesia Government. He therefore invited Mr. Ian Smith, the Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia, to come to London for discussions early this week. Mr. Smith replied that he could not come at that time.

"The British Government would not like there to be any misunderstanding that in their view the inevitable consequences of a unilateral declaration of independence would be very serious indeed. The previous Administration made this clear earlier in the year to Mr. Field and later repeated the warning to Mr. Smith. On Sunday 25th October the British Government communicated to the Government of Southern Rhodesia the text of a statement which they would feel obliged to issue at a very early date unless they received from that Government an assurance that no attempt at a unilateral declaration of independence would be made. The Prime Minister would have preferred to put the points in the statement to Mr. Smith privately and in person; he still hopes that an early opportunity will be found for him to have discussions with the Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia before any irrevocable steps are taken. Since however the assurance sought was not forthcoming the British Government are now publishing this statement."

572. The text of the statement by the United Kingdom Government on a unilateral declaration of independence in Southern Rhodesia read as follows:

"The British Government look forward to the day when Southern Rhodesia can take her place as an independent sovereign State within the Commonwealth. The decision to grant independence rests entirely with the British Government and Parliament and they have a solemn duty to be satisfied that before granting independence it would be acceptable to the people of the country as a whole. Indeed, the present Government of Southern Rhodesia have already recognized that independence must be based on general consent and that the British Government are entitled to be satisfied about this.

"The British Government trust, therefore, that the progress of Southern Rhodesia will proceed on constitutional lines. Nevertheless, in view of reports that there might be a resort to a unilateral declaration of independence they find it necessary to declare what

/...

serious consequences would flow from such an act. The British Government cannot believe that once the consequences have been made clear the Government and people of Southern Rhodesia will take an irrevocable step of this kind.

"A mere declaration of independence would have no constitutional effect. The only way Southern Rhodesia can become a sovereign independent State is by an act of the British Parliament. A declaration of independence would be an open act of defiance and rebellion and it would be treasonable to take steps to give effect to it.

"In the final communiqué of the meeting of Commonwealth Prime Ministers in July it was made clear that no Commonwealth Government would be able to recognize a unilateral declaration. There would then be no prospect of Southern Rhodesia becoming a member of the Commonwealth with all the economic consequences that would then ensue.

"The British Government would be bound to sever relations with those responsible for such a declaration. It would not be possible for Southern Rhodesia to establish a new and special relationship with the Crown or with Britain. The British Government would not be prepared to advise Her Majesty to accede to any request that she should become a separate Sovereign of a territory which has rebelled. The ultimate result would inevitably be that Southern Rhodesians would cease to be British subjects.

"The reactions of foreign Governments would likewise be sharp and immediate. With one or two exceptions they are likely to refuse to recognize Southern Rhodesia's independence or to enter into relations with her. Many of them might recognize a Government in exile if, as seems probable, one were established.

"The economic effects would be disastrous to the prosperity and prospects of the people of Southern Rhodesia. All financial and trade relations between Britain and Southern Rhodesia would be jeopardized. Any further aid or any further access to the London market would be out of the question. Indeed, most serious consequences would be involved for anyone in the United Kingdom who afforded aid, financial or otherwise, to the illegal Government. Southern Rhodesia's external trade would be disrupted.

"In short, an illegal declaration of independence in Southern Rhodesia would bring to an end relationships between her and Britain, would cut her off from the rest of the Commonwealth, from most foreign Governments and from international organizations, would inflict disastrous economic damage upon her and would leave her isolated and virtually friendless in a largely hostile continent."



573. Mr. Bottomley, the Commonwealth Secretary, had offered to go to Salisbury to meet Mr. Smith, after attending the independence celebrations of Zambia at Lusaka, and had asked if arrangements could be made for him to meet persons representing a cross-section of public opinion, in particular Mr. Nkomo and Mr. Sithole, the acknowledged leaders of African nationalists. Mr. Smith had replied that he was unable to agree to that condition. The Commonwealth Secretary had therefore not gone to Salisbury.

574. The aim of the United Kingdom Government policy was to ensure a peaceful transition to African majority rule. The United Kingdom Government looked forward to the negotiation of a new Constitution but it must be satisfied that the terms on which independence would be granted were acceptable to the people as a whole. Although it had been reported that Chiefs and Headmen had pronounced themselves in favour of independence under the present Constitution, that consultation did not, in his Government's view, provide conclusive evidence that such was the case.

575. The representative of Ethiopia emphasized the importance of the United Kingdom statement and thought that the Committee should formally take note of it. As the meeting progressed, the Chairman should be in a position to formulate the consensus of the Special Committee on the developments in Southern Rhodesia. His delegation thought that the Committee should reaffirm all the resolutions it had adopted in the past, in particular the conclusions and recommendations of its Sub-Committee on Southern Rhodesia, and should discuss with the United Kingdom Government how they could be implemented. His delegation agreed that the views of 600 or 800 chiefs, more or less under the supervision of the Government of the country, could not be accepted as representing the views of 4 million Africans. Finally, it seemed that the situation should be brought to the attention of the Security Council, before it got out of hand.

