"A difficult, tedious and unwanted task"

Representing the Central African Federation in the United Nations, 1960-1963

ANDREW COHEN*

> The General Assembly continued to make quite a distinction between South Africans and the Portuguese as unregenerate, and the British who were regarded as trying, though not hard enough, to get on with the decolonisation process. We abstained on two resolutions about <u>Southern Rhodesia</u>, which urged the UK to do what it was unwilling (and now, with Whitehead's surprising defeat will be unable) to do.
>
> <div align="right">Memorandum from Dean Rusk to John F. Kennedy, 22 December 1962[1]</div>

On Tuesday 22 January, 1963, the First Secretary of State and Minister in charge of the Central Africa Office, R.A. Butler, met with the Southern Rhodesia Cabinet in Salisbury. Butler notified the Cabinet that he was visiting the Central African Federation in order to "gauge for himself" the situation. Southern Rhodesia, he remarked, was "an issue unjustifiably pursued at the United Nations" and countering this negative international opinion "was providing the British Government with a difficult, tedious and unwanted task".[2]

The Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland (henceforth the Central African Federation) spanned just over ten years between 1 September 1953 and midnight on 31 December 1963. It placed the three British territories of Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe), Northern Rhodesia (Zambia), and Nyasaland (Malawi) in a federal structure. It was a bold experiment in political power during the late stage of British colonialism and constituted one of the most intricate episodes in its retreat from empire. Faced with a settler minority demanding self rule, Britain also had to contend with growing African nationalism. Furthermore, Central African policy had to be acceptable in the wider context of British politics, and internationally in light of growing Cold War tension.

Anglo-Rhodesian relations during the early to mid-1960s have recently received renewed attention by scholars. Larry Butler has teased out the influence of Anglo-American affairs in framing British policy; Richard Coggins has argued for the importance of Britain's economic weakness in dictating action; while Carl Watts has highlighted the influence of the Commonwealth.[3] This article seeks to examine Anglo-Rhodesian relations from a different vantage point, that of the United Nations

(UN).[4] As such, it will build on work by Wm. Roger Louis and Asahiko Hanzawa who have considered Britain's broad position in the world assembly.[5] Neither of these accounts examines the difficulties raised in the General Assembly by Britain's central African territories.

An appreciation of territorial differences is crucial when considering the Federation, and many of Britain's problems in the UN centred on the sizeable settler minority of Southern Rhodesia. Therefore the focus of this article reflects the importance of Southern Rhodesia as the key battleground over which the debate hinged.[6] In doing so it will examine the actions and motivations of the British and Federal governments, rather than provide a detailed account of African nationalist campaigning at the United Nations.[7] After giving a brief outline of the history of British involvement in the organisation and the makeup of its most ardent critics, it will focus on the broad issues facing Britain. Following this, it will demonstrate how the British government set about addressing these concerns. A constant strand running through both these sections will be the role of the Federal government and territorial governments within central Africa itself.

I

Established in 1945 by the victorious states of the Second World War, the UN not only inherited many aspects of the pre-war League of Nations, but also possessed increased powers in areas of conflict resolution, human rights and economic affairs. As a result, European nations with colonial interests often encountered tension between their sovereignty and commitment to internationalism. Oliver Stanley, Colonial Secretary at the UN's formation, understood the difficulties that Britain's overseas territories could cause when he remarked: "A motley international assembly" must not be allowed to put the empire in the dock.[8] However, at this time Stanley could not have predicted the number of ex-colonial countries which would gain a voice at his "motley international assembly" over the following two decades. On its formation the UN had 51 members; by the end of 1960 its membership had grown to 99. This had further risen to 113 members by the time the Central African Federation was dissolved at the end of 1963. The increase in number of African countries was particularly telling. In 1958, there were eight African members in the UN; by 1964, this number had grown to thirty-four. These new members all had direct experience of European colonialism, and in many ways it is unsurprising that they used their newfound influence to draw attention to the remaining colonial presence on the continent.

The structure of the organisation, however, limited the power these countries could wield. None of the newly independent countries held a permanent seat on the Security Council or enjoyed veto power over UN resolutions. The only arena in which the former colonial territories were all represented was the General Assembly. Although the Assembly was useful in raising awareness of issues, it could only offer recommendations which were not legally binding among the organisation's members.[9] With the onset of the Cold War another facet influenced the debate over colonial possessions.[10] Smaller states could suddenly exert considerable influence, as the structure of the United Nations made it possible for them to exploit their non-aligned position effectively in a world divided into two rival blocs.[11]

The Soviet Union found Britain's remaining colonial heritage a convenient issue

with which to goad the western alliance. Britain, with regard to its reversion to nineteenth century gunboat diplomacy at Suez in November 1956, was prepared to make this comparatively easy for the Soviets. Following Britain's ill-advised incursion, Sir Pierson Dixon, Britain's Permanent Representative to the UN (1954-60), tongue firmly in cheek, noted that "flanked by our faithful Australians and New Zealanders, we wandered about the U.N. halls like lost spirits. Our best friends averted their gaze or burst into tears as we passed".[12] Dixon was later to complain that during the Suez crisis "one of the intolerable features of the present proceedings in New York was the fact that quite serious proposals were projected at us without notice late at night when Europe was asleep and we were forced to take up a position in public immediately".[13] This point remained relevant during the discussions over Southern Rhodesia five years later.

Britain's "faithful Australians and New Zealanders" may have stood firm over Suez, but a striking feature of the international influences on the Federation is the way Commonwealth influence faded as the Federation waned.[14] This is perhaps indicative of the changing nature of the organisation as it was transformed from a small grouping of the "white" dominions into an enlarged multiracial organisation. Harold Macmillan, the British Prime Minister, allegedly complained that Commonwealth membership was "no longer like gaining admission to Brooks's but joining the R[oyal] A[utomobile] C[lub]".[15] Macmillan's apathy toward the Commonwealth was underlined by his commitment to take Britain into closer association with Europe. As Max Beloff mused in 1963: "Eventual entry into Europe must mean a sacrifice of one aspect of Britain's world role; namely, the potentialities of development inherent in an alternative grouping of countries based upon the existing membership of the Commonwealth".[16] More recently, Stuart Ward noted that Britain's desire to play a full economic and political role in Europe "hardly seemed compatible with being leader of the Commonwealth family of nations".[17] Similarly the Federal Prime Minister, Sir Roy Welensky, could be found in 1960 questioning the utility of the organisation that he had been so keen to secure the Federation membership of only three years previously:

> I really believe that the Commonwealth has come to the crossroads. If Macmillan is as able as I think he is, I think he can preserve it. If not, I think we see the beginning of the end. It does look as if Malaya is determined to discuss South Africa's affairs. Ceylon had a blood bath a little over three years ago, and I don't have to tell you how they deal with their language and minority problems. Pakistan is a military dictatorship. Can these people really sit in judgement on South Africa? I am seriously hoping that commonsense will prevail. If it doesn't then the future, Commonwealthwise, [*sic*] is a grim one.[18]

The fear of a split—between the newer members who advocated a more robust stance towards apartheid, and the older members who urged caution—in the Commonwealth over South Africa's continued membership was negated when the Union withdrew in March 1961. As early as 1956 it became apparent to the Commonwealth's Afro-Asian members that the United Nations was a far more effective arena to pursue their policies, as confirmed by the Assembly's reaction to Suez.

The Suez crisis caused embarrassment as it demonstrated that the British had attempted to undermine the purpose of the UN itself. This was particularly damaging as, one official summarised, the British position was "based not so much…[on our] material power as on our reputation for wisdom, honesty, fair dealing and restraint".[19] Criticism in New York over colonial policy was not only confined to the British. It has been remarked that "the French were equally notorious, but with a difference. No one at the United Nations expected anything but colonialist behaviour from the French".[20] French actions in North Africa were largely responsible for its poor reputation in the General Assembly, however this antipathy did not just flow one way.[21] In 1961, Charles De Gaulle, the French President, derisively referred to the United Nations as "*ce machin-la*" (that thing!).[22] By contrast the British conferral of independence to former colonies, beginning with India in 1947, had demonstrated a willingness to transfer power to indigenous populations.[23] Conversely, Britain's concomitant record in southern Africa, particularly with regard to South Africa, attracted criticism in the General Assembly. South Africa had been a live issue at the United Nations prior to the National Party's election in 1948.

In the very first session of the Assembly, during the autumn of 1946, South Africa spent weeks in the spotlight over the treatment of its Indian minority and its stewardship of South West Africa.[24] This condemnation grew rapidly after the introduction of apartheid and reached fever pitch after the South African police response to protests at Sharpeville, which left sixty-nine Africans dead and one hundred eighty injured. Furthermore, it set a worrying precedent in the eyes of the British, as for the first time the internal affairs of a member state became the focus of a UN resolution. Britain's lukewarm record of criticising South African policies led to it being cast as a member of "the Unholy Alliance" of white interests in Southern Africa with the South Africans and the Portuguese. This may explain why Britain's claims of fostering racial partnership in the Federation were treated with suspicion if not outright disbelief by many in the General Assembly.

