Declaration on Independence for Colonial Countries and Peoples

Security Council to examine the situation in the Territory as soon as possible.

Report of Special Committee of 24

Various recommendations and conclusions on the situation in the Trust Territory were contained in the 1964 and 1965 reports of the General Assembly's 24-member Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.
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Chapter II

The Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

During 1965, the General Assembly's 24-member Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples continued to discharge its mandate as set forth by the Assembly on 10 December 1963. The Special Committee held 74 plenary meetings between 6 April and 10 November 1965 (including 35 in Africa), during the course of which it examined and made recommendations on the implementation of the Declaration with respect to 15 territories.

1 See Y.U.N., 1960, pp. 49-50, text of resolution 1514(XV).

2 See Y.U.N., 1963, pp. 446-47, text of resolution 1956(XVIII); pp. 441-42, text of resolution 1970(XVIII); and also pp. 466-67, text of resolution 1899(XVIII).
In the pages that follow, an account is given of the Special Committee's work in general during 1965. Following that, details are given of its consideration of, and recommendations on, individual territories.

Details of the action taken in 1965 by the General Assembly, the Special Committee of Twenty-four and other bodies on matters concerning Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and territories under Portuguese Administration will be found elsewhere in this volume of the Yearbook (see pp. 117-34, 594-605 and 605-16).

**General Aspects**

**SYSTEM OF EXAMINATION**

During 1965, the General Assembly's 24-member Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples continued to use the methods of work developed in preceding years and endorsed by the General Assembly.

Under this procedure, it examined the implementation of the Declaration in individual territories, the order of priority being decided on the basis of recommendations made by its Working Group (composed of the officers of the Committee and four other members).

To assist in its examination of conditions in each territory, the Special Committee normally has before it an information paper prepared by the Secretariat describing recent political and constitutional developments as well as current economic, social and educational conditions. This information is derived from published sources and, in relevant cases, from the information transmitted by administering powers under Article 73e of the United Nations Charter. (For text of Article 73e, see APPENDIX II.)

In addition, the Special Committee requests the administering powers to submit information on political and constitutional developments in the territories they administer. The Committee hears statements from the administering powers, inviting those which are not members of the Committee to participate in its examination of the territories they administer. Petitions are circulated and the Special Committee may decide to hear petitioners at its meetings. (Reservations concerning these proceedings have been expressed by Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States.) At the conclusion of its examination of the situation in the particular territory concerned, the Special Committee adopts its recommendations in the form of a consensus formulated by its Chairman or by means of a resolution which is adopted by vote. The Special Committee is empowered by the General Assembly to send out visiting groups to territories in co-operation with administering powers. (This procedure has also been the subject of reservations expressed in the Special Committee by Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States.) The Committee establishes sub-committees whenever it considers them necessary.

Each year, the Special Committee adopts a report to the General Assembly which includes separate chapters on the situation in each territory or group of territories which it has considered. It is on the basis of this report that the Assembly considers the implementation of the Declaration in general and with respect to individual territories.

**SCOPE OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE'S WORK IN 1965**

In 1965, the Special Committee considered the situation in the following territories: Southern Rhodesia, Aden, the territories under Portuguese administration, South West Africa, Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland, the Cook Islands and British Guiana. It also heard a petitioner concerning the Bahamas, but it did not consider conditions in that territory. Because of lack of time, the Special Committee was not able to consider the situation in the other territories on its preliminary list. However, in its 1965 report, the Special Committee included additional information on these territories which was to be regarded as supplementary to that contained in the relevant chapters of its 1964 report.

On 27 May 1965, the Special Committee, upon the request of Somalia, decided to include French Somaliland in its list of territories to
which the Declaration applied. The Special Committee was not able to complete this list as requested by the Assembly in 1965 and was to consider the question further during 1966.

It will be recalled that, in 1963, the General Assembly entrusted the Special Committee with the question of examining information on non-self-governing territories transmitted under Article 73e of the Charter. On 13 September 1965, the Special Committee took note of the report of the Secretary-General on this question. As in previous years, the Secretariat continued to take this information into account, in relevant cases, in preparing the working papers on individual territories which the Special Committee, after approving, incorporated in its report to the General Assembly.

The Special Committee continued its Sub-Committee on Petitions which, in 1965, considered a total of 197 communications, including 36 requests for hearings. As a result, the following 50 petitioners appeared before the Special Committee, on the recommendation of the Sub-Committee.

Aden
Quhtan Shaabi and Saif Dhalee, National Front for the Liberation of the Occupied South of Yemen.

Bahamas

Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland
I. B. Tabata, All-African Convention (AAC) and Unity Movement of South Africa
A. B. Ngcobo and Z. B. Molete, Pan-Africanist Congress of South Africa (PAC)

Basutoland
Bishop Mpeta and L. A. Matooane, Basutoland Congress Party (BCP)

Swaziland
J. J. Nquku, Swaziland Progressive Party (SPP)

British Guiana
Felix A. Cummings, People's Progressive Party (PPP)

Territories under Portuguese Administration
Angola
Lufuino M. Muliaita and S. K. Njolomba on behalf of the Angolan refugees in Zambia
Adao Jose Domingos Kapilango, Uniao das Populagoes de Angola (UFA)
Anibal de Melo, Movimento Popular de Libertacao de Angola (MPLA)

Marcos Kassanga, Conseil du Peuple Angolais (CPA)

Mozambique
Zarica J. Sakupwanya [Comite Preparatorio do Congresso Constitucional, do-] Comite Revolucionario de Mozambique (COREMO)
Eduardo C. Mondlane, Lazaro Kavandame, Mateus Muthemba, Uria Simango, Frente de Libertacao de Mozambique (FRELIMO)

Portuguese Guinea
Amilcar Cabral, Partido Africano da Independencia da Guine e Caba Verde (PAIGC)

South West Africa
Sam Nujoma, Albert Muyongo, Jacob Kuhangua, Andreas Shipanga, Emil Appolus, South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)
Vuzumuzi Make, Elias Ntloedibe (accompanied by L. Masimini), Pan-Africanist Congress of South Africa (PAC)

Gottfriedt Jario, Godfrey Gaoseb, South West Africa National Union (SWANU)

J. D. Nyaose (accompanied by Moses Smith), Federation of Free African Trade Unions of South Africa (FOFATUSA)
Alfred Ngokong (accompanied by James Hadebe and Mindu Msimang), African National Congress of South Africa (ANC)

Mburumba Kerina, National Unity Democratic Organization (NUDO)

Southern Rhodesia
Nathan Shamuyarira and James Mutambiri
G. B. Nyandoro, Zimbabwe African Peoples' Union (ZAPU)
Noel G. Mukono and J. W. Matuure, Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU)
Francis Nehwati, Zimbabwe African Congress of Trade Unions (ZACU) or (ZACTU)

The Special Committee was again assisted in its work by its Sub-Committee on Southern Rhodesia, its Sub-Committee on Aden and its Sub-Committee of Good Offices on British Guiana. In taking action on the reports of these Sub-Committees, the Special Committee authorized each to continue its work and report to the Special Committee as necessary.

