The whites of Rhodesia declared themselves independent from Britain in large degree to be able to maintain control over the country's 4 million Africans. Britain has stated that they will not get away with this illegal act and has placed economic sanctions on Rhodesia. Britain has stated that she hopes to undermine Rhodesian Prime Minister Smith's support to the point that the country will demand a change. The Governor, Sir Humphrey Gibbs could then rule until general elections on the basis of the 1961 Constitution could be held. A moderate white government could then take over that would move the country slowly but surely toward majority rule. As the weeks pass, this solution seems more and more unrealistic.

Observers are beginning to see that even if there were enough moderate whites to control the mechanics of government, they would not have the needed support from the white or the black populations to be able to run the country. Lawrence Fellows, N.Y. Times reporter, interviewed a number of whites in the Rhodesian town of Banket. Their attitudes differ: The more realistic ones are quite willing to admit that it will be impossible for Rhodesia to remain in the white man's control. The numbers are obviously against this. However, it will be 10 or 15 years before the black man will be able to rule responsibly. Those who show genuine feeling for the Africans are however, extremely paternalistic. They talk about all they have done for the "boys"; how loyal their "boys" are to them.

On the blatantly negative side are those who desperately fear a black government and who feel it is worthless to even try to teach the Africans because they cannot learn. Somewhere in the middle are those well meaning, hard working whites who unfortunately are blind to the way in which their attitudes dehumanize the Africans. One woman is actually quoted as saying, "...I've just saved its life... from malnutrition...if we could only train it into something,...so it could earn money."

These are the people who don't see why the Africans keep demanding things they won't work for. They do not understand why the Africans do not work with the same energy with which they work. Their attitude is "why don't the blacks help themselves?" They have not been able to see the meaninglessness of striving for advancement in a nation which is so governed that an African cannot expect to reap the benefits of his labor as a free man. He cannot participate as a whole person, taking on social and political responsibility. It is the old story of domination. The privileged refuse to give up their superior position until the oppressed act like the privileged in terms of values, manners, and life ambitions. Yet, as oppressed, this is an impossibility; and of course a questionable thing to strive for anyway. The black Rhodesians can hardly be expected to want to be like the white man, even though they may wish to learn a great deal from the white man. Thus, it is clear that white men, with these attitudes, are not really ready to move with a moderate government towards
majority rule.

At least a good deal of British opinion supports this attitude. The Economist has expressed itself: "...Mr. Wilson should give no credence to the belief that blood is either necessary or inevitable in Rhodesia. Those who want force in Rhodesia have no idea what they would do with the country if it fell into their hands. For no British government could hand over to the black Rhodesian politicians without a very long time spent in African political education. For most of that time the only difference from today would be that Messrs Nkomo and Sithole would be in British-run jails if they insist on one-man, one-vote tomorrow, not Mr. Smith's jails."

What the Economist and the whites fail to deal with are African attitudes. And, articulate African leaders are in no way prepared to live under a white government, if Smith is defeated. For the Rhodesian African, the end of U.D.I. is a black government. To oppose U.D.I. is to fight for African rule. Rhodesia has never really been ruled from Britain and the Africans are not prepared to accept British rule now. Neither is a moderate white Rhodesian government a possibility.

Most reporting on the Rhodesian Africans has stressed their divisions, their lack of preparation to rule. Yet their aspirations towards the control of their own nation are certainly more realistic than the white Rhodesian's belief that he can go on treating the black as "boy" and reaping the benefits of his labor.
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