Britain's non-communist critics in the United Nations were collectively referred to as the Afro-Asian bloc.[25] The group had its origins at the Bandung Conference of Asian and African states during April 1955.[26] Representatives from twenty-four African and Asian countries (excluding South Africa) attended the conference, although not all had received independence. Tellingly, the Central African Federation declined their invitation. The delegates agreed to take a non-aligned position in the context of the Cold War. Furthermore, they passed a resolution calling for a speedy end to colonialism in all its manifestations.[27] The Bandung Conference was an important forerunner of Afro-Asian involvement in the United Nations, and heralded "an important step in developing the role of the African and Asian nations in world diplomacy".[28]

In Africa, Kwame Nkrumah, the Ghanaian President, made his country a haven for anti-colonial movements across the continent.[29] During April 1958, Ghana hosted the Conference of Independent African States (CIAS) and later that year in December the All African People's Conference (AAPC).[30] These events provided forums for newly independent and aspiring independence movements to obtain support and inspiration from fellow Africans. It has been suggested by one scholar that "the AAPC meetings were more militant and revolutionary", however, "the CIAS and later similar conferences were to become the vehicles which committed the

independent African states to direct involvement in the liberation struggle".[31] More broadly, Afro-Asian collaboration in this period has been compared to the convergence of the White and Blue Nile at Khartoum by one scholar: "at first they retained a separate identity, although travelling along the same direction, but fairly soon they intermixed, even though they never lost the qualities of their separate sources".[32]

It is important, however, not to misidentify the Afro-Asian group in the United Nations as monolithic. A State Department official in Washington noted how a separate "African Group" became more of an identifiable bloc during 1960. "It established a regular, if informal, method of procedure and met frequently" he reported. Furthermore, even this African group voted together only on issues that reflected "a similarity of situations in their countries, such as being all economically underdeveloped, rather than a calculated policy of unity." He concluded by recognising that although "the African group may be regarded as at best a mixed blessing, there is no sense in trying flatly to oppose it".[33] In 1958, many Western diplomats considered the Afro-Asian group "an instrument that pushed moderate Africans further than they intended"; however, by the early 1960s, "these same diplomats wished the Afro-Asian caucus had its old authority and thereby restrain the African group".[34]

By the end of 1962 the informal nature of this structure was sometimes a liability. For example, the Afro-Asian caucusing group met to consider a draft resolution. Although there was no serious disagreement by any of the fifty-five members of the caucus, it took three hours for the caucus to agree on two sentences of a two-page draft resolution.[35] A further, more divisive split in the African membership was between the Casablanca and Brazzaville blocs. The former contained most of the more radical African states, whilst the latter consisted of many of the more conservative ex-French colonial possessions.[36] This split was potentially damaging, as the influence that the African states could wield necessarily depended on a degree of unity.[37] Despite this tension, if the members agreed on an issue, as was a common occurrence in the case of colonial questions, they possessed an effective veto in the General Assembly as a two-thirds vote was required to carry substantive issues.[38]

Generally, the Afro-Asian countries agreed that colonialism and white rule should be eradicated from Africa, although they sometimes differed on how this was to be achieved. In March 1961, the African and Asian counties put forward different resolutions regarding apartheid South Africa. The African proposal called for specific measures to be taken against South Africa while the Asian resolution asked all states to consider collective and separate action as was open to them. The Asian proposal was eventually adopted as Resolution 1598 (XV) and was further notable for being the first occasion where the United Kingdom voted against apartheid.[39] If colonialism was an issue on which common ground could be found between the Afro-Asian states in the UN, there were several issues during the early 1960s where it was politically impossible for there to be a collective stance: the struggle for power in the Congo;[40] the deteriorating relationship between the USSR and China; and the border disputes between India and China, all caused friction within the group. However, in regard to colonialism, and the situation in Southern Rhodesia in particular, it was comparatively easy for the Afro-Asian group to reach a consensus.

One such Resolution supported by all factions of the Afro-Asian movement was 1514 (XV), the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries

and Peoples. Resolution 1514 was passed in December 1960, and exhibited a "definitive expression of anti-colonialism" from the Assembly, as it provided formal recognition that colonialism could no longer be regarded as legitimate.[41] The Soviet Union had initially proposed a declaration demanding immediate freedom for all non-self-governing countries. However, there was a general fear within the Afro-Asian group that Soviet sponsorship of an anti-colonial motion would result in a Cold War vote, in which the Latin American countries would side with the west and endanger the resolution.[42] Consequently, a watered-down Afro-Asian version was eventually submitted and adopted by a unanimous vote of 89 to 0, with nine countries—including the United Kingdom, the United States, France, and Belgium—abstaining.[43] Resolution 1514 was couched in the language of the Bandung conference, and called for "the end of colonialism in all its manifestations".[44] This success for the Afro-Asian bloc in the Assembly was reinforced during 1961, when the Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was established under Resolution 1654 (XVI). The committee was, perhaps unsurprisingly, more commonly known as the UN Committee of Seventeen, or after December 1962, the UN Committee of Twenty-Four.[45]

The decision to enlarge the Committee in December 1962 led the United States government to reassess their membership of the Committee. In discussions with the Foreign Office, a State Department official warned that the Americans were "disillusioned" with their experience on the Committee. Their "special relationship" with Portugal over the Azores and friendship with Britain, had obliged them to vote "almost on every occasion" against anti-colonial proposals. As a result there was concern that this had damaged American relations with the "moderate Afro-Asians and undermined their effectiveness at ameliorating the bitterness of United Nations colonial debates".[46] Despite this unease the United States eventually decided to retain its membership of the Committee.

This debate was replicated in Whitehall with an issue from the Colonial Office which advocated that Britain should withdraw from the Committee in order to "decrease its prestige [so] that little notice would be taken of it".[47] However, this suggestion was vehemently opposed by a civil servant on the United Nations desk in Whitehall, who forcefully argued that this course of action would show "a fundamental misunderstanding of the world of 1963 and the United Nations. The committee would then become purified of imperialist elements and turn from a not really too offensive discussion group into a jolly little extremist hate body".[48] Sir Patrick Dean, Britain's Permanent Representative to the United Nations (1960-4) also advocated remaining in the Committee. In his opinion, "the most striking feature of the Committee is the air of lassitude and boredom which usually surrounds it; at times it reminds one of a whale stranded on a beach, imposing in its bulk but helpless in action. It is in our interest to encourage such a posture". He continued "I believe withdrawal would on balance be a mistake. In the first place, our mere participation in the work of the Committee is a clear and obvious manifestation of the difference between our position on colonial and racial questions and that of Portugal and South Africa".[49]

The Colonial Office's concern with the Committee stemmed from the criticism they received over the administration of Britain's remaining colonies. In part, this

was due to the composition of the Committee which was weighted highly in favour of the anti-colonial bloc.[50] For example, in 1963 twelve of its members were Afro-Asian; four, including the Soviet Union, were drawn from the communist bloc; and three were Latin American. Only five members represented the West: the United Kingdom, the United States, Italy, Denmark, and Australia. Following these developments, Afro-Asian anti-colonial policy generally adopted a three-pronged attack. Colonialism was condemned as it denied fundamental human rights, was contrary to the UN Charter, and impeded the promotion of world peace. Yet, for all that:

> no quantity of UN resolutions could force Portugal to acknowledge that its territories were non-self-governing and must therefore be reported on, compel South Africa to change its ways in relation to *apartheid* or South West Africa, or to make the United Kingdom admit a UN Mission of investigation to Aden or order Southern Rhodesia to democratize its constitution. The result in part was a stalemate.[51]

This was not always obvious to the British government of the day. Reginald Maudling, Secretary of State for the Colonies, was "very worried" about the situation developing at the United Nations. He found it "not improbable" that Britain could be "faced with Mr. Kaunda arguing about the Northern Rhodesia constitution; Kenyatta arguing about the independence of Kenya, or Mintoff about the Malta constitution" at the United Nations.[52] Furthermore, he was "convinced that if we do not make a stand at this moment on a clear matter of principle the slippery slope down which we may have been moving for some months will grow rapidly and disastrously steeper".[53]