As requested by the General Assembly on 18 February 1965, the United Nations Representative for the Supervision of Elections in the Cook Islands reported to the Special Committee, as well as the Assembly, and on 30 August 1965, the Special Committee adopted a resolution taking note of his report. (For details, see pp. 570-74.)

The Special Committee also considered a report by the Secretary-General on the ways and means of ensuring the economic independence of Basutoland, Bechuanaland, and Swaziland, submitted in compliance with a request made by the Special Committee on 2 November 1964, and adopted a resolution thereon on 20 September 1965. (For details of resolution, see below, pp. 566-67.)

The Special Committee, in addition, considered a report on the activities of foreign economic and other interests impeding the implementation of the Declaration (on the Granting of Independence) in territories under Portuguese administration, which it had requested on 3 July 1964. (For details, see pp. 605-16.)

On 22 April 1965, the Special Committee requested a similar study on the implications of activities of foreign economic and other interests in Southern Rhodesia and their mode of operation, in order to assess their economic and political influence. (For details, see pp. 117-34.)

In its relations with other United Nations bodies in 1965, the Special Committee, in accordance with a General Assembly decision of 11 December 1963, drew the attention of the Security Council to what it described as the "grave situation" prevailing in both Southern Rhodesia (see pp. 118-19) and Aden, to the "continued deterioration of the situation in the territories under Portuguese domination," to the "serious situation prevailing in South West Africa," and to "the threat to territorial integrity" of Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland "posed by the expansionist policy" of the Government of South Africa. (For details, see pp. 118-19, 556-57, 605-6, 595-97, and 563-64.)

On 21 December 1965, Cambodia having resigned from the Special Committee, Afghanistan was appointed by the President of the Assembly to fill the vacancy which had occurred. (See also pp. 189-90.)

A feature of the Special Committee's activities during 1965 was the series of meetings it held in Ethiopia, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia. The Committee met in Lusaka (Zambia) from 25 to 28 May; in Dar es Salaam (United Republic of Tanzania) from 31 May to 10 June; and in Addis Ababa (Ethiopia) from 14 to 18 June. In the course of these meetings, the Committee heard 23 groups of petitioners and adopted resolutions on: Southern Rhodesia; the territories under Portuguese administration; South West Africa; and Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland.

On 18 June 1965, while in Addis Ababa, the Special Committee drew the attention of the General Assembly and the Security Council to the explosive situation existing in the southern region of Africa owing to "the intolerable behaviour of the Governments of Portugal and South Africa and the minority settler regime of Southern Rhodesia." It recommended that both bodies, each acting within its own competence, should take positive measures laid down in the United Nations Charter with a view to: (a) ensuring respect for the rights of the African populations in the region and in particular their rights to self-determination and independence, and putting an end to the dangerous activities of the Governments and regime cited; and (b) strengthening the confidence which the peoples under colonial domination placed in the United Nations. The text of this resolution was transmitted to the President of the Security Council on 21 July 1965.

In its report for 1965, the Special Committee welcomed The Gambia's attainment of independence on 18 February 1965. In reviewing the situation in the territories to which it had given considerable attention in 1964, the Committee stated that it was deeply concerned by the further deterioration in the already grave situation in these territories and by the increasingly serious threats to international peace and security which had therefore developed. The Special Committee once again emphasized that it regarded the sending out of visiting groups as one of the most effective means of discharging its mandate and recommended that the General Assembly should call upon the administering powers to extend their full co-operation to this end by permitting access, as desired by the Special Committee, to territories under their administration.

It placed special emphasis on a recommendation to the General Assembly that it make financial provision to cover the expenses of the activities of the Special Committee in 1966, 

including the possibility of another series of
meetings which it might hold in Africa, the
sending out of visiting groups, and the super-
vision of elections and other forms of consulta-
tion of the wishes of colonial peoples.

CONSIDERATION BY
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

General aspects of the question of the im-
plementation of the Declaration on the Grant-
ing of Independence to Colonial Countries and
Peoples were considered by the General
Assembly at plenary meetings held between
30 November and 20 December 1965.

The General Assembly had before it the
report of the Special Committee covering its
work in 1965, as well as that for 1964, which
the Assembly had not been able to consider
at its nineteenth session. Chapters of the Special
Committee's reports dealing with the situations
in specific territories were referred to the Fourth
Committee.

Many of the delegations taking part in the
debate on general aspects of the question pointed
out that, although five years had elapsed since
the adoption by the Assembly of the Declara-
tion on the Granting of Independence to
Colonial Countries and Peoples, more than 50
territories, having a combined population of
over 40 million, were still under colonial regimes.
Many representatives, including those of Ghana
and Poland, felt that the process of decoloniza-
tion had been dangerously impeded, especially
in southern Africa and South Arabia. The
intransigence of certain colonial powers and
dominant minorities in these territories, it was
argued, constituted a permanent threat to inter-
national peace and security. This threat, it
was contended by Albania, Bulgaria, the Congo
(Brazzaville), Cuba, Guinea, the USSR, the
United Arab Republic and the United Republic
of Tanzania, among others, was especially
marked in colonial territories where military
bases had been situated and directed against
national liberation movements.

In this connexion, the United Kingdom stated
that these bases were needed to carry out peace-
keeping obligations and to meet treaty com-
mittments.