576. The representative of India welcomed the categorical statement by the United Kingdom, which contained some of the terms he himself had used at the 224th meeting of the Special Committee. He noted that the attitude of a large number of members of the Committee and of the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries who had met at Cairo in October 1964 had been explicitly stated in the Cairo communiqué, from which he quoted certain passages (A/5763,

pages 8-9 of Declaration). He associated himself with the remarks made by the representative of Ethiopia.

577. The representative of the Ivory Coast said that he had listened with both satisfaction and anxiety to the United Kingdom statement: with satisfaction, because that statement opposed the plans of a racist minority which wanted to impose a constitution denying Africans the right to vote; anxiety, because the sanctions which the United Kingdom was envisaging might, so to speak, cause the death of the patient. It would perhaps be better to adopt a preventive method which would stop the Southern Rhodesian minority regime from putting its threat into effect. Like the representative of Ethiopia, he hoped that the Chairman would be able to formulate a consensus of the Committee designed to obtain forceful but flexible preventive action, which his delegation would wholeheartedly support.

578. The representative of Iraq said that he, too, welcomed the forthright and clear statement made by the United Kingdom representative, although he regretted that so much valuable time had been lost. He stressed the historic significance, for other colonial Territories, of a statement which affirmed that independence should be based on the freely expressed wishes of the people. He was glad that the United Kingdom was contemplating effective measures and hoped that there would be greater and more fruitful co-operation between the Committee and the United Kingdom Government in respect not only of Southern Rhodesia but also of other colonial Territories for which the United Kingdom was responsible.

579. He feared, however, that the minority Government of Southern Rhodesia would carry out its threat. In that event, the United Nations could do no less than the United Kingdom proposed to do, but it would be for the Security Council to take the necessary steps to deal with the situation, which was clearly a threat to international peace and security on the African continent. It was certainly necessary to have a consensus in the Committee, but the matter was of such an urgent nature that there was no time to be lost. While he would have no objection to further contacts with the United Kingdom Government, he thought that the matter was no longer a question between the Committee of Twenty-Four and the United Kingdom but was henceforth within the competence of the Security Council.

580. The representative of Cambodia supported the Ethiopian representative's proposal that a consensus on the question should be drawn up. While taking note of the United Kingdom statement, it would be well to reaffirm all the resolutions adopted on the matter by the United Nations, to retain the item on the Committee's agenda and to seek, in co-operation with the administering Power, appropriate measures for the settlement of the question of Southern Rhodesia.

581. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that, notwithstanding its statements, the conservative United Kingdom Government had so far not taken the necessary steps to prevent the Southern Rhodesian racists from carrying out their plans but had, on the contrary, followed a policy of concessions to them which encouraged lawlessness. At the most recent meeting of the Prime Ministers of the United Kingdom and Southern Rhodesia, the United Kingdom Government had been satisfied with the assurances given by Mr. Smith that he would provide proof that independence under the present Constitution had the support of the overwhelming majority of the white and African population. That was only a manoeuvre on the part of Mr. Smith. Upon his return from London, he had proceeded to carry out his plans, which made no provision for a genuine national referendum. Instead, he had decided to hold a referendum among the European settlers, who would undoubtedly support the plans of the Government, which represented that minority and not the interests of the African population. In so far as the Africans were concerned, their views, according to Mr. Smith's statement, could be represented by a handful of chiefs and headmen who were in the pay of the Government. That was a natural result of the course of events in Southern Rhodesia against which the United Nations had repeatedly warned the United Kingdom Government when it had called on the conservative Government to refrain from transferring the weapons and armed forces of the former Central African Federation to the Southern Rhodesian racists, to abrogate the racist Constitution of 1961 and to transfer power to the government of the majority. The United Kingdom Government had refused to act accordingly.

582. The statement made by the United Kingdom at the present meeting was a step in the right direction. The question of Southern Rhodesia, however, had for a long time assumed an international aspect and it was the duty of the Committee to take account of the resolution adopted in Cairo by the Conference of Heads

of African States and Governments, which stated explicitly that the question should be referred once again to the Security Council (see appendix II). The Soviet delegation would have no objection if the Special Committee took all the necessary steps and explored all possible ways and means to settle that dangerous and complicated situation and to give effect to the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Committee, particularly the decision which the Committee had adopted at its first session of the current year.

583. The representative of Tunisia took note of the statement in which the United Kingdom declared its readiness to shoulder its responsibilities and to put down the rebellion in Southern Rhodesia. Whatever assurances were given, however, and whatever official statements were made, the fact remained that the future of the Africans in Southern Rhodesia, deprived of their political rights and subjected to an undisguised system of slavery, continued to be threatened. Thus, in view of the serious and urgent nature of the situation, it was imperative that the Security Council should reaffirm the many resolutions adopted by the Special Committee and by the General Assembly, give them executive force and take all the necessary steps to redress a situation fraught with danger for the entire African continent. The Tunisian delegation accordingly associated itself with the suggestions made by the representative of Ethiopia.