Wider regional problems were also linked to the Federation, and exerted pressure on the Federal and British governments alike. The Congo gained its independence from Belgium at the end of June 1960, and five days later the army mutinied against its Belgian officers, which led to outbreaks of violence throughout the country. The widespread breakdown of order peaked with the declaration of independence by the mineral-rich south-eastern province of Katanga, on 11 July 1960.[54] Northern Rhodesia and Katanga were connected through both human and natural geography. The border between the two states crossed the Copperbelt, which provided each territory with mineral wealth.[55] Although Macmillan thought it was natural that Moise Tshombe, the Katangan President, should enjoy the moral support of Welensky, who was anxious to see a reasonably stable regime in a territory so intrinsically connected to Northern Rhodesia, he still aligned Britain behind UN action in the Congo.[56] This greatly annoyed the Federal Prime Minister. Britain, he claimed, was more concerned with following the American line, and causing no offence to the "very noisy leaders of the Afro-Asian *bloc*" in the UN, than defending its interests in Central Africa.[57] Welensky later recalled how his relationship with the British government which was "already delicate enough, not to say strained" deteriorated further after Britain supported UN intervention in the Congo.[58]

The UN committed civilian advisers and a "peace-keeping" force which, at full strength, comprised 19,000 troops.[59] As one scholar notes "they intervened extensively in the politics of the country, thereby not conforming to the popular image of a 'peace-keeping' force".[60] Welensky's apprehension over UN activities in the Congo resonated with some quarters of the British press.[61] During September 1961 *The*

Daily Telegraph asked "[w]hy has the United Nations now abandoned conciliation for a policy of force?" and concluded that "[w]e have now been deliberately confronted with a 'last resort' that bears every appearance of having been deliberately engineered".[62] Two days later it built on this theme in an editorial, arguing that "[i]n ruins at the moment is the whole conception of the United Nations as an austere and impartial force, standing above the quarrels of the nations, not the servant of any one nation or group of nations but the servant of all".[63] *The Times* noted "it seems odd to attack Katanga to prevent civil war".[64] *The Daily Mail* asked "is a gun-slinging coup d'etat, engineered by outsiders, any way to secure lasting unity and stability?"[65] The *Daily Express* directly linked the unfolding crisis in Katanga to events within the Federation:

> One man emerges from the Katanga crisis with enhanced reputation: Sir Roy Welensky…time after time he warned of the dangers of [UN] activities in the Congo…There is only one way in which the British Government can redeem its wretched blunders in Africa. That is to support Sir Roy Welensky in the tremendous—but not yet hopeless—task of holding the front for civilisation.[66]

As welcome as this support was to Welensky, a mere forty-eight hours after *The Daily Express*' rallying-call, events in Northern Rhodesia dramatically intensified criticism of the Federation in the UN.

On 17 September 1961 an aeroplane carrying the United Nations' Secretary-General, Dag Hammarskjöld, crashed twelve kilometres from the Northern Rhodesian town of Ndola. Hammarskjöld was flying to the Federation to meet with the Tshombe. Prior to the accident, the Federation had been accused of allowing Katangan forces to use its airfields for fighter planes, and Hammarskjöld's death inevitably cast suspicion on the Federation. Welensky reflected on the day after the crash that "[t]he Federation has taken the place of South Africa and this morning I had a fairly difficult time with the United Nations in Southern Rhodesia".[67] He did, however, continue to vigorously deny any Federal involvement in the crash, and lamented that "the death of Hammarskjöld has not made our task any easier".[68] His protestations, however, went unheeded and Afro-Asian suspicions were voiced in the UN when the Guinean Minister of Foreign Affairs announced:

> …there can be no doubt whatever that Secretary General Hammarskjöld fell a victim to the same colonial and racist forces whose united front, organized and financed in broad daylight, after having murdered Patrice Lumumba and his companions, is now endeavouring to prevent at any cost the inevitable decolonization of Central and Eastern Africa…[69]

This was indicative of the view held by many independent African states in the United Nations that explicitly linked events in Katanga with those within the Federation. Hammarskjöld's death in Northern Rhodesia only strengthened this view, and Welensky's decision to openly back Tshombe in the media, and attempts to provide more practical assistance discreetly added to the criticism in New York. Since the crisis began, the UN had repeatedly requested that Britain allow UN observers into the Federation to supervise the border. This was not an unreasonable request. Correspondence between the Federal and South African governments the

previous year demonstrates that Pretoria was providing Tshombe with weaponry, with all identification marks removed, via the Federation.[70] Mercenaries played a key role in Tshombe's forces. Initially, predominately French and Belgian ex-servicemen were recruited, though as the crisis wore on the focus shifted to Southern Rhodesians and South Africans. Criticism in New York was such that Britain applied pressure on the Federal government to restrict mercenary recruitment in Salisbury and Bulawayo, however it made little difference. Recruitment was temporarily displaced to South Africa where lax visa controls allowed mercenaries to travel through the Federation unhindered.[71]

To many in the West, the hypocrisy of the Afro-Asian position was exposed in December 1961 when the United Nations failed to condemn India, a leading member of the Afro-Asian bloc and Commonwealth, for its use of military force to wrest Goa from the Portuguese.[72] Adlai Stevenson, the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, believed it could be "the first act in a drama that could end on its death".[73] To numerous British officials, the perceived inconsistency with which world affairs were viewed by the non-aligned states had long been a bone of contention. It seemed that representatives of the non-western countries, especially India, held the communist states to one standard, which was tolerant and forgiving, and Britain to another that was harsh and exacting. Nehru had been slow to criticise the Russians in Hungary but quick to condemn the British at Suez.[74]

II

By the beginning of 1962, Africa was thoroughly intertwined with the procedure and policy of the United Nations, to the extent that forty-two percent of the sixteenth *Annual Report of the Secretary General* (1962) was devoted to African issues. For comparison, the first sixty-six page long *Annual Report* contained only two sentences on Africa.[75] One issue attracting increasing attention was the situation in Southern Rhodesia. This change in priorities was not welcomed by Welensky. He began the year in a deflated mood, writing how he had "been having one of my recurring rows with Her Majesty's Government", he continued "they quake every time the United Nations say anything. I know that we are a tremendous embarrassment and, after having chewed up South Africa, the United Nations are now looking for fresh victims".[76]

Welensky was proved correct and much to the surprise of both the British and Federal governments, the question of whether Southern Rhodesia had received "a full measure of self-government" was referred to the Committee of Seventeen, after a vote on the last day of the Sixteenth General Assembly. For the first time Southern Rhodesia was a topic of formal discussion at the UN. Britain had three main points for opposing this action. Firstly, they had cooperated with colonial issues on the condition that there would be no intervention by the UN in British territories; secondly, Southern Rhodesia was self-governing in its internal affairs and completely responsible for its own economic, social and educational policies; and finally, the British government was not in a position to provide information as it could not demand such information from the colony. The Ghanaian representative responded to these claims by suggesting that if Britain could not control the situation in Southern Rhodesia, then the United Nations should "come to the rescue". Scorn was also poured on British assertions of self-government for the territory:

> How can a colonial territory in Africa be self-governing when the three mil-
> lion Africans have no say in the administration—which is in the hands of
> only 280,000 European settlers who, by the grace of the British
> Government, have been allowed to maintain a racist regime, comparable
> only to the apartheid state of South Africa?[77]

Ghana was not the only country to voice its displeasure during the March debate.
The representative of Sierra Leone accused Britain of upholding "a mockery of
democracy" in the Federation. Much to the incredulity of the British representative,
the USSR and Bulgaria also argued that the principle of one man one vote should
be recognised and independence given to the Africans of Southern Rhodesia rather
than the white settlers.[78] In response, the British representative again claimed a lack
of jurisdiction over the territory and categorically denied that Southern Rhodesia
was another South Africa. He referred to Southern Rhodesian Prime Minister, Sir
Edgar Whitehead's recent comment that "white supremacy [in Southern Rhodesia]
is as dead as a dodo and that those who wanted to perpetuate white supremacy can
get another Prime Minister".[79] Unfortunately for Whitehead his electorate ultimately
agreed and he was consequently replaced by the more intransigent Winston Field,
leader of the Rhodesian Front, in December 1962.