The majority of those speaking felt that the
United Nations should modify its tactics to
deal more firmly with the administering powers.
The United Nations, according to a statement
of the Chairman of the Special Committee,
should be, if not the spearhead in the battle
against colonialism and apartheid, at least a
protector of oppressed peoples. The Special
Committee should be in a position to enter
into direct contact with populations under
colonial domination and to learn in the most
objective ways their views and date of accession
to independence. In this connexion, it was re-
commended that the General Assembly and
Security Council adopt suitable measures to
guarantee sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Most representatives, including those of Iraq,
Italy, the Philippines and Tunisia, considered
that, while concentrating on the major colonial
territories, the Special Committee should con-
tinue to study the problems posed by small
or sparsely populated territories.

The representatives of Mali and Yugoslavia
were among those who favoured sending United
Nations visiting missions to the territories con-
cerned with the purpose of accelerating the
implementation of measures aimed at transfer-
ing power to the representatives of the people
and guaranteeing their independence.

Singapore and Pakistan suggested that 1970
—the tenth anniversary of the Declaration and
twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations
—be set as a target date by which all colonial
countries should be free from all forms and
manifestations of colonialism.

The United Arab Republic said that it had
been the intention of the drafters of the
Assembly's resolution of 27 November 1961
which established the Special Committee, to
make this Committee an action body and not
a debating society. Tunisia maintained that
four years of the Special Committee's work
showed that it was being hindered by lack of
co-operation on the part of the administering
powers. Senegal considered that, with regard
to the Special Committee, a little new blood
would do no harm and could be beneficial.

On 17 December 1965, a draft resolution
was proposed by 23 Members whereby the

\textsuperscript{5} See Y.U.N., 1960, pp. 49-50, text of resolution
1514(XV).

\textsuperscript{6} See Y.U.N., 1961, p. 56, for text of resolution
1654(XVI).
Assembly would, among other things: (1) deeply regret the refusal of certain colonial powers to co-operate with the Special Committee and their continued disregard of the Assembly's resolutions; (2) call upon the colonial powers to discontinue their policy of violating the rights of colonial peoples through the systematic influx of foreign immigrants and the dislocation, deportation and transfer of indigenous inhabitants; (3) request the Special Committee to continue to perform its task; (4) approve the Special Committee's work programme envisaged for 1966, including the possibility of holding a series of meetings in Africa, and sending out visiting groups to territories; (5) ask the Special Committee to pay particular attention to the situation in small territories and to recommend the most appropriate ways to enable their peoples to exercise fully their right to self-determination and independence; (6) ask the Special Committee, whenever it considered it appropriate, to recommend a deadline for the accession of each territory to independence; (7) recognize the legitimacy of the colonial peoples' struggle to exercise their right to self-determination and independence; (8) ask the Special Committee to apprise the Security Council of developments in any territory examined by it which might threaten international peace and security, and make suggestions which might assist the Council in considering appropriate measures under the Charter; and (11) request the Secretary-General to take all necessary measures to promote the large-scale dissemination of the Declaration so that world opinion might be sufficiently informed about the serious threat to peace posed by colonialism and apartheid, and call upon the administering powers to co-operate with him.

The 23 powers sponsoring the proposal to this effect were: Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Ceylon, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India. Iraq, the Ivory Coast, Kenya, Mali, Mauritania, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Tunisia, Uganda, the United Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen and Yugoslavia.

When the 23-power draft resolution was circulated, the United States representative submitted a motion whereby the Assembly would consider the draft resolution as one making recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security and hence that Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter would apply to it (so that a two-thirds majority vote in favour would be required for the Assembly to adopt the 23-power text). The United States representative referred specifically in this connexion to three paragraphs in the 23-power text, namely: (a) a preambular paragraph whereby the Assembly would state its awareness that the continuation of colonial rule and the practice of apartheid, as well as all forms of racial discrimination, threatened international peace and security and constituted a crime against humanity; (b) the operative paragraph asking the colonial powers to dismantle the military bases installed in colonial territories and to refrain from establishing new ones; and (c) the operative paragraph requesting the Special Committee to apprise the Security Council of developments in any territory examined by it which might threaten international peace and security, and to make suggestions which might assist the Council in considering appropriate measures under the Charter.

The representative of Mali pointed out that when introducing the draft resolution, on 17 December 1965, he had formally requested that it be adopted by a simple majority. He felt that, in conformity with the established practice and with the rules of procedure, the Assembly ought first to take a decision on his motion.

The representative of the United States said that the question was essentially the same, no matter what procedure was followed. One could not, he declared, go to the Security Council, on
the one hand, and say that action was called for because international peace and security was threatened, and, on the other hand, say that Article 18 of the Charter did not apply to the Assembly's consideration of the question. Fidelity to the Charter required adherence to it.

In the debate which ensued on the procedural issue, the representative of the USSR said that an attempt was being made to undermine the purposes of the draft resolution in the expectation that it would not obtain a two-thirds majority vote; this erroneous interpretation of the rules of procedure should not prevent the Assembly from expressing its will. He pointed out that the judgement evoked in the draft was general in nature, that it imposed no concrete course of action and was addressed to no concrete, specific case. It therefore could not be construed as a recommendation which the Assembly would adopt in discharging its duties under the Charter in matters relating to international peace and security.

Among those who supported this view, the representative of Guinea pointed out that a similar resolution, concerning Southern Rhodesia, had already been adopted by the Assembly without any request having been made for a two-thirds majority. He also contended that the draft resolution did not make any "recommendations" concerning the maintenance of international peace and security; its provisions were "findings" only.

Iran considered that the operative paragraph in question dealing with the dismantling of military bases went beyond colonial questions and involved those which might have implications with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security. Honduras, while supporting the self-determination of peoples in all the various resolutions on human rights and those tending to eliminate colonialism, considered that the 23-power draft resolution involved the introduction of politics and policies far from the noble purposes of anti-colonialism; Honduras asked whether the dismantling of bases was not a question of disarmament, an act of peace-keeping.

The procedural motion submitted by Mali was then put to the vote, the United States having agreed that it would not ask for priority in voting on its motion and noting that it would have supported a proposal by Spain for a separate vote on the paragraphs of the 23-power text in question. The motion was adopted by a roll-call vote of 59 to 45, with 4 abstentions. The Assembly did not vote on the motion of the United States.

It proceeded at the same meeting, on 20 December 1965, to vote on the text of the draft resolution.