584. The representative of Yugoslavia said that he, too, fully endorsed the Ethiopian representative's suggestions. No one denied the seriousness of the situation which had resulted from the irresponsible policy of the minority Government of Southern Rhodesia. The time had come to take immediate and categorical action to prevent any senseless decision by this Government, and to find the final solution of the problem of Southern Rhodesia in accordance with the resolutions of the General Assembly as well as in the interests of the African population of that Territory. The Yugoslav delegation also welcomed the statement of the United Kingdom and the fact that the United Kingdom Government had finally associated itself with general opinion, expressed many times previously by the Committee on the problem of Southern Rhodesia.

585. The representative of Syria expressed his indignation at the developments which were taking place in Southern Rhodesia. His delegation could not but welcome the stand of the United Kingdom Government and the steps which it

contemplated taking if the worst happened. The Special Committee and the Security Council, however, had great responsibilities to discharge. The representative of the Ivory Coast had suggested that the Committee should consider some preventive measures. The Syrian delegation was prepared to accept that suggestion. The United Kingdom Government could issue an ultimatum to the Smith Government, informing it that the United Nations and world opinion were seriously considering the adoption of steps to frustrate its designs.

586. Syria supported the suggestions that a consensus should be prepared and that the matter should be referred to the Security Council, in the hope that the whites in Southern Rhodesia would return to their senses before their ultimate destruction. It thought that the Under-Secretary should immediately inform the Secretary-General of the feelings of the Committee and ask him to assist the people of Southern Rhodesia, if necessary.

587. The representative of Sierra Leone said that it was regrettable that the administering Power had not promptly extended to the Special Committee and the United Nations the co-operation which was necessary for an early and peaceful solution of the problem. The delegation of Sierra Leone was happy to note that the United Kingdom had now taken a position which was more in keeping with the aims and obligations of the Special Committee.

588. He denounced the dishonesty of the Southern Rhodesia Government, which sought to present the views of a handful of tribal chiefs as the expression of the wishes of millions of indigenous inhabitants. The Committee should reject the spurious referendum held by the Smith Government; he hoped that the consensus to be adopted would include a statement to that effect. The Committee could also inform the Security Council of the situation so that it could take the necessary action. Meanwhile, the Committee should avail itself of the opportunities offered by the new attitude of the United Kingdom and, in an atmosphere of co-operation, should endeavour to find a peaceful and satisfactory solution to the problem.

589. The representative of Madagascar said that he had listened with satisfaction to the statement made by the United Kingdom representative, which the Special Committee had been impatiently awaiting for years. The Malagasy delegation hoped that Mr. Smith, however misguided he might be, had not lost the modicum of common

sense needed to understand the warning. Nevertheless, the danger was still there and the Malagasy delegation was therefore in favour of a consensus that would express the satisfaction of the members of the Committee at the United Kingdom statement and specify the steps that should be taken to avoid a fait accompli.

590. The representative of Poland welcomed the unambiguous statement of the United Kingdom Government, which was of historic importance in that the United Kingdom had at long last dissociated itself from the practices which had existed in Southern Rhodesia since 1923 and which were the very basis of the tragic situation obtaining in the Territory.

591. The statement did not, however, resolve the question of Southern Rhodesia. Indeed, the rebellion to which the United Kingdom had referred had already begun. As Mr. Smith had said at a meeting of the Chiefs and Headmen, whatever the United Kingdom Government or anyone else might say or do, the Southern Rhodesian Government had set its course and that course led to a unilateral declaration of independence by Southern Rhodesia. It was the duty of the Special Committee to ward off the danger. The Polish delegation would therefore associate itself with the consensus to be prepared by the Chairman.

592. The representative of the United Republic of Tanzania reiterated his delegation's support for the just cause of the Africans of Southern Rhodesia in opposing the ambitions of the tiny white racist minority. Despite the fact that the plans of the racists had encountered strong opposition not only from the indigenous people of Southern Rhodesia but also from some of the white settlers who realized the folly of the Smith Government, that Government was proceeding to carry out its designs by making use of the tribal Chiefs who were its puppets.

593. His delegation welcomed the statement by the United Kingdom but would like to know whether the administering Power was prepared, if necessary, to crush any rebellion and to protect the rights of the Africans of Southern Rhodesia.

594. The Committee should inform the Security Council of a situation which constituted a threat to international peace and should call upon the administering Power to take positive steps, in keeping with the Committee's resolutions and recommendations, to enable the African majority to rule themselves in tranquillity and national independence.