   Only Canada and the United States supported Britain on this issue. A State
Department report maintained that one explanation for the Afro-Asian bloc's "sur-
prising success" in securing the referral of Southern Rhodesia to the Committee of
Seventeen was "the effective lobbying" of African nationalist representatives in the
United Nations. This lobbying was characterised quite differently by Sir Roy
Welensky, who found the President of the United National Independence Party,
Kenneth Kaunda's "performance of wailing before the Committee of Seventeen in
New York…nauseating".[80] The State Department report further recognised that

> [t]his move in the General Assembly lends moral support to the African
> nationalists in Southern Rhodesia and could subject Southern Rhodesia to
> a barrage of external agitation and propaganda from Africa's nationalist
> statesmen at a time when delicate negotiations on the Northern Rhodesian
> and Federal Constitution are under way…[81]

These points succinctly illustrate the problems facing Britain in the international
community. Southern Rhodesia was too easily linked to events in neighbouring
countries and the publicity provided by the UN encouraged African nationalists still
further. Welensky alluded to this, writing that "the nationalists here now no longer
look to the United Kingdom; they look to the Afro-Asian Group at the United
Nations".[82] However, he was forced to admit that Britain did its best to resist open
interference by the United Nations in the Federation.[83]

   Britain's attempts to resist UN intervention in Southern Rhodesia were driven by
pragmatism, rather than a desire to cement white minority rule in the Federation.
Southern Rhodesia, unlike Britain's other African colonies, contained a sizeable
settler minority which possessed its own well trained and equipped armed forces.
Philip Murphy has demonstrated how British military planners formulated propos-
als in 1961 for an armed intervention in Central Africa, in the event of a unilateral
declaration of independence by the Federal government. They concluded that

military intervention in the Federation was "neither military nor politically feasible", and henceforth it should be avoided at almost any cost.[84] Therefore, British policy in the UN was required to satisfy Afro-Asian calls for progress towards greater African political freedom, while simultaneously not alienating the settlers into open rebellion. As such, it was in Britain's best interest to keep discussion of Southern Rhodesia to a minimum.

Events during March 1962 caused further consternation among the Afro-Asian bloc. The debate over Southern Rhodesia's "self-governing" status was still ongoing when Whitehead's government decided to ban the Zimbabwe African Peoples Union (ZAPU), the successor to the National Democratic Party, also previously banned by the Southern Rhodesia government in December 1961.[85] Lord Home informed Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, that while he fully regretted Whitehead's decision to ban ZAPU, he felt sure that the Rhodesian authorities must have done it with the "greatest reluctance". Home made clear that if Britain was forced to enter into any undertakings at the UN it would be "most damaging" to securing any success in the Federation. Whitehead was apparently "particularly sensitive" to the "danger that any appearance of yielding to the United Nations pressures could well lose them the election".[86] As a result of the ZAPU ban, the Special Committee decided to make Southern Rhodesia its first order of business. This consistent focus on Britain's colonial record continued to place the United States in a difficult position. G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for Africa, believed that the issue was so contentious that "[t]he U.S. position on the Southern Rhodesia question will to a large extent determine our effectiveness in pressing for moderation on subsequent 'colonial' issues and in exercising influence with the Afro-Asians on the whole range of the UN Agenda".[87] The problem facing Washington was that if the Afro-Asian bloc believed that the US had not fully pressured Britain over Southern Rhodesia, it could move them closer to the Soviet Union. In the Cold War context of the early 1960s this was to be avoided. Consequently, Williams concluded that

> [i]n the absence of any ameliorating action by the UK or the Southern Rhodesian Government, we should express in the UN General Assembly, in restrained terms, and avoiding criticism of the UK, our dismay and dissatisfaction with the course of events in Southern Rhodesia. While urging moderation in corridor conversations with Afro-Asians, we should not conduct a campaign on behalf of the UK or the Southern Rhodesian Government.[88]

By the end of the month, the Southern Rhodesian question had still not been satisfactorily addressed and, according to the South African representative's report to Pretoria, "the end is not yet in sight".[89] At least thirteen of the seventeen members of the Committee were convinced that Southern Rhodesia was not self-governing. Only the United States, Australia and Italy accepted that there were constitutional problems facing Britain. The British representative then argued that it would be impossible to solve Southern Rhodesia's problems without widening the debate to consider Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland. The Committee agreed to this on the condition that Southern Rhodesia was discussed first. The South African representative believed Britain was attempting to blur the issue. He noted that "it is already absolutely clear that the whole Southern Rhodesian issue is now on the

United Nations plate and will probably stay there as long as Southern Rhodesia exists in its present form".[90]

Discussions were forthcoming on Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland and the Special Committee concluded a series of meetings in May by approving a vote 12-4 in favour of calling for immediate independence for Northern Rhodesia.[91] The Special Committee had prepared a report which the United States representative described as "excessive and emotional".[92] A State Department commissioned report contended that Britain feared UN interference would "hinder" their efforts to find a solution to the problems in the territory as it would "stimulate African nationalist agitation" for immediate independence. Not only would UN action encourage African extremists, it would also encourage reactionaries among the European population. If "serious conflict and violence" ensued in Southern Rhodesia, and Britain could not devise a new constitution acceptable to the majority African population, Southern Rhodesia would also be added to the Assembly's programme. Furthermore, as the report astutely recognised, it was "virtually impossible to discuss any of the individual territories of the Federation without becoming involved in the question of the Federation itself".[93] This was a key concern to Welensky, particularly in the case of Nyasaland. He was well aware that "[i]f Nyasaland goes…how does one refuse Northern Rhodesia the right?"[94] Welensky was determined to keep Northern Rhodesia, or at least the Copperbelt, as the territory contained the bulk of the mineral wealth of the Federation.[95] The only argument he could offer was the size of Northern Rhodesia's European population; however, he was realistic enough to realise that this would carry little weight in the eyes of the Afro-Asian bloc.[96]

As expected, a vote in June passed the debate over Southern Rhodesia to the General Assembly, Welensky tartly noting that of the sixty-one nations to vote for the debate, twenty-two were dictatorships, twenty-three were in arrears with their subscriptions to the UN and in two—Saudi Arabia and Yemen—slavery was openly practised.[97] The debate began on the 14 June with a resolution tabled by thirty-eight Afro-Asian countries, including all the African and Asian members of the British Commonwealth. The resolution claimed that, as "the territory of Southern Rhodesia is a non-self-governing territory within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations," Britain should convene a Conference with "the full participation of all political parties."[98] The resolution also requested the UN Committee of Seventeen continue its efforts to ensure that Southern Rhodesia emerged as an "independent African State".[99]

During the week-long debate, the Ghanaian representative argued that Southern Rhodesia presented "one of the most urgent colonial problems of Africa", which could produce "a colonial conflict of the Algerian or Angolan type".[100] This sentiment was echoed by other Afro-Asian delegates. Britain continued to deny it had any power to intervene in Southern Rhodesia, an assertion that was supported by Canada and Australia. Furthermore, the British representative warned that any UN action would only increase difficulties, harden attitudes, and widen existing divisions in Southern Rhodesia. Britain, he avowed, had faith in the genuine intention of the Southern Rhodesian Government to eliminate racial discrimination and to build a multi-racial society based on tolerance and goodwill. In any case, he declared, the organisation had no authority under the Charter or elsewhere to intervene in Southern Rhodesia. Thus the resolution was "objectionable in principle and danger-

ous in practice".[101] The General Assembly disagreed and adopted the resolution by seventy-three votes to one (South Africa) with twenty-seven abstentions. An amendment by Bulgaria was also adopted which called on the Southern Rhodesian franchise to be based on the principle of one man one vote.[102] Britain suffered further embarrassment later in the year when Sir Hugh Foot, Britain's Ambassador to the UN Trusteeship Council, resigned during October. Foot's reason for his decision was that he could no longer defend Southern Rhodesia's policies in the Assembly. The British Conservative press denounced his action as a "stab in the back".[103] However, Foot was unrepentant and revealed that he was honouring a pledge to Joshua Nkomo, the leader of ZAPU, to resign if Britain refused to intervene in Southern Rhodesia.[104]

III

A study of issues referred to the Security Council during the period shows, in addition to time spent discussing the Congo, over forty-seven per cent of the UN Security Council's remaining time for the period 1960-3 was spent debating questions of white supremacy or European colonial rule in Africa.[105] This demonstrates that the increased number of Afro-Asian states in the General Assembly provided enough votes to ensure that issues of their immediate concern remained on the UN agenda.[106] However, the western powers tended not to argue about many of these issues, preferring instead to register reservations. Britain used its veto only once during this period, during September 1963, to reject a resolution calling for Britain not to turn over control of the Federation's armed forces to, or grant sovereignty to, Southern Rhodesia. The British representative later announced that his government had the choice of vetoing the resolution or announcing its refusal to follow this "invitation", and consequently it had chosen to veto.[107]

British responses to growing criticism in the UN evolved over the period under consideration. A Foreign Office paper argued that, independent from its position in the western alliance and its close relationship with the United States, Britain derived influence from three factors: its position in the Commonwealth, the similarity of its objectives to those of the Secretary-General, Dag Hammarskjöld, and its relationship with the Scandinavian group. In 1960 it was believed that British policies towards the Federation would have an important bearing on its standing in the world community. It was not anticipated that "the reaction of the Afro-Asian world, will be such as to destroy the general understanding for our colonial policies which has been built up in recent years".[108] Members of the Cabinet recognised that the success of independence movements in other African countries would "act as a spur" to African nationalism in British territories. However, "irritating" though Britain may have found the attitude of the United Nations, both the Soviets and the Americans "probably find it equally unsatisfactory on other scores" and they would "have to pay increasing attention to the voice of world opinion as expressed through the United Nations and personified in the Secretary-General".[109]