Several representatives stated that, whereas in the past they had been able to support the Declaration on the Granting of Independence, the establishment of the Special Committee and earlier resolutions concerning the implementation of the Declaration, they were unable to support the 23-power text since certain aspects of it were not acceptable. Norway, for example, considered, among other things, that it was the prerogative of the Security Council to determine the existence of a threat to the peace or the application of economic sanctions against certain countries, and abstained. New Zealand protested against the failure to take account of differences between various types of colonial situations and voted against the draft resolution.

The preambular paragraph describing colonial rule and apartheid as a threat to international peace and security was adopted by 63

Voting details were as follows:
In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, India, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.
Against: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela.
Abstaining: Haiti, Madagascar, Malaysia, Trinidad and Tobago.
votes to 16, with 22 abstentions. The operative paragraph calling for dismantling of military bases in colonial territories was adopted by 49 votes to 37, with 18 abstentions. The operative paragraph asking the Special Committee to apprise the Security Council of developments threatening international peace and security was adopted by 66 votes to 15, with 24 abstentions.

The 23-power text as a whole was then adopted by a roll-call vote of 74 to 6, with 27 abstentions, as resolution 2105 (XX). (For full text of resolution, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)
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RESOLUTION 2105 (XX), as proposed by 23 powers, A/L.476/Rev.l and Rev.l/Add.1, adopted by Assembly on 20 December 1965, meeting 1405, by roll-call vote of 74 to 6, with 27 abstentions as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Democratic Republic of the Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Australia, New Zealand, Portugal, South Africa, United Kingdom, United States.
Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, France, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Spain, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago.

"The General Assembly,
"Recalling the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in its resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960, and its resolutions 1654(XVI) of 27 November 1961, 1810(XVII) of 17 December 1962 and 1956(XVIII) of 11 December 1963,
"Having considered the reports prepared by the Special Committee for the years 1964 and 1965,
"Noting with deep regret that five years after the adoption of the Declaration many Territories are still under colonial domination,
"Deploring the negative attitude of certain colonial Powers, and in particular the unacceptable attitude of the Governments of Portugal and South Africa, which refuse to recognize the right of colonial peoples to independence,

"Concerned about the policy of colonial Powers to circumvent the rights of colonial peoples through the promotion of the systematic influx of foreign immigrants and the dislocation, deportation and transfer of the indigenous inhabitants,

"Noting the action taken and envisaged by the Special Committee regarding the list of Territories to which the Declaration is applicable,

"Deploring further the attitude of certain States which, despite the resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Special Committee, continue to co-operate with the Governments of Portugal and South Africa and even to provide them with aid which is being used by two Governments to intensify the repression of the oppressed African populations,

"Fully aware that the continuation of colonial rule and the practice of apartheid as well as all forms of racial discrimination threaten international peace and security and constitute a crime against humanity,

"Having adopted resolutions on specific Territories considered by the Special Committee,

"Reaffirms its resolutions 1514(XV), 1654 (XVI), 1810(XVII) and 1956(XVIII);

"Notes with appreciation the work accomplished by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and congratulates it on the efforts it has made to implement the Declaration;

"Approves the reports of the Special Committee and again invites the administering Powers to implement the recommendations contained therein;

"Deeply regrets the refusal of certain colonial Powers to co-operate with the Special Committee and their continued disregard of the resolutions of the General Assembly;

"Calls upon the colonial Powers to discontinue their policy of violating the rights of colonial peoples through the systematic influx of foreign immigrants and the dislocation, deportation and transfer of the indigenous inhabitants;

"Requests the Special Committee to continue to perform its task and to continue to seek the best means for the immediate and full application of resolution 1514(XV) to all Territories which have not yet attained independence;

"Approves the programme of work envisaged by the Special Committee during 1966, including the possibility of holding a series of meetings in Africa and the sending of visitings groups to Territories,

QUESTIONS CONCERNING

The following pages give a brief account of decisions concerning various individual territories taken in 1965 by: the General Assembly, particularly in the Atlantic, Indian and Pacific Ocean areas;

"Requests the Special Committee to pay particular attention to the small Territories and to recommend to the General Assembly the most appropriate ways, as well as the steps to be taken, to enable the populations of those Territories to exercise fully their right to self-determination and independence;

"Requests the Special Committee, whenever it considers it appropriate, to recommend a deadline for the accession to independence of each Territory in accordance with the wishes of the people;

"Recognizes the legitimacy of the struggle by the peoples under colonial rule to exercise their right to self-determination and independence and invites all States to provide material and moral assistance to the national liberation movements in colonial Territories;

"Requests all States and international institutions, including the specialized agencies of the United Nations, to withhold assistance of any kind to the Governments of Portugal and South Africa until they renounce their policy of colonial domination and racial discrimination;

"Requests the colonial Powers to dismantle the military bases installed in colonial Territories and to refrain from establishing new ones;

"Requests the Special Committee to apprise the Security Council of developments in any Territory examined by it which may threaten international peace and security and to make suggestions which might assist the Council in considering appropriate measures under the Charter of the United Nations;

"Requests the Secretary-General to take all necessary measures to promote the large-scale dissemination of the Declaration and of the work of the Special Committee, in order that world opinion may be sufficiently informed of the serious threat to peace posed by colonialism and apartheid, and calls upon all administering Powers to co-operate with the Secretary-General in his efforts;

"Requests the Secretary-General to continue to provide the Special Committee with all the facilities and personnel necessary for the implementation of its mandate."

WITHDRAWAL OF CAMBODIA

OTHER DOCUMENTS
A/C.4/640; A/C.4/664. Statements by Chairman of Fourth Committee on 28 September 1965, meeting 1517, and 20 December 1965, meeting 1594.

INDIVIDUAL TERRITORIES

bly's Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colo-
Aden

The territory of Aden, which is administered by the United Kingdom, consists of the Colony of Aden, known as Aden State, and 20 Protectorates, known as the Protectorate of South Arabia. Sixteen of the Protectorate States are joined with Aden State in the Federation of South Arabia. Also included in the territory are Perim Island, the Kuria Muria Islands and Kamaran Island.

The situation in Aden, it will be recalled, was considered in 1963 by the General Assembly’s 24-member Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, following which—on 11 December 1963—the General Assembly adopted a resolution calling upon the United Kingdom to take a series of steps to enable the people of the territory to exercise their right of self-determination.