595. The representative of Bulgaria deplored the wretched farce being played by the racist Government of Ian Smith in isolating the indigenous chiefs, who were

presumed to represent African opinion. That step had certainly been taken with the connivance of certain near-by countries, which were doing everything in their power to help to set up a system of racial discrimination in the Territory. That situation should not be tolerated either by world public opinion, or by the United Nations or by the administering Power. The United Kingdom had repeatedly said that it would never countenance a unilateral declaration of independence by the white minority. His country would now like to see those words become deeds. 596. However effective they might be, the measures announced by the United Kingdom Government could not solve everything. Bulgaria nevertheless did not believe that the worst was inevitable and thought that there was still a possibility of bringing the Smith Government to see reason.

597. A unilateral declaration of independence by the Government of Southern Rhodesia would have immediate repercussions on the neighbouring State, where the terrorist policy of apartheid was practised, and the African countries would have to make a vigorous response. Such a decision would therefore constitute an immediate danger to peace in the Territory, in the region and in the world.

598. The United Kingdom Government had said that it would consider a unilateral declaration of independence to be an act of treason. In the past, the United Kingdom Government had also branded as "treason" and "rebellion" certain African movements which it had been able to put down. In the present case, it would undoubtedly keep its word and punish the traitors who wished to endanger peace in that region of the world.

599. The United Nations, too, must take certain measures. The matter could be brought before the Security Council, which could take the necessary action. The Special Committee, for its part, should take certain decisions to help the peoples of Southern Rhodesia and the neighbouring countries to defend themselves from the nefarious consequences of a unilateral action. His delegation was prepared to support any measures or consensus directed to that end.

600. The representative of Denmark said that his delegation, whose position on the question was well known, also welcomed the statement made by the United Kingdom. His delegation agreed with the representative of Sierra Leone that the so-called referendum organized by the Southern Rhodesian Government was completely unacceptable. It also agreed with the representative of Iraq that the Security

Council's attention should be drawn to the developments in Southern Rhodesia so that the Council might be able to take up the matter in the event of the minority Government issuing a unilateral declaration of independence.

601. The representative of Chile said that he shared the deep concern expressed by the other members of the Special Committee. If it wished to remain true to the principles it was bound to uphold, the United Nations could not be complacent about the Southern Rhodesian Government's defiance of the numerous resolutions adopted over a period of several years. It must marshal all the means at its disposal to protect the fundamental rights of the overwhelming majority of the inhabitants of Southern Rhodesia.

602. His country was gratified that the administering Power had taken a progressive and firm stand. Its statement, which could have far-reaching importance, should give the Salisbury Government food for thought, and if the latter still had any common sense, it would ultimately give up its plan.

603. His delegation was prepared to join with the other members of the Committee in supporting a consensus.

604. The representative of Australia considered that, in its language and in its implications, the United Kingdom statement was one of the most serious which the Special Committee had ever heard. He referred, in particular, to the sentence in which the United Kingdom said that a unilateral declaration of independence would be an open act of rebellion and that it would be treasonable to take steps to give effect to it. That warning, which reflected great credit on the United Kingdom, would probably have a profound effect in Southern Rhodesia.

605. In such circumstances, Australia believed that the Committee should tread very warily. There was little the Committee could do to affect the situation; the most it could do would be to take note of the fact that the solution of the problem still rested with the Governments of the United Kingdom and Southern Rhodesia and to be encouraged by the nature of the United Kingdom statement.

606. It had been repeatedly said that the United Kingdom possessed the key to the situation. If that was so, that key was obviously being turned. The Committee should be careful not to complicate the situation by taking action without further contact with the United Kingdom Government, which had moved with great speed and decision.



607. The representative of Venezuela said that, despite the disturbing nature of the situation in Southern Rhodesia and despite the Special Committee's concern, his delegation could not support a resolution or a consensus or subscribe to any measure that was not in keeping with the terms of reference received by the Committee from the General Assembly. Any action designed to counteract a unilateral decision by Southern Rhodesia must be taken through the administering Power. The United Kingdom's statement in the matter seemed quite clear and categorical, and he was gratified that it had been brought to the Committee's attention.

608. With regard to bringing the question before the Security Council, the Committee could not, within its terms of reference, do more than draw the Council's attention - as his country hoped it would do - to the situation in Southern Rhodesia without making any judgement on that situation, because the Security Council had the sole responsibility for doing so and for deciding what action should be taken. If the situation endangered the countries of the region, those countries could apply to the Security Council directly without going through the Special Committee, which had no jurisdiction in the matter. His country agreed on the other hand that the Committee should reaffirm its own resolutions and those of the General Assembly.

609. While, moreover, his delegation could see no objection to the Committee's making contact with the new British Government, it regarded the United Kingdom statement as a sufficiently clear and categorical explanation of its position. Such contact, if decided upon, should be undertaken only through the Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom to the United Nations.

610. The representative of Uruguay said that his delegation welcomed the statement by the representative of the United Kingdom and considered it very important. Although it would have liked to be able to study the statement more thoroughly, it approved its general lines. With regard to preventive measures, it was difficult to go further than those which the United Kingdom Government was apparently ready to take. However, he did not think that the decision regarding the granting of independence fell exclusively within the competence of the United Kingdom Government.