Towards the end of the 1960 session of the United Nations a distinct change could be seen in Britain's handling of the Afro-Asian group. On a Security Council resolution relating to South Africa, Britain abstained rather than voting against. This was an attempt to diffuse African criticism as it was believed that to have opposed the resolution would have caused "serious damage to our relations with African

states and, above all, to our ties with the African and Asian members of the Commonwealth".[110] Domestic politics were also of concern as public opinion in Britain "was strongly against South Africa".[111] Sir Andrew Cohen,[112] Britain's permanent representative on the United Nations Trusteeship Council, had been following this tactic through "with great skill" and "had been able to take the heat out of disputes on colonial matters by promoting compromises, especially in the wording of resolutions."[113] Cohen, it was reported, had achieved this by cooperating fully with the "admittedly tedious and in themselves largely useless…discussions of various U.N. bodies; and to keep the leading anti-colonial delegations 'in play' and in good humour, so diverting them from mischief".[114]

Before long, however, anti-colonial criticism was such that the effectiveness of Cohen's tactics was being questioned. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs mused that:

> although it is comforting to persuade oneself that it does not matter if one votes for the Afro-Asian resolutions however foolish they are as long as one makes reservations. But what does our Colonial Secretary say to Kenyatta when he greets him with, "I am so glad that you voted for resolution 1514 which instructs the Colonial powers to give independence immediately and without conditions"?[115]

The General Assembly could be appeased, but only at the cost of making it far more difficult to pursue policies of moderate advancement for Africans in its remaining territories. Britain's overall objective in dealing with the United Nations was to "prevent U.N. intervention of a kind which would lessen our authority and consequently impede the smooth progress of our territories to independence".[116] This policy was fraught with difficulty as Britain had "little room left for manoeuvre and this objective might be defeated either by our conceding too much or by our not conceding enough".[117] When the British did make concessions to the Afro-Asian bloc, events on the ground often negated any benefit they could expect to gain. A memorandum on colonial questions dryly noted:

> genuine good-will…has…been largely dissipated by the belief that we support Tshombe against the central Congo Government, by anger against Welensky and what he represents, and by suspicions that we are more concerned to retain good relations with Portugal and the South African Government than to help the people they oppress…[118]

Further, it argued that the time had come for Britain actively to refuse to cooperate in carrying out United Nations recommendations when they went against its colonial interests. In effect it was hoped that "by a combination of obstinacy and persuasion" Britain would be able to use this targeted non-cooperation to avoid using the ultimate sanction at their disposal, namely an arbitrary refusal to cooperate with the United Nations or any of its Committees across the board. The document was brought to a close with a Churchillian metaphor, "[w]e should fight on the resolutions. We should fight in the corridors. We should fight in the Committees. We should never abstain".[119]

Ghana joined the UN Security Council as a non-permanent member during 1962. Although it has been contended that membership of the Security Council

tended to be a "moderating influence" on Ghana, it used the opportunity to attack Britain over Southern Rhodesia.[120] On 2 August 1962, Ghana presented a memorandum co-authored with Guinea, Morocco, and the United Arab Republic (Egypt), to the Security Council which criticised Britain over the terms of the Victoria Falls agreement arrived at to disband the Federation. The key issue was the transfer of the Federal army and air force to Southern Rhodesia's control following the Federation's dissolution. In the subsequent Security Council debate the Ghanaian representative asserted that such a move would start an arms race on the African continent.[121]

Sir Patrick Dean, judged the Ghanaian speech to be "highly effective", particularly as any draft resolution proposed by the Ghanaians along the same line would be "very mild" in its content. This would prove problematic for Britain as a mild resolution could garner support from more "moderate" delegations in Latin America or Scandinavia. Consequently Dean feared the proposed resolution could be "a slippery slope that could easily lead them ultimately to supporting a resolution".[122] Dean proved correct and Britain was forced to use its Security Council veto to prevent the Resolution being adopted on 13 September 1963.

Following the Security Council veto, the issue of Southern Rhodesia again moved back to the General Assembly, and Dean again was troubled by the "mildness" of potential resolutions. Consequently, he notified Whitehall that

> We have been telling our friends that we would prefer them not to promote or go along with these resolutions on the grounds that, however mild and responsible their language may be, they all in fact saddle us with responsibilities or invite us to take courses which we are bound to reject. It is naturally embarrassing to have to take this attitude but I am sure that you will agree that in the circumstances we have no choice. At the same time it is clear that our friends are reluctant to abandon the search for a text which they will feel able to vote for, and we cannot exclude the possibility of a resolution being passed with the support of everyone except the Portuguese, the South Africans and ourselves.[123]

To be left solely in the company of Portugal and South Africa was the constant fear of British policy makers in both London and New York as it would prove disastrous for Britain's image on the world stage. Avoiding this eventuality was an important facet of British policy in the United Nations over the Southern Rhodesian question. A further strand of British policy was to keep the United States' support in the United Nations.[124] This accord looked to be in danger of crumbling during December 1960 when worrying news reached Macmillan that the United States, although planning to criticise an Afro-Asian resolution, would vote in its favour. Macmillan's panicked response demonstrates how important the solidarity of its closest ally was deemed to be. Macmillan was "very shocked" to learn of this development and was moved to appeal directly to President Eisenhower. He couched the need for American support in Cold War terms, stressing that Britain was "making a tremendous effort…to get peaceful development in Africa and to try and keep communism out". On the contrary, if the Americans were to vote in favour of the Afro-Asians it would have "a most discouraging effect" on both the British and settlers who were "working so hard for progress". Macmillan concluded by pleading "[d]o

let us stand together, at least on a decision to abstain, and thus disassociate our-selves from a resolution which has no connection to reality".[125] Macmillan's entreaty worked, and Eisenhower informed him two days later that the United States would abstain, warning that "the wording of certain paragraphs makes it impossible for us to vote in favor of the resolution…[however] we do support the general principles the sponsors had in mind".[126] Macmillan offered thanks, assuring Eisenhower that Britain was doing everything possible to placate African demands in the Federation.[127]

The United States' growing interest in African affairs was not welcomed by Welensky, particularly with regard to the apparent ease with which African national-ists from the Federation could be heard in Washington. State Department protocol maintain that if the President met with a leader, the same courtesy would be extend-ed to other visiting recognised national leaders. Consequently, following the visit during April 1961 of Kenneth Kaunda, the State Department recommended that the President meet with Hastings Banda, leader of the Malawi Congress Party in Nyasaland, and Joshua Nkomo, then leader of the National Democratic Party in Southern Rhodesia.[128] In comparison to this ease, the State Department questioned the 'usefulness' of a proposed visit by Welensky to Washington. The visit was sched-uled for a time when colonial items could potentially have been debated before the United Nations, and could be "embarrassing to say the least".[129] Although they were not "uninviting" Welensky, the American consulate in Salisbury was requested to make it clear to the Federal government that he should be in the United States for another "valid reason" and would merely be taking the opportunity to make calls in Washington while visiting.[130]

By October 1962, a State Department report judged the situation in the Federation, and Southern Rhodesia in particular, as "perhaps the most difficult sit-uation for the United States in Africa today".[131] Mennen Williams summarised that although the partnership programme had started well, it had moved too slowly to accommodate African nationalism in the Federation over the last five years and claimed: "the winds of change have now proved to have blown stronger and faster than Sir Roy Welensky's ability to accommodate and perhaps even with greater velocity than Sir Edgar Whitehead has felt himself able to cope with".[132] Further-more:

> The political problem which confronts Great Britain is that they are con-vinced that the Southern Rhodesian whites will not accept a more liberal constitution than the one under consideration and that if there is any liber-alization of the constitution, then Sir Edgar Whitehead will fall. They state the case very boldly that it is Sir Edgar or apartheid.[133]

However, if changes were not made to the constitution there would be increasing dissatisfaction from Africans which would increase the level of violence. This would also provide a rallying call for the Afro-Asians in the United Nations to further increase pressure on Britain. The United States, while sympathetic to Britain's prob-lems, hoped that a policy which would satisfy both parties could still be found.[134]