By this resolution, it will be remembered, the General Assembly, among other things, called upon the United Kingdom Government to convene immediately a conference of representatives of all sectors of public opinion to decide on general elections which would be followed by the establishment of a representative government for the whole of the territory and for the granting of immediate independence. The Assembly also: requested the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Special Committee of Twenty-Four and the administering power, to arrange for an effective United Nations presence before and during these elections; reaffirmed that the maintenance of the military base in Aden was prejudicial to peace and security in the region; and stated that its early removal was therefore desirable.9

In 1964, the Special Committee again considered the situation in Aden and made further recommendations concerning the territory. The Assembly was, however, unable to consider the question at its nineteenth session, owing to the special circumstances then prevailing.10 In 1965, the matter was considered by both the Special Committee and the General Assembly.

CONSIDERATION BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The Special Committee considered the question in April and May 1965, on the basis of a report submitted by its Sub-Committee on Aden. (The Sub-Committee was composed of the representatives of Cambodia, Iraq, the Ivory Coast, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.)

In reviewing recent developments in the territory, the Sub-Committee drew attention to: the decision by the United Kingdom to retain its military base in Aden in agreement with the Federal Government; the postponement of the constitutional conference that was to have been held in London in March 1965; and the continuation by the United Kingdom of the state of emergency and military operations in the territory. The Sub-Committee deplored the fact that the United Nations resolutions were still not being implemented by the administering power. It noted that there had been signs of a slight change in the attitude of the administering power, such as its support of the concept of a unitary state for the area and its apparent willingness to widen representation at the constitutional conference. It remained fully convinced that the solution of the question could best be found through the immediate and full implementation of the United Nations resolutions. The Sub-Committee felt that the situation continued to be extremely serious and demanded the urgent attention of the Special Committee.

On 17 May 1965, by 19 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions, the Special Committee adopted a resolution whereby it endorsed the Sub-Committee’s conclusions and called upon the United Kingdom Government to implement the General Assembly’s resolution of 11 December 1963

on the situation in Aden. It also drew the attention of the Security Council to the grave situation prevailing in the territory and requested the Sub-Committee on Aden to keep the question under constant review and to report to the Committee as necessary.

The resolution was sponsored in the Special Committee by Cambodia, Ethiopia, India, Iran, Iraq, Mali, Sierra Leone, Syria, Tunisia, the United Republic of Tanzania, and Yugoslavia.

Among others who supported it was the USSR, which maintained that, although the United Kingdom Government had made vague promises about independence for the peoples of Aden and about their right of self-determination, it had not said a word about the powers to be exercised by the future unitary state. Aden had become an important link in the chain of United Kingdom military bases and the United Kingdom policy of delaying independence was prompted by economic and military considerations.

Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States opposed the resolution. The representative of the United Kingdom reiterated his Government's intention of granting independence to South Arabia, as a unitary state, not later than 1968. He recalled that a constitutional conference had been planned for March 1965 but that it had to be postponed because there was not yet a sufficient consensus in South Arabia about the form of government desired by the people of the territory. There was a wide measure of agreement about the objectives and long-term constitutional aims but not about the practical problems involved. The administering power intended to continue with its plans by sending out a constitutional commission on Aden's constitutional problems and it wished to give South Arabia independence in peace and with order.

The state of emergency and the restriction laws, added the representative of the United Kingdom, had been made necessary by the situation on the borders of the Federation, by incitement to violence from neighbouring countries and by acts of violence within the Federation. The restrictions were under constant review and would not be unnecessarily maintained. With regard to the military base, he said his Government's policy was that it would retain the base in Aden, in agreement with the Government of the Federation of South Arabia, for as long as it was required to serve the common interests of the two Governments. The United Kingdom Government intended that the eventual arrangements for the base should be negotiated between itself and the Government of the new State at the time when South Arabia became independent.

Denmark and Italy said they would abstain in the vote as the resolution did not, among other things, reflect the progressive developments in the territory.

In the course of meetings which it held in June in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, the Special Committee heard statements from Qahtan Shaabi and Saif Dhalee, speaking for the National Front for the Liberation of Occupied South Yemen.

The Special Committee gave further consideration to the question of Aden in September 1965, in the context of a further report submitted by its Sub-Committee on Aden. In its review of recent developments in the territory, the Sub-Committee drew attention to: the decisions of the Aden Legislative Council in May calling on the United Kingdom Government to base its policy on the United Nations resolutions on the territory; the withdrawal in July of the Sudanese member of the South Arabian constitutional commission established by the United Kingdom; and the failure of talks held in London during August to prepare an agenda for a constitutional conference.

The Sub-Committee concluded that the situation in Aden was still serious and should be closely followed, so that it could, if necessary, be brought to the attention of the Security Council. It felt that the failure of both the proposed constitutional commission and the London talks held in August could be attributed to the refusal by the United Kingdom to accept the provisions of the General Assembly's resolution of 11 December 1963 on the question of Aden which, it pointed out, not only set out principles but also outlined the methods whereby self-determination and independence might be achieved. It emphasized the pressing need for the United Kingdom to take practical steps, without delay, to implement this resolu-
tion while the present widespread support for the resolution remained. The Sub-Committee also reiterated the provisions of this resolution with regard to the military base on Aden. This resolution had stated that the base was prejudicial to peace and security in the region and that its early removal was desirable.

The Special Committee decided, without objection, to take note of the Sub-Committee’s report, endorse the conclusions in that report and transmit it to the General Assembly. Before this decision was taken, the representatives of Iraq, Syria, the USSR and Yugoslavia stated that the military base should be removed immediately. Australia, Denmark, the United Kingdom and the United States reserved their position on the report and on the conclusions.

CONSIDERATION BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Later in the year, at the General Assembly’s twentieth session, the question of Aden was discussed mostly in the Assembly’s Fourth Committee.

The following petitioners were heard by the Fourth Committee: Abdul Qawee Mackawee; Qahtan Shaabi and Saif Dhalee (speaking for the National Front for the Liberation of Occupied South Yemen); Shaikhan A. Alhabshi (speaking for the South Arabian League); and Mohammed Salem Basendwah and Ahmad Abdullah Al-Fadhli (speaking on behalf of the Organization for the Liberation of the Occupied South).