611. Some delegations had suggested that the question should be referred to the Security Council, and his delegation had no basic objection to that procedure. It had approved of it previously, when the situation in Southern Rhodesia had been much less serious than at present and had still concerned only the transfer of arms and military equipment to the Government of Southern Rhodesia; it had all the more reason to approve that procedure now.

/...

612. It would nevertheless be more useful for the Special Committee to resume contact with the United Kingdom Government, especially as that Government had now gone much further than it had done previously. Although the representative of the United Kingdom had not mentioned the responsibilities incumbent upon the United Nations and the Special Committee with regard to Southern Rhodesia, it was desirable for the Committee to obtain assurances concerning the action that the United Kingdom Government would take if the contemplated preventive measures should prove inadequate. It was also important for the Committee to know what the United Kingdom Government considered to be a peaceful transition to a system of government by the African majority and how it intended to ensure that transition.

613. The representative of Iran said that his delegation welcomed the statement by the representative of the United Kingdom. It was gratified that the United Kingdom Government had categorically affirmed its responsibility with regard to Southern Rhodesia and had specified the measures it would take if the minority Government of that Territory should unilaterally declare its independence.

614. His delegation, like the Uruguayan delegation, would have preferred to have time to study the statement by the United Kingdom Government more thoroughly; however, it would defer to the apparent desire of the majority of the Special Committee to take a decision at that meeting. It supported the Ethiopian suggestion regarding a consensus formulated by the Chairman.

X. ACTION TAKEN BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE IN THE LIGHT  
OF LATEST DEVELOPMENTS

615. The Chairman thought that he would be expressing the general feeling of the Special Committee if he said that all the members had listened to the statement of the administering Power with great interest. Although the members of the Committee had not had the time to study the statement thoroughly, they were already in a position to conclude that the attitude of the new United Kingdom Government was, to a great extent, in conformity with the opinions expressed by the majority of Committee members on the question of Southern Rhodesia.

616. All the members of the Committee agreed that the situation had become very serious and that urgent measures must be taken if the Committee was to avoid being faced with a fait accompli. It was certainly with that thought in mind that some

delegations had spoken of calling a meeting of the Security Council. In its statement, the United Kingdom Government had outlined the measures it would take against the racist minority Government of Southern Rhodesia in the case of a unilateral declaration of independence. However, even if those measures were taken into consideration, a declaration of independence by the Territory under minority rule would have consequences constituting a real threat to international peace and security and thus calling for action by the Security Council.

617. He submitted to the Committee the following consensus, which would have the force of a decision by the Committee at the present stage of its debate on the question of Southern Rhodesia:

"1. The Special Committee has taken note of the statement by the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland with great interest.

"2. The Committee also wishes to recall all the resolutions on the question of Southern Rhodesia already adopted by the General Assembly and the Special Committee.

"3. The Committee reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of Southern Rhodesia to self-determination and independence.

"4. In view of the gravity of the situation, the Special Committee once again draws the attention of the Security Council to the question of Southern Rhodesia.

"5. The Committee affirms that any decision the Government of Southern Rhodesia might take on the basis of the spurious consultation with the tribal chiefs or of consultations organized solely with the present electorate of Southern Rhodesia would be illegal, since the people of Southern Rhodesia have rejected the Territory's present Constitution.

"6. Irrespective of when or how the question is referred to the Security Council, the Special Committee hopes to establish renewed contacts with the present Government of the United Kingdom in an endeavour, in accordance with the provisions of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, to find a solution to the grave problems of Southern Rhodesia. The aim of these contacts will be to induce the present Government of the United Kingdom to implement the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Special Committee on the question of Southern Rhodesia.

"In view of the foregoing, the Special Committee invites the Sub-Committee on Southern Rhodesia to keep the situation in Southern Rhodesia under review, to establish renewed contacts with the

United Kingdom Government, if the desire should be expressed by the latter, and to report to the Special Committee as soon as possible."

618. He pointed out that the last part of the consensus gave the representative of the United Kingdom the opportunity to inform the Special Committee or its Chairman whether his Government wished to resume contact with the Sub-Committee on Southern Rhodesia. As soon as such a desire had been expressed, the Sub-Committee on Southern Rhodesia could meet and study the methods which would best enable it to comply with its terms of reference.

619. The representative of the United Kingdom said that his delegation had taken note of the statements made during the meeting and of the consensus just read out by the Chairman, and would report them to his Government as soon as possible. He reserved the right to comment on the statements that had been made.

620. At the 295th meeting on 27 October 1964, the Special Committee adopted without objection the consensus as read out by the Chairman.

621. At the 296th meeting on 28 October 1964, the representative of the United States of America read a statement issued by the Department of State of the United States.