Whitehead's expected success in the December 1962 Southern Rhodesian elec-tion was considered crucial, by State Department officials, if race relations were to improve in the territory. Sir Roy Welensky was judged a handicap which Whitehead

had to negotiate in order to implement swifter changes: "Although Welensky is on record as favoring non-racial political development…he seems to be opposed to the swiftness with which Whitehead is advancing Africans in Southern Rhodesia."[135] The influence of the Rhodesian Front was said to diminish or increase as Whitehead took a firm or lenient line with the African nationalists, respectively.[136] The report noted that though African nationalists in the territory had gained strength despite numerous banning orders, they still lacked the strength of other comparable movements in colonial Africa. The African nationalists were considerably bolstered by the support they had received in the United Nations. The other party, Britain, was not prepared to intervene as actively in the problem as the United States wanted. "In typical fashion, the British are knocking off one colonial problem after another in Africa and Southern Rhodesia's turn has not yet reached the center of the stage despite the focus of attention by the UN."[137]

IV

Britain was undoubtedly faced with a "difficult, tedious and unwanted task" in having to reconcile settler and African interests on the world stage during the early 1960s. Yet, it would seem that R. A. Butler actually understated the problems facing Britain at the United Nations. John Darwin has noted how after 1945 an ideological climate was created in which self-determination and the unnaturalness of foreign rule were almost universally followed political dogmas, and that it was the United Nations that gave institutional focus to this creed.[138] Consequently, such moral authority as Britain may previously have enjoyed in the United Nations was seriously undermined by the Suez fiasco in 1956. The worsening situation in *apartheid* South Africa made it all the more difficult to defend white minority rule in central Africa. Nor was pressure on Britain confined to the Afro-Asian *bloc*. In the context of the Cold War, retaining links with the non-aligned nations was of paramount importance to the western alliance, and Britain's kith and kin in central Africa provided an embarrassing—and potentially dangerous—area for the Soviet Union to exploit.

Asahikio Hanzawa suggests that Britain's susceptibility to UN dynamics was directly linked to its position as the second most powerful state in the West. Britain could not afford to ignore the UN in the same way that the United States could perhaps have, nor was she able to adopt the open defiance of South Africa and Portugal.[139] Britain's desire to maintain her position as a 'great power' in the post-1945 era required the acquiescence of her former colonial possessions and the acceptance of the wider world in general. The approach Britain took towards dealing with the problem of Southern Rhodesia sketched out above reinforces Hanzawa's claim.

Resolution 1514 (IX) passed in 1960 and the formation of the Committee of 17 during 1961 clearly underlined the UN's commitment to advancing the world's remaining colonial territories towards independence. These developments allowed African nationalists in the Federation effectively to exploit the arena to raise world awareness of their plight. The United Nations not only provided a forum for debate, it also exerted influence through its actions in the breakaway Congolese state of Katanga. The sight of a United Nations army militarily engaged against a pro-Western, anti-communist African president, Moise Tshombe, just across the border

from Northern Rhodesia, infuriated Welensky. At the same time, the steady stream of European refugees entering the Federation with horrific stories of their treatment at the hands of Congolese and UN soldiers, further exacerbated unease within the settler community. Meanwhile, many Africans in the Federation were emboldened by the sight of UN troops across the border, and this may have encouraged further use of the General Assembly as a forum for debate. Criticism reached fever pitch after the death of the UN Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld, in an aeroplane crash in Northern Rhodesia, led to accusations that he had been killed by the Federal government and brought additional criticism aimed at the central African settlers.

   This is not to say that British policy was dictated by the dour, anti-colonial rhetoric which poured forth in the committee rooms of the United Nations. Rather, it suggests that the effect of this condemnation helped foster both African protest and a sense of siege within the European community in the Federation. This led to increased clashes between the two groups. Consequently, the relationship between local events and international criticism was cyclical and ultimately self-reaffirming. Britain had little, if any, interest in upholding a political system which eventually had precious few African or European supporters.

Bibliography of Works Cited

Unpublished Primary Sources
Cory Library, Grahamstown, RSA
     The Smith Papers (SP)
National Archives of the United Kingdom, Kew, UK
     Records of the Foreign Office (FO 371)
National Archives of the United States, College Park, Maryland, USA
     Records of the Department of State (RG 59)
National Archives and Records Service of South Africa, Pretoria, RSA
     Records of the Department of Foreign Affairs (BSB)
Rhodes House Library, Oxford, UK
     The Welensky Papers (WP)

Printed Primary Sources

Newspapers:
Daily Express
Daily Mail
Daily Telegraph
The Times

Document Collections:
Hyam R. and W.M.R. Louis, eds. *British Documents on the End of Empire, Series A, Volume 4, The Conservative Government and the End of Empire 1957-1964:* Part I: *High Policy, Political and Constitutional Change.* London: The Stationary Office, 2000.
     ———. *The Conservative Government and the End of Empire 1957-1964:* Part II: *Economics, International Relations and the Commonwealth.* London: The Stationary Office, 2000.

Books
Alport, C. *The Sudden Assignment.* London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1965.

Borstelman, T. *Apartheid's Reluctant Uncle: The United States and Southern Africa in the Early Cold War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Darwin, J. *Britain and Decolonisation*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1988.

DeRoche, A. *Black, White & Chrome: The United States and Zimbabwe, 1953-1998*. Trenton: Africa World Press, 2001.

Dixon, P. *Double Diploma: The Life of Sir Pierson Dixon, Don and Diplomat*. London: Hutchinson, 1968.

Freund, B. *The Making of Contemporary Africa*. London: Macmillan, 1998.

Good, R.C. *U.D.I: The International Politics of the Rhodesian Rebellion*. London: Faber, 1973.

Hovet, Jr., T. *Africa in the United Nations*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1963).

James, A., *Britain and the Congo Crisis, 1960-1963*. London: Macmillan, 1996.

Macmillan, H. *At the End of the Day*. London: Macmillan, 1973.

Moore, Jr., R.A. *The United Nations Reconsidered*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1963.

Rotberg, R.I. *The Rise of Nationalism in Central Africa: The Making of Malawi and Zambia, 1873-1964*. Cambridge, MA, Oxford University Press, 1972.

Sibanda, E.M. *The Zimbabwe African Peoples Union, 1961-87: A Political History of Insurgency in Southern Rhodesia.* Trenton: Africa World Press, 2005.

Thompson, W.S. *Ghana's Foreign Policy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969.

Wallerstein, I. *Africa the Politics of Unity: An Analysis of a Contemporary Social Movement*. London: Pall Mall, 1968.

Welensky, R. *4000 Days*. London: Collins, 1964.

Wood, J.R.T. *So Far and No Further! Rhodesia's Bid for Independence during the Retreat from Empire 1959-1965*. Johannesburg: Trafford Publishing, 2005.

Articles and Chapters in Edited Collections

Beloff, M. "Britain, Europe and the Atlantic Community", *International Organisation* 17:3 (1963): 574-91.

Butler, L. "Britain, the United States, and the Demise of the Central African Federation, 1959-1963". *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 28:3 (2000): 209-30.

———. "Business and British Decolonisation: Sir Ronald Prain, the Mining Industry and the Central African Federation". *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 35:3 (2007): 459-84.

Coggins, R. "Wilson and Rhodesia: UDI and British Policy towards Africa". *Contemporary British History* 20:3 (2006): 363-81.

Cohen, Sir A. "The New Africa and the United Nations". *International Affairs* 36:4 (1960): 476-88.

———. "The New Africa and the United Nations". *African Affairs* 60:241 (1961): 508-17.

Cohen, A. "Business and Decolonisation in Central Africa Reconsidered". *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 36:4 (2008): 641-58.

Drake, S.C. "Pan Africanism: What is it?". *Africa Today* 6:1 (1959): 6-10.

Emerson, R. "Colonialism, Political Development and the UN". *International Organization* 19:3 (1965): 484-503.

Gibbs, D.N. "Dag Hammarskjold, the United Nations, and the Congo Crisis of 1960-61: A Reinterpretation". *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 31:1 (1993) 163-74.

Hadsel, F. L. "Africa and the World: Nonalignment Reconsidered". In *Governing in Africa: Perspectives on New States,* edited by M.E. Doro and N.M. Stultz, 334-52. New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs, (1970).

Henshaw, P. "Canada and the 'South African Disputes' at the United Nations, 1946-1961". *Canadian Journal of African Studies* 33:1 (1999): 1-52.

Holloway, S. "Forty Years of United Nations General Assembly Voting". *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 23:2 (1990): 279-96.

Hoskyns, C. "The African States and the United Nations 1958-1964". *International Affairs* 40:3 (1964): 466-80.

Hughes, M. "The Central African Federation, Katanga and the Congo Crisis". *Military and International History* 2 (2003): 7-33.

Kay, D.A. "The Politics of Decolonization: The New Nations and the United Nations Political Process". *International Organization* 21:4 (1967): 786-811.

Lerner, D. and M. Kramer. "French Elite Perspectives on the United Nations". *International Organization*

17:1 (1963): 54-75.