Mr. Mackawee, who had been Aden’s Chief Minister when its Constitution was suspended on 25 September 1965, described the situation in the territory as explosive as a result of British policies. He and the other petitioners said that the recent constitutional proposals which had been made by the United Kingdom had been wholly rejected by the political organizations, the Aden Ministers and the delegates of the Eastern Aden Protectorates because they fell short of what the United Nations had asked for in its resolutions on Aden, which, they believed, constituted the minimum demand of the people and formed the minimum guarantees for a just and democratic introduction to genuine independence.

The representative of the United Kingdom said that his Government’s aim in South Arabia was to bring together a score of protected States and the Colony of Aden to form a single viable independent State, not later than 1968. Certain elements in Aden State had refused to cooperate in working out the necessary steps in order to achieve this purpose. His Government’s aim had been further jeopardized by a terrorist campaign and by the attitude of the former Aden Ministers in not only failing to condemn that terrorism, but in publicly supporting the externally controlled organization of the terrorist campaign. His Government accepted without any qualification what he described as the most important paragraph of the General Assembly’s resolution of 11 December 1963 on the Aden question, namely, that which reaffirmed the right of the people to self-determination and freedom from colonial rule.

On the other constitutional paragraphs of that resolution, the United Kingdom representative added, there was little or no disagreement on vital principles, once agreement between the leaders of South Arabia had been reached. The United Kingdom Government’s attitude to the military base was that the future of any defence facilities should be a matter for negotiation with the Government of the new State at the time of independence and that no base was militarily or morally defensible unless it had the support of the people of the territory in which it was situated. The United Kingdom representative reiterated that his Government could not put into effect the Assembly’s recommendations on the emergency measures and the military operations as long as the campaign of terrorism and violence continued.

A number of Members referred to the failure of the United Kingdom to accept and implement the United Nations resolutions on the territory. Some, including Algeria, Czechoslovakia and the Ukrainian SSR, questioned the sincerity of the United Kingdom in this regard. In their view, the United Kingdom was waging a colonial war against the people of the territory and was seeking to prolong its rule there. Czechoslovakia, Ghana, the USSR, the United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia considered that the United Kingdom was pursu-
ing this policy in Aden because of the oil in the area and because of its strategic interests there. Iraq was among those who stressed the importance of genuine independence for the whole territory. The USSR and Yemen maintained that the United Kingdom was trying to create a "false" independence and to hand over power to a group of feudal puppets.

Some Members—including Bulgaria, Kenya, the United Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen and Yugoslavia—said that the efforts being made by the people to free themselves from colonialism could not be described as "terrorism."

Cyprus, Ecuador, India, Iran, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Somalia, Syria, Uganda and others believed that the solution could best be found by the United Kingdom's implementing the decisions of the United Nations. Albania, Ghana, Jordan, Mali, Morocco, Somalia and Syria, were among those which thought that these decisions should be strengthened by demanding the immediate removal of the military base. Another suggestion put forward—by Mongolia, Poland and the USSR, among others—was that the Assembly should draw the attention of the Security Council to the dangerous situation prevailing in the area. Ceylon, supported by Iran, suggested the appointment of a committee of good offices to bring the parties together to decide on machinery for holding elections.

Denmark maintained that, in order to create the proper political climate to enable the constitutional basis for an independent South Arabia to be worked out before 1968, it was essential for all acts of violence to cease and for the administering power to revoke the emergency measures. Australia pointed out that political negotiations could not be carried on, and preparations for independence could not advance, in an atmosphere of terror; the representatives of all shades of opinion should, in Australia's view, agree to subdivide their particular ideas in the common interest and work together for the realization of the essential aim, namely, the accession of the territory to independence by 1968.

The outcome of the discussions was a resolution (approved by the Fourth Committee on 3 November and adopted at a plenary meet-
action against the people of the territory; requested the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the specialized agencies and the international relief organizations to offer all possible assistance to the people who were suffering as a result of the military operations in the territory; and requested the Secretary-General to take such action as he might deem expedient to ensure the implementation of the present resolution and report thereon to the Special Committee. (For full text, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

The following 45 Members were the sponsors of this resolution in the Fourth Committee: Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, the Congo (Brazzaville), the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Cyprus, Dahomey, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, the United Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

Their proposal, as finally approved, incorporated some oral amendments put forward by Venezuela.

The Fourth Committee agreed to this resolution by a roll-call vote of 83 to 11, with 8 abstentions. The Assembly approved it by a roll-call vote of 90 to 11, with 10 abstentions, as resolution 2023 (XX).

Introducing the draft resolution in the Fourth Committee, the representatives of Cyprus, Iraq and the United Republic of Tanzania said that the reports of the Sub-Committee, as well as the statements of representatives and petitioners in the Fourth Committee, demonstrated that, instead of heeding the wishes of the people of Aden, the United Kingdom had merely stated its intention of granting independence to the territory by 1968 and was continuing to oppress the indigenous inhabitants by military and other means. They stressed that the resolution which they supported represented the minimum that could be done to meet the wishes of the people of the territory. It was designed to ensure that the independence which the United Kingdom granted to the territory would be in accordance with the freely expressed wishes of the inhabitants. Events had shown that the military base constituted one of the major obstacles in the way of the attainment of independence by the inhabitants of the territory. The resolution therefore stressed that the immediate and complete removal of the base was essential. The sponsors attached considerable importance to the request to the Secretary-General not only to report to the Special Committee but also to take such action as he deemed expedient to ensure the implementation of the resolution.

The United Kingdom representative opposed the resolution, stating that its sponsors seemed to have taken into account only the views of certain petitioners who had tried to give the impression that they represented the peoples of the territory as a whole, whereas they had often distorted the facts. The resolution seemed, moreover, to be based on the situation in Aden State alone, without regard for the situation in the remaining States of the Federation and in the unfederated States of the Protectorate. It misrepresented the position of his Government and ignored the efforts it was making. Furthermore, the draft resolution gave the clear impression of condoning and encouraging the campaign of violence and terrorism which was not and never had been a nationalist movement but was an instrument used by an outside country in pursuance of its own ambitions in South Arabia.