622. The statement said that the Government of the United States had followed the course of events in Rhodesia with mounting concern. It had on frequent occasions expressed its hope that a solution would be found to the Rhodesian problem acceptable to the majority of the people. It continued to hope that Rhodesia would gain independence as a united nation with a government based upon the consent of the governed. It had been encouraged by the forthright position taken by the British Government in insisting that it would not sanction independence for Rhodesia until satisfied that the people had been allowed the full exercise of self-determination. Prime Minister Wilson's message to the Rhodesian Prime Minister made clear some of the serious consequences which could befall Rhodesians should their Government continue to follow its present course. The United States therefore hoped that the Rhodesian Government would continue to discuss with the United Kingdom Government ways to achieve a satisfactory solution.

623. The representative of India read a statement issued by the Indian Government the previous evening. The statement declared that the likelihood of a unilateral declaration of independence by Southern Rhodesia had created a grave situation

which was bound to have serious repercussions in Africa and the rest of the world. Steps recently taken in Salisbury indicated the determination of the minority Government to achieve its objective without delay and without the consent of the people of the country through recognized democratic processes. The settlers' Government had no authority or moral right to act in flagrant disregard of the wishes of the people and any semblance of constitutionality sought to be given by the process of a so-called referendum and consultation of African opinion through African chiefs, who were in reality paid government servants, would be completely unacceptable.

624. The Government of India had made it known that the only basis on which Southern Rhodesia should gain independence was after the establishment of a duly constituted democratic government elected on the principle of "one man one vote". Any unconstitutional declaration of independence by the present minority Government would not be recognized by the Government of India. Those views had been made clear to the British Government and there had been close consultation in the past with the African member States of the Commonwealth who held similar views on this issue. The Government of India welcomed and supported the categorical public declaration by the British Government that a unilateral declaration of independence by the minority Government would be an open act of defiance and rebellion.

#### XI. ACTION ARISING FROM THE FURTHER REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON SOUTHERN RHODESIA

625. At the 315th meeting of the Special Committee on 17 November 1964, the Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Southern Rhodesia<sup>4/</sup> submitted an oral report on its work.

626. In his report, the Chairman, after alluding to the circumstances in which the Special Committee had adopted its consensus on 27 October 1964, described the action taken by the Sub-Committee in the discharge of its mandate as follows:

627. Following consultations between the Chairman of the Sub-Committee and Lord Caradon, the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom to the

---

<sup>4/</sup> The composition of the Sub-Committee is described in document A/5800/Add.1, paragraph 461. The representative of Syria was Mr. Rafik Asha.

United Nations, the Sub-Committee held a meeting with the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom on 4 November 1964.

628. At these talks, the Sub-Committee explained the mandate conferred on it by the Special Committee and invited the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom to furnish it with information on any changes that may have occurred in the United Kingdom Government's position regarding the question of Southern Rhodesia and what steps the United Kingdom Government proposed to take for the implementation of the resolutions of the General Assembly and Special Committee concerning the Territory.

629. In response to this invitation, the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom recalled that his Government had issued a statement on 27 October 1964, of which the Sub-Committee was aware, warning the Southern Rhodesia Government, in clear and firm terms, of the consequences for the Territory which would flow from a unilateral declaration of independence. He added that it was not yet possible to assess the full impact of this warning on the Government and on public opinion in Southern Rhodesia. Meanwhile, his Government had invited Mr. Ian Smith, the Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia, to London for talks on the future of the Territory, but no firm reply was yet available. In conclusion, the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom assured the Sub-Committee that, on behalf of his Government, he would be prepared in due course to explore with the Special Committee new forms and areas of co-operation in the work of the Committee.

630. The Sub-Committee took note of the remarks of the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom and expressed the view that, while the warning addressed by the United Kingdom Government to the Southern Rhodesia Government might be adequate to deter that Government from a unilateral declaration of independence for the time being, stronger measures should be considered. These measures should be aimed at achieving a solution of the question of Southern Rhodesia in conformity with the resolutions of the General Assembly and Special Committee and the wishes of the African majority.

631. The Chairman then presented the conclusions of the Sub-Committee as follows:

632. The Sub-Committee notes the steps taken by the United Kingdom Government with a view to discouraging the Southern Rhodesia Government from resorting to a

unilateral declaration of independence. The Sub-Committee considers, however, that whatever the effectiveness of these steps as a deterrent to a unilateral declaration of independence by the Southern Rhodesia Government, energetic measures require urgently to be taken by the United Kingdom Government for the implementation of the resolutions of the General Assembly and Special Committee concerning Southern Rhodesia.

633. The Sub-Committee notes that the United Kingdom Government has rejected the results of the recent test of public opinion conducted by the minority settler regime in Southern Rhodesia as unsatisfactory evidence of the wishes of the African population. The Sub-Committee is also aware that consultations are in progress between the United Kingdom Government and the minority regime in Southern Rhodesia regarding the future constitutional development of the Territory, but has no information regarding the status and substance of these consultations.