Louis, W.M.R. "Public Enemy Number One: The British Empire in the Dock at the United Nations, 1957-71". In *The British Empire in the 1950s, Retreat or Revival?,* edited by M. Lynn, 186-213. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Mittleman, J. "Collective Decolonisation and the U.N. Committee of 24". *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 14:1 (1976): 41-64.

Murphy, P. "'An Intricate and Distasteful Subject': British Planning for the Use of Force Against the European Settlers of Central Africa, 1952-65". *English Historical Review* 121:492 (2006): 746-77.

Petersen, K.S. "The Business of the United Nations Security Council: History (1946-1963) and Prospects". *The Journal of Politics* 27:4 (1965): 818-38.

Rana, S. "The Changing Indian Diplomacy at the United Nations". *International Organization* 24:1 (1970): 48-73.

Rowe, E.T. "The Emerging Anti-Colonial Consensus in the United Nations". *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 8:3 (1964): 209-30.

Russett, B.M. "Discovering Voting Groups in the United Nations". *The American Political Science Review* 60:2 (1966): 327-39.

Tarling, N. "'Ah-Ah': Britain and the Bandung Conference of 1955". *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 23:1 (1992): 74-111.

Tekle, A. "A Tale of Three Cities: The OAU and the Dialectics of Decolonization in Africa". *Africa Today,* 35:3/4 (1988): 49-60.

Thomas, M. "France Accused: French North Africa before the United Nations, 1952-1962". *Contemporary European History* 10:1 (2001): 91-121.

Ward, S. "'Worlds Apart'. Three 'British' Prime Ministers at Empires End". In *Rediscovering the British World,* edited by Phillip Buckner et al., 399-420. Calgary: Calgary University Press, 2005.

Watts, C. "'Moments of Tension and Drama': The Rhodesian Problem at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Meetings, 1964-1965". *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History* 8:1 (2007): 98-146.

Welensky, R. "The United Nations and Colonialism in Africa". *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 354 (1964): 145-52.

Williams, G.M. "Aids and Obstacles to Political Stability in Mid-Africa". *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 342 (1962) 1-8.

Yifru, K. et al. "Africa Speaks to the United Nations: A Symposium of Aspirations and Concerns Voiced by Representative Leaders at the UN". *International Organization* 16:2 (1962): 303-30.

Unpublished Sources

Hanzawa, A. "An Invisible Surrender: The United Nations and the End of the British Empire, 1956-1963". Oxford: Unpublished D.Phil (2002).

Notes

* Earlier versions of this paper were given at the Imperial History Seminar, Institute of Historical Research, London (2007) and the 22nd Biennial Conference of the Southern African Historical Society, UNISA, Pretoria (2009). I would particularly like to thank Ian Phimister, John Darwin, and Alois Mlambo for their insightful questions and comments.

1   RG 59 General Records of the Department of State 1960-3 Central Decimal File, 320/ 12-1462 (Box 507), Memorandum from Rusk to J. F. Kennedy, 22 December 1962. All file references refer to the National Archives of the United States, College Park, Maryland.

2   SP Box 2/001 (A), Cabinet Memorandum S.R.C. (F) (63) 36: Note of a meeting between R.A. Butler and the Southern Rhodesian Cabinet, 25 January 1963. All file references refer to the Smith Papers, Cory Library, Grahamstown, RSA.

3   Butler, "Britain, the United States"; Coggins, "Wilson and Rhodesia"; Watts "Moments of Tension and Drama".

4   One existing study focuses on the Rhodesian problem at the United Nations in the post-1965 period: Good, *International Politics.*

5   Louis, "Public Enemy Number One"; and Hanzawa, "An Invisible Surrender".

6   During the period under discussion in this paper (1960-3), there was a growing general acceptance of majority rule (even grudgingly by the Federal Government by 1962), in both Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland. Robert Rotberg's account of the rise of nationalism in Malawi and Zambia reflects this lack of concern in New York and contains only two sentences mentioning the United Nations. See Rotberg, *Rise of Nationalism*, 211 and 250.

7   Unfortunately the author's research in the United National Independence Party and African National Congress archives in Lusaka failed to uncover any documents of major significance regarding the United Nations. This, again, perhaps reflects the unimportance of Northern Rhodesia in New York at this time. The political situation in Zimbabwe during the research for this paper made it impossible for adequate research to be conducted in Harare on African nationalist sources. Hopefully future research in this area will address this omission.

8   Louis, "Public Enemy Number One", 186-7.

9   Ibid., 146.

10 Rowe, "Anti-Colonial Consensus", 229.

11 Hoskyns, "African States and the United Nations", 466.

12 Louis, "Public Enemy Number One", 192.

13 Dixon, *Double Diploma,* 271.

14 The influence of the Commonwealth reasserted itself over Rhodesia in the post-Federal period; see Watts, "Moments of Tension and Drama", 98-146.

15 CO/926/1196, recalled by Martin, minute, 11 January 1960, cited in Hyam and Louis, *The Conservative Government and the End of Empire:* Part I, lxxviii.

16 Beloff, "Britain, Europe and the Atlantic Community", 575.

17 Ward, "Worlds Apart", 408.

18 WP 671/4, Welensky to Spicer, 28 April 1960. All file references refer to Rhodes House Library, Oxford.

19 DO 35/6948, no. 14, "The United Nations: a stocktaking": memorandum by I.T.M. Pink, 7 February 1957, cited in Hyam and Louis, *The Conservative Government and the End of Empire:* Part II, 306.

20 Louis, "Public Enemy Number One", 192-3.

21 A good account of French issues in the UN during this period can be found in Thomas, "France Accused", 91-121.

22 Lerner and Kramer, "French Elite Perspectives", 57.

23 Louis, "Public Enemy Number One", 192-3.

24 Borstelman, *Apartheid's Reluctant Uncle,* 75; and Henshaw, "Canada and the "South African Disputes", 9-12.

25 For a breakdown of Afro-Asian voting patterns in this period see Russet, "Discovering Voting Groups", 327-39; and Holloway, "United Nations Voting", 279-96.

26 Hovet, Jr., *Africa in the United Nations*, 24.

27 Ibid., 24-25.

28 Tarling, "Ah-Ah", 110.

29 Freund, *Contemporary Africa,* 182.

30 A contemporary account of these conferences can be found in St. Clare Drake, "Pan Africanism", 6-10.

31 Tekle, "A Tale of Three Cities", 51.

32 Hadsel, "Africa and the World", 342.

33 RG 59, [C]entral [D]ecimal [F]ile, 321/ 1-560, 1960-3, Box 507. State Department Report "The African Group at the United Nations General Assembly, September – December 1962" (n.d.)

34 Wallerstein, *Politics of Unity*, 32.

35 Hovet, Jr., *Africa in the United Nations,* 217.

36 For a more detailed appraisal of the differing African blocs see Williams, "Aids and Obstacles", 3-4.

37 Hovet, Jr. *Africa in the United Nations*, 19.

38 Moore, Jr., *The United Nations Reconsidered*. 9.

39 Cohen, "New Africa", 511.

40 The Congo crisis was a particularly divisive issue for the African countries in the United Nations as both Kasavubu and Lumumba claimed the legal right to represent the country in the General Assembly and sent delegations to New York. The African states were then forced to cast a ballot to decide which faction should be recognised. As Wallerstein notes: "the African Group of the United Nations, though it continued to exist in desultory form, was unable to contain this division effectively". *Politics of Unity* 45.

41 Mittleman, "Collective Decolonisation", 41.

42 Kay, "Politics of Decolonization", 790.

43 Countries voting for abstention were Australia, Belgium, Dominican Republic, France, Portugal, Spain, South Africa, United Kingdom, and the United States.

44 Emerson, "Colonialism, Political Development and the UN", 495; and Mittleman, "Collective Decolonisation", 45.

45 Mittleman, "Collective Decolonisation", 41-45.

46 NA, FO/371/172591, Ormsby-Gore to Foreign Office, 12 January 1963. All file references refer to the United Kingdom National Archives, Kew.

47 Ibid. "The UN and Colonial Questions", draft Colonial Office memorandum (n.d.).

48 Ibid. Comment by Falle, 22 July 1963.

49 Ibid. Dean to Home, 8 August 1963.

50 Emerson, "Colonialism, Political Development and the UN", 497.

51 Ibid., 496.

52 FO 371/166819, no. 8, Letter from Maudling to Home, 5 January 1962, cited in Hyam and Louis, *The Conservative Government and the End of Empire: Part II*, 322-3.

53 Ibid.

54 Darwin, *Britain and Decolonisation*, 252.

55 Alport, *The Sudden Assignment*, 95-97.

56 Macmillan, *At the End of the Day*, 280.

57 Ibid., 211.

58 Welensky, *4000 Days*, 211.

59 For a detailed account of events in the Congo see James, *Congo Crisis*.

60 Gibbs, "Dag Hammarskjold", 163.

61 Six months after the dissolution of the Federation Welensky published aired his criticisms of the United Nations publically. See Welensky, "United Nations and Colonialism", 145-52.