Other Members opposing the resolution—including Australia, Canada, Italy and the United States—felt that it would only be fair to take into account the assurances of the administering power and to recognize that efforts to reach a solution had been made. They also did not consider that the situation in Aden threatened peace and security within the meaning of the United Nations Charter. They believed that constitutional development must take place on the basis of consultations between the political leaders of South Arabia and the administering power. The Fourth Committee, they said, should not attempt to impose a rigid time-table on the parties concerned nor should it prejudge the stand which the people of Aden would take with regard to the military base following independence. They felt, too, that the resolution
did not deal adequately with the question of terrorism; the United States was concerned lest some of the paragraphs were construed as an endorsement by the United Nations of violence. The paragraph calling for the immediate removal of military bases, which was voted on separately at the request of Colombia, was approved by the Fourth Committee by a roll-call vote of 60 to 20, with 22 abstentions. The General Assembly also took a roll-call vote on the paragraph calling for the immediate removal of military bases, which it adopted by 64 votes to 22, with 25 abstentions.

COMMUNICATIONS TO SECURITY COUNCIL

In a letter dated 5 October 1965, addressed to the President of the Security Council, 12 United Nations Member Governments—Algeria, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, the United Arab Republic and Yemen—reviewed events in Aden from 25 September 1965, when the United Kingdom Government suspended the Aden Constitution and dismissed the Council of Ministers of Aden. Recent measures against the people of the territory, the letter said, must be considered as an act of open defiance of the United Nations and a deliberate attempt to consolidate colonial rule and to deny the people their fundamental rights to freedom and self-determination. The existence of the British military base in Aden, the letter added, threatened peace and security in the whole region and its removal was necessary and essential. The situation in the territory, the letter concluded, constituted a "grave threat to international peace and security" which required the urgent attention of the Security Council.

On 13 October, the United Kingdom replied by letter, stating that it could not accept certain allegations in the 12-power letter. The United Kingdom had frequently declared its firm intention of bringing South Arabia to independence not later than 1968. Action taken by the United Kingdom, in a matter wholly within its own responsibilities, had as its objective the restoration of peaceful conditions and progress towards the self-determination and independence of South Arabia. These measures were therefore not contrary to the provisions of the United Nations Charter. Nor did they constitute an attempt to deny the exercise of freedom and self-determination to the Aden people. The United Kingdom also rejected the suggestion in the 12-power letter that the situation in the territory constituted a grave threat to international peace and security requiring the attention of the Security Council.
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Recalling its resolutions 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960 and 1949(XVIII) of 11 December 1963, and the resolutions adopted by the Special Committee on 9 April 1964, 11 May 1964 and 17 May 1965,

Having heard the statements of the petitioners,

"Having taken note of the declarations of the representative of the administering Power,

"Deeply concerned at the critical and explosive situation which is threatening peace and security in the area, arising from the policies pursued by the administering Power in the Territory,

"1. Approves the chapters of the reports 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 relating to the Territory of Aden and endorses the conclusions and recommendations; of the Sub-Committee on Aden;

"2. Endorses the resolutions adopted by the Special Committee on 9 April 1964, 11 May 1964 and 17 May 1965;

"3. Deplores the refusal of the administering Power to implement the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Special Committee;

"4. Further deplores the attempts of the administering Power to set up an unrepresentative regime in the Territory, with a view to granting it independence contrary to General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1949(XVIII), and appeals to all States not to recognize any independence which is not based on the wishes of the people of the Territory freely expressed through elections held under universal adult suffrage;

"5. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of the Territory to self-determination and to freedom from colonial rule and recognizes the legitimacy of their efforts to achieve the rights laid down in the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

"6. Considers that the maintenance of the military bases in the Territory constitutes a major obstacle to the liberation of the people of the Territory from colonial domination and is prejudicial to the peace and security of the region, and that the immediate and complete removal of these bases is therefore essential;

"7. Notes with deep concern that "military operations against the people of the Territory are still being carried out by the administering Power;

"8. Urges the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland immediately to:

(a) Abolish the state of emergency;

(b) Repeal all laws restricting public freedom;

(c) Cease all repressive actions against the people of the Territory, in particular military operations;

(d) Release all political detainees and allow the return of those people who have been exiled or for-
bidden to reside in the Territory because of political activities;  
"9. Reaffirms paragraphs 6 to 11 of resolution 1949(XVIII) and urges the administering Power to implement them immediately;  
"10. Appeals to all Member States to render all possible assistance to the people of the Territory in their efforts to attain freedom and independence;  
"11. Draws the attention of the Security Council to the dangerous situation prevailing in the area as a result of British military action against the people of the Territory;  
"12. Requests the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the specialized agencies and the international relief organizations to offer all possible assistance to the people who are suffering as a result of the military operations in the Territory;  
"13. Requests the Secretary-General to take such action as he may deem expedient to ensure the implementation of the present resolution, and to report thereon to the Special Committee;  
"14. Requests the Special Committee to examine again the situation in the Territory and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its twenty-first session;  
"15. Decides to maintain this item on its agenda."

A/6179. Letter of 14 December 1965 from USSR.
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S/6368. Letter of 18 May 1965 from Chairman of Special Committee transmitting text of resolution on question of Aden adopted by Special Committee at its 338th meeting on 17 May 1965.
S/6900. Letter from President of General Assembly transmitting text of resolution 2023(XX) adopted by Assembly on 5 November 1965, meeting 1368.

Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland

The situation in the British-administered territories of Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland, which are adjacent to South Africa, has been under consideration by the United Nations General Assembly since 1962. During that time, the Assembly and its 24-member Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples have adopted resolutions urging the United Kingdom to implement the Assembly's Declaration on granting independence (adopted on 14 December 1960) in these territories. They have also voiced concern at the economic situation of the territories and their relationship with South Africa.

Elections were held in Basutoland in April 1965, and in Bechuanaland in March 1965, under pre-independence constitutions agreed upon at constitutional conferences held in 1964. Elections were most recently held in Swaziland in June 1964. Swaziland's constitutional position towards independence in 1965 was less advanced than that of either of the other two territories.

In 1965, the situation in these three territories was again considered by the Special Committee and the General Assembly.

CONSIDERATION BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The Special Committee considered the situation in Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland in the course of its visit to Africa in May and June 1965, during which it heard the following petitioners: I. B. Tabata, representing the Unity Movement of South Africa; A. B. Ngobo and Z. B. Molete, representing the Pan-Africanist Congress of South Africa (PAC); Bishop Mpeta and L. A. Matoane, representing the Basutoland Congress Party; and J. J. Nquku, representing the Swaziland Progressive Party.