634. The deep concern about the gravity of the prevailing situation, which was expressed by the Sub-Committee in its report on 17 June 1964 (A/AC.109/L.128), has by no means been allayed by recent developments, inasmuch as the underlying causes of that situation have not yet been eliminated. Accordingly, the Sub-Committee would again stress the urgent necessity of the following measures being taken, in order to remedy the situation prevailing in Southern Rhodesia:

1. The release of all political prisoners and the removal of all constraint on African nationalist detainees and restrictees;

2. The repeal of all repressive and discriminatory legislation, and in particular, the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act and the Land Apportionment Act;

3. The removal of all restrictions of African political activity and the establishment of full democratic freedom and equality of political rights;

4. The holding of a constitutional conference in which representatives of all political parties will take part with a view to making constitutional arrangements for independence, on the basis of universal adult suffrage, including the fixing of the earliest possible date for independence.

635. Finally, the Sub-Committee would recommend that, as its talks with the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom were of a preliminary character, the Special Committee may wish to authorize it to continue to keep the situation under review and to maintain contact with the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom with a view to the fulfilment of its mandate.

636. At its 315th meeting on 19 November 1964 the Special Committee decided to take note of the oral report of the Sub-Committee on Southern Rhodesia.



APPENDIX I

MEETING OF COMMONWEALTH PRIME MINISTERS, JULY 1964

EXCERPT FROM FINAL COMMUNIQUÉ

1. The Prime Ministers of the other Commonwealth countries welcomed the progress of British territories to independent membership of the Commonwealth. They recognized that the authority and responsibility for leading her remaining Colonies to independence must continue to rest with Britain.
2. At the same time, Prime Ministers of other Commonwealth countries expressed their views to the Prime Minister of Britain on the question of the progress of Southern Rhodesia towards independence within the Commonwealth. They welcomed the decision already announced by the British Government that, as in the case of other territories, the existence of sufficiently representative institutions would be a condition of the grant of independence to Southern Rhodesia. They also noted with approval the statement already made by the British Government that they would not recognize any unilateral declaration of independence; and the other Prime Ministers made it clear that they would be unable to recognize any such declaration. The view was also expressed that an Independence Conference should be convened which the leaders of all parties in Southern Rhodesia should be free to attend. The object would be to seek agreement on the steps by which Southern Rhodesia might proceed to independence within the Commonwealth at the earliest practicable time on the basis of majority rule. With a view to diminishing tensions and preparing the way for such a conference, an appeal was made for the release of all the detained African leaders. The Prime Ministers called upon all leaders and their supporters to exercise moderation and to abstain from violence; and they affirmed their belief that the best interest of all sections of the population lay in developing confidence and co-operation, on the basis of tolerance, mutual understanding and justice. In this connexion, they recognized the necessity for giving confidence to the minority community in Southern Rhodesia that their interests would be protected.
3. The Prime Minister of Britain said that he would give careful consideration to all the views expressed by other Commonwealth Prime Ministers. At the same time

/...

he emphasized that the Government of Southern Rhodesia was constitutionally responsible for the internal affairs of that territory and that the question of the granting of independence was a matter for decision by the British Parliament.

## APPENDIX II

### RESOLUTION CONCERNING SOUTHERN RHODESIA ADOPTED AT THE FIRST ORDINARY SESSION OF THE ASSEMBLY OF HEADS OF AFRICAN STATES AND GOVERNMENTS

The Assembly of Heads of State and Government meeting in its First Ordinary Session in Cairo, the United Arab Republic, from 17 to 21 July 1964,

Recalling the Resolution on Decolonization adopted by the Conference of Heads of State and Government in Addis Ababa, in May 1963, and Resolution CM.14 (II)<sup>a/</sup> adopted by the Council at its Second Session in Lagos,

Recalling further the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on the question of Southern Rhodesia,

Deeply concerned over the continued deterioration of the situation in Southern Rhodesia resulting from the increasingly repressive measures being applied by the racist minority Government of European settlers,

Noting with satisfaction the stand taken by the leaders of the African Member States of the Commonwealth at the 13th Conference of Commonwealth Presidents and Prime Ministers held in London, in July 1964,

Noting further the final communiqué issued by the Conference on the question of Southern Rhodesia,

Having examined the Report of the African Group at the United Nations, submitted in response to Resolution CM.14 (II) of the Council of Ministers to take appropriate diplomatic measures to ensure that the British Government implement, without delay, the resolutions of the United Nations on Southern Rhodesia,

#### Requests:

1. African States to take a vigorous stand against a Declaration of Independence of Southern Rhodesia by a European minority Government and to pledge

<sup>a/</sup> See A/5800/Add.1, appendix I.

themselves to take appropriate measures, including the recognition and support of an African nationalist Government in exile should such an eventuality arise;

2. The African Group at the United Nations to examine further measures to be taken in the event of declaration of independence by the European minority Government and to submit a report to the Council;

3. The United Kingdom to convene immediately a constitutional conference in which representatives of all political groups in Southern Rhodesia would participate with a view to preparing a new and democratic constitution ensuring majority rule on the basis of "one man, one vote";