62 *The Daily Telegraph*, 14 September 1961.

63 *The Daily Telegraph*, 16 September 1961.

64 *The Times*, 14 September 1961.

65 *The Daily Mail*, 14 September 1961.

66 *Daily Express*, 15 September 1961.

67 WP 584/5, Welensky to Adams, 18 September 1961.

68 WP 584/4, Welensky to Acutt, 20 September 1961.

69 Katema Yifru et al., "Africa Speaks", 319.

70 WP 234/8, Report by Benoy regarding his visit to Cape Town and Pretoria, 6 February 1961.

71 Hughes, "The Central African Federation", 19-21.

72 For an appraisal of Indian policy at the United Nations during this period see Rana, "Indian Diplomacy", 48-73.

73 Moore, Jr., *The United Nations Reconsidered*, 4.

74 Ibid., 194-5.

75 Hovet, Jr., *Africa in the United Nations*, 4.

76 WP 677/8, Welensky to van der Byl, 10 January 1962.

77 BSB S.20/6 Vol. (1), Memorandum from the Permanent South African Mission to the United Nations to the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Pretoria, 7 March 1962. All file references are to the National Archives and Records Service of South Africa, Pretoria.

78 Ibid.

79 Ibid.

80 WP 647/4, Welensky to Millin, 3 May 1962.

81 RG 59, Office of Eastern and Southern African Affairs, COUNTRY FILES, 1951-65, Kenya biographic data to Rhodesia desegregation, Box 1. Report entitled "The Southern Rhodesian Question at the UN" by E.H. Kloman, Jr. and F. Taylor Ostrander of American Metal Climax Inc., 2 March 1962.

82 WP 647/4, Welensky to Millin, 13 May 1962.

83 Welensky, *4000 Days*, 340-2.

84 Murphy, "Intricate and Distasteful", 776.

85 ZAPU's role in the struggle against Federation has recently been addressed in Sibanda, *Zimbabwe African Peoples Union*.

86 RG 59, Presidential and Secretary of State Correspondence with Foreign Heads of State, 1953-64, Rusk's Correspondence with UK Officials, Vol. 4, Box 19. Douglas-Home to Rusk, 18 October 1962.

87 RG 59, Records of G. Mennen Williams, 1961-6, Entry 719.3 Signature and Clearance File, 1961-6, January to December 1962, Box 10. Mennen Williams to Secretary of State, 10 March 1962.

88 Ibid.

89 BSB S.20/6 vol. (1). Permanent South African

Mission to the United Nations to the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Pretoria, 29 March 1962.

90 Ibid.

91 Voting in favour were: Cambodia, Ethiopia, India, Mali, Poland, Syria, Tanganyika, Tunisia, the USSR, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia. Opposing were: Australia, Italy, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Madagascar was absent.

92 RG 59, Office of Eastern and Southern African Affairs, COUNTRY FILES, 1951-65, Kenya biographic data to Rhodesia deseg-regation, Box 1. Report entitled "The Northern Rhodesian Question at the UN" by E.H. Kloman, Jr. of American Metal Climax Inc., 28 May 1962.

93 Ibid.

94 WP 647/4, Welensky to Millin, 27 June 1962.

95 For the importance of the Copperbelt to the Federal government in this period see Butler, "Business and Decolonisation", 459-84; and Cohen, "Business and Decoloni-sation Reconsidered", 641-58.

96 WP 647/4, Welensky to Millin, 27 June 1962.

97 Welensky, *4000 Days*, 340-2.

98 Wood, *So Far and No Further!,* 109-10.

99 Ibid.

100 Ibid.

101 Ibid.

102 Welensky, *4000 Days*, 340-2.

103 Wood, *So Far and No Further!,* 118

104 Ibid.

105 Petersen, "Business of the United Nations", 824.

106 Hovet, Jr., *Africa in the United Nations*, 216.

107 Petersen, "The Business of the United Nations", 830.

108 FO 371/152112, no.1, Letter from Beeley to Ramsbottom, 13 January 1960, cited in Hyam and Louis, *The Conservative Government and the End of Empire:* Part II, 244-5.

109 CAB 129/100, C (60) 35, "Future Policy Study, 1960-1970": Cabinet memorandum, report of officials' committee (chairman, Sir N. Brook), 24 February 1960, cited in Hyam and Louis, *The Conservative Government and the End of Empire:* Part II, 91.

110 CO 936/678, no. 40, CO circular letter from Sir H Poynton to various governors, 29 Sep-tember 1960, cited in Hyam and Louis, *The Conservative Government and the End of Empire:* Part II, 307-10.

111 Ibid.

112 For Cohen's views on Africa and the UN see his article: "The New Africa and the United Nations", 476-88.

113 CO 936/678, no. 40, CO circular letter from Sir H Poynton to various governors, 29 Sep-tember 1960 cited in Ibid., 307-10.

114 Ibid.

115 FO 371/154892, no.286, Letter from Lord Home to Dean Rusk, 29 November 1961, cited in Hyam and Louis, *The Conservative Government and the End of Empire:* Part II, 295.

116 CO 936/680, no 251, CO memorandum by Sir J Martin to Mr Macleod, 1 June 1961, cited in Hyam and Louis, *The Conservative Government and the End of Empire:* Part II, 312.

117 Ibid.

118 FO 371/166819, no. 1 "Colonial questions at the United Nations": memorandum by Sir Hugh Foot, 27 December 1961, cited in Hyam and Louis, *The Conservative Government and the End of Empire:* Part II, 319-32.

119 FO 371/166819, no. 1 "Colonial questions at the United Nations": memorandum by Sir Hugh Foot, 27 December 1961, cited in Hyam and Louis, *The Conservative Government and the End of Empire:* Part II, 319-32.

120 Thompson, *Ghana's Foreign Policy*, 197.

121 NA FO 371/172584, Dean to Foreign Office, 9 September 1963 (first telegram).

122 Ibid. Dean to Foreign Office, 9 September 1963 (second telegram).

123 Ibid. Dean to Foreign Office, 14 October 1963.

124 Andrew DeRoche has suggested that from the beginning of 1962 Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland held little interest for American policymakers as it was clear that the territories would soon be independent. See DeRoche, *Black, White & Chrome*, 63.

125 RG 59, Presidential and Secretary of State Correspondence with Foreign Heads of State, 1953-64, Macmillan to Eisenhower Correspondence 1960-1, Vol. (5), Box 3. Macmillan to Eisenhower, 9 December 1960.

126 RG 59, Presidential and Secretary of State Correspondence with Foreign Heads of State, 1953-64, Macmillan to Eisenhower Correspondence 1960-1, Vol. (5), Box 3. Eisenhower to Macmillan, 12 December 1960.

127 RG 59, Presidential and Secretary of State

Correspondence with Foreign Heads of State, 1953-64, Macmillan to Eisenhower Correspondence 1960-1, Vol. (5), Box 3. Macmillan to Eisenhower, 10 December 1960.

128 RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Records of G. Mennen Williams, 1961-6, Entry 719.3 Signature and Clearance File, 1961-6, January – December 1961 (Box 9), Williams to Rusk, 1 May 1961.

129 RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Records of G. Mennen Williams, 1961-6, Trips file, 1961-6, January – October 1961, Telegram (458) from Department of State, Washington to American Consulate, Salisbury, 26 May 1961.

130 Ibid.

131 RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Records of G. Mennen Williams, 1961-6, Entry 719.3 signature and clearance file, 1961-6, January – December, 1962 (Box 10), Report from Mennen Williams to Matthews and Martin, 12 October 1962.

132 Ibid.

133 Ibid.

134 Ibid.

135 The conclusion held by the State Department that Whitehead was more liberal than Welensky is somewhat surprising given that it was Whitehead who Introduced the Emergency Powers Bill which, amongst other measures permitted arbitrary arrest and detention in the public interest; the Vagrancy Bill, which enabled the arrest of anyone who could not prove they were living by "honest means" and the controversial Law and Order Maintenance Bill, which even Welensky opposed due to its draconian minimum sentences for minor offences. See Wood, *So Far and No Further!,* 58.

136 RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Bureau of African Affairs, Office of Eastern and Southern African Affairs, COUNTRY FILES, 1951-65, Rhodesia, educational and culture to South Africa, Social, education (Box 2), Research Memorandum from Hilman to Rusk, 29 October 1962.

137 Ibid.

138 Darwin, *Britain and Decolonisation*, 332-3.

139 Hanzawa, "An Invisible Surrender", 270.