On 17 June 1965, the Special Committee adopted a resolution, by a roll-call vote of 17 to 0, with 6 abstentions, by which it: reiterated its previous requests to the administering power; drew the attention of the Security Council to the threat to the territorial integrity of the territories posed by the expansionist policy of the Government of South Africa; and recommended that the General Assembly and the Security Council urgently consider and initiate the measures necessary to ensure the territorial integrity of the territories and the safeguarding of their sovereignty.

In September 1965, the Special Committee again took up the question of the situation in the three territories in the context of a report by the Secretary-General, submitted at the Committee's request, on the economic and social development needs of the territories. Annexed to it was the report of an economic and technical assistance mission sent out in consultation with the United Kingdom, which visited the territories in May and June 1965. The Secretary-General noted that the mission had concluded that considerable funds would have to be made available to the three territories to develop the various sectors of their economies. He proposed the establishment of a fund to aid in the economic development of Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland which would supplement the assistance provided by the administering power and the agencies of the United Nations. Such a fund would be made up of voluntary contributions by United Nations Member States and would be administered by the Secretary-General, in close consultation with the Governments of the three territories and with the co-operation and assistance of the United Nations Special Fund, the Technical Assistance Board (TAB), the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) and the specialized agencies concerned. The Secretary-General also said that, at the appropriate time, he would recommend the establishment in each territory of a United Nations Technical Assistance Office headed by a Resident Representative to expedite and co-ordinate all United Nations assistance to the territory concerned, including that made available from the proposed fund, if one was established on the basis of his proposals.

On 20 September, the Special Committee endorsed the Secretary-General's recommendations by a vote of 18 to 0, with 4 abstentions.

CONSIDERATION BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY

In 1965, at the twentieth session of the General Assembly, the situation in Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland was discussed on the basis of the reports of the Special Committee of Twenty-Four for 1964 and 1965 and the report of the Secretary-General on economic and social development needs in the territories (see above). Debate took place mostly in the Assembly's Fourth Committee.

The United Kingdom informed the Assembly's Fourth Committee that Basutoland and Bechuanaland were expected to achieve their independence during 1966 and that, in Swaziland, a committee had been appointed to review the constitution.

Concern at the total economic dependence of the territories on South Africa was expressed by many Members, including Ethiopia, India, Iraq, Liberia, Nigeria and the United Arab Republic. This dependence, it was felt, had hindered the territories' political advancement and would render their political independence precarious and unreal. The remedy, it was stated, lay in effective economic and financial assistance from the United Nations which should be provided as a matter of urgency. These Members therefore supported the Secretary-General's proposal for a special fund for the economic development of the territories.

Nigeria and the Byelorussian SSR were among those which charged that South Africa was trying to achieve the political subjugation of the territories and that it was being encouraged in this by the United Kingdom, which had taken no effective steps to bring about independence or to protect the territories from South Africa. These and other Members, including the USSR, stressed the need to create conditions to ensure genuine independence and not a continuation of colonial rule in a different form. Algeria felt that the United Nations should guarantee the territorial integrity of these territories as had been recommended by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in 1964. The Byelorussian SSR and the USSR maintained that the constitutions were still undemocratic and that elections held under their provisions could not be expected to reflect the true desires and wishes of the people.

The representative of South Africa denied the allegations that his country was seeking to dominate or annex the territories. He said that the ties existing between his country and the three territories were mutually beneficial, and constituted no threat to their territorial integrity. South Africa welcomed their evolution
towards independence in an atmosphere of
good neighbourliness, regarding it as an ex-
ample of the concept of separate development.
Because of that policy, South Africa had openly
abandoned the provisions for incorporation con-
tained in the South Africa Act of 1909.

During the discussions, a draft resolution was
submitted to the Fourth Committee, sponsored
by 31 Members. By this text, the Assembly
would: endorse the Special Committee's con-
clusions and recommendations; reaffirm the in-
alienable right of the peoples of the territories
to freedom and independence; once again in-
vite the administering power to take urgent
steps to implement fully the Assembly's resolu-
tions in conformity with the freely expressed
wishes of the peoples of the three territories;
request the Special Committee of Twenty-Four
to consider, in co-operation with the Secretary-
General, necessary measures for securing the
territorial integrity and sovereignty of the
three territories and to report to the Assembly
in 1966; endorse the recommendations con-
tained in the Secretary-General's report; de-
cide to establish a fund for the economic de-
velopment of the three territories to be made
up of voluntary contributions and to be ad-
ministered by the Secretary-General in close
consultation with the Governments of the ter-
ritories and with the co-operation and assist-
ance of the various United Nations agencies
and organs concerned; consider that the efforts
to provide economic, financial and technical
assistance, through United Nations programmes
of technical co-operation and the specialized
agencies, should continue in order to remedy
the deplorable economic and social situation of
the three territories; and request the Secretary-
General to appoint resident representatives in
these territories, and to report to the Assembly
in 1966 on the operation of the fund.

The 31 sponsors of the proposal to this effect
were Algeria, Cameroon, the Congo (Brazza-
ville), the Democratic Republic of the Congo,
Dahomey, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Iran,
Iraq, the Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon,
Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger,
Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone,
Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, the United Arab
Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, and
Zambia.

Iran and Mali, speaking for the sponsors,
said the draft resolution was designed to lead
the three territories rapidly to independence,
to safeguard their territorial integrity and sov-
ereignty and to ward off the threat of domina-
tion by South Africa.

Commenting on the proposal, the United
Kingdom pointed out that it made no refer-
ence to the constitutional progress that had
taken place, or even to the fact that Basutoland
and Bechuanaland were due to become inde-
pendent during 1966. The references to deplor-
able economic and social conditions in the ter-
ritories were not justified; in fact, those condi-
tions did not compare unfavourably with those
in many similar parts of the world. The United
Kingdom welcomed any offer of supplementary
assistance to the territories and would co-oper-
ate in the administration of the proposed fund
while continuing to give bilateral aid.

Australia, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zea-
land, Sweden, the United States and others
agreed that the draft did not take into account
what the administering power had done to pro-
mote the political and economic development
of the territories. Reservations concerning the
proposal to establish a special fund were ex-
pressed by Belgium, Canada, Finland