4. The immediate release of Joshua N'Komo, the Rev. Ndabinye Sithole and all other political prisoners and detainees;

5. The Foreign Ministers of Algeria and Senegal assisted by the African Group at the United Nations to undertake the task of presenting the problem of Southern Rhodesia at the appropriate time before the Security Council;

6. The Governments of Malawi and the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar to offer their good offices to the nationalist parties in Southern Rhodesia so as to bring about a united front of all the liberation movements for the rapid attainment of their common objective of independence;

7. The African nationalist movements in Southern Rhodesia to intensify their struggle for immediate independence.

### APPENDIX III

TEXT OF THE JOINT COMMUNIQUÉ ISSUED AT THE END OF DISCUSSIONS  
BETWEEN THE UNITED KINGDOM PRIME MINISTER, SIR ALEC DOUGLAS-HOME,  
AND THE PRIME MINISTER OF SOUTHERN RHODESIA, MR. IAN SMITH,  
IN LONDON, 7-11 SEPTEMBER 1964

1. There was a full discussion of all aspects of the problem of independence for Southern Rhodesia. The Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia expounded his case for the grant of independence on the basis of the present constitution and franchise. The British Prime Minister restated and explained the position of the British Government, as already stated in Parliament.

2. The British Prime Minister conveyed to the Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia the views expressed at the meeting of Commonwealth Prime Ministers in July as set out in their final communiqué. The Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia, for his part, made it clear that he did not feel bound by any of the statements made at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' meeting to which he had not been invited.
3. The British Prime Minister told the Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia that the British Government looked forward to the day when Southern Rhodesia would take her place as an independent sovereign State within the Commonwealth. For their part they were anxious that this should come about as soon as practicable. The British Prime Minister said that the British Government must be satisfied that any basis on which it was proposed that independence should be granted was acceptable to the people of the country as a whole.
4. The Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia accepted that independence must be based on general consent and stated that he was convinced that the majority of the population supported his request for independence on the basis of the present constitution and franchise. The British Prime Minister took note of this statement but said that the British Government had, as yet, no evidence that this was the case. The Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia recognized that the British Government were entitled to be satisfied about this and said that he would consider how best it could be demonstrated so that independence could be granted.
5. The British Prime Minister said that the British Government would take account of any views which might be freely expressed by the population on the issues involved, but he must make it plain that the British Government reserved their position.

#### APPENDIX IV

##### STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF SOUTHERN RHODESIA IN THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ON 15 SEPTEMBER 1964

1. The joint communiqué which was issued last Friday by the British Prime Minister and myself is the culmination of a long and intensive exercise on the part of my Government. Over two years ago I had myself come to the conclusion, through my association with the rural areas and the affairs of those areas, that the rural African did not support the extreme African nationalists, and I found

that these views were wide-spread amongst others in the rural areas, and this has been confirmed by my advisers. This Government realized that the activities of these extreme African nationalists, and their resort to the use of intimidation and violence, even murder and arson, had been deliberately designed to undermine the tribal structure. We have taken, and are still taking, steps to remedy this position. In the meantime, the African nationalists over-played their hand and lost most - if not all - of the little sympathy they commanded amongst the African people. I made it very clear to the British Government - and I would stress this point of view to the House - that the bulk of the African people retain their affiliations with the Tribal Trust Areas, and these include the older and more mature African, who is a good and reasonable citizen of this country. The fact that some are not literate is hardly their fault, but they are by no means lacking in wisdom, and I feel that it is only fair and right to obtain from these people an expression of their opinion in this matter. This can most reasonably be done within the framework of the tribal system by using the Chiefs and Headmen as a means of consultation with the people. I must stress further that the expression of opinion to which I refer cannot and will not mean "one man, one vote". The consultation will, however, be as wide as possible but the plan must be practicable and must operate within the tribal structure. Over and above this, a referendum will be held of all registered voters.

2. I have already discussed this question with the Leader of the Opposition, and am happy to inform the House that he has agreed to co-operate with me in an effort to find the best means of carrying out this vast exercise and I repeat that the necessary consultation must be fair, honest and above board, and although there will be practical difficulties we must go ahead now, and deal with these difficulties in the best manner available to us when and if they occur.

3. I regret that certain people, in spite of the earnest appeal I made to the contrary, rushed into print on this question before even listening to the case which I have to present, and in these circumstances, as is only to be expected, they have completely misunderstood and misinterpreted the position. By so doing they have confused what would have been a very clear picture had I first had the opportunity of placing the correct facts before the country.

4. Finally, I would like to make an earnest appeal that whatever party differences exist in this House I believe that the issue of independence for Southern Rhodesia should be placed completely above party politics, and in fact, in the national interest, it is essential that it be so placed, and that all Rhodesians should treat it as such. If we are prepared to do this, our chances of success, which are already excellent, will be even further strengthened.
5. I must emphasize that if we succeed in this exercise it will mean independence for Southern Rhodesia on the present Constitution and franchise and with no lowering of standards.
6. Let our united aim be: independence by Christmas 1964 - an achievement which could be shared by all Honourable members of this House who support me in this mission.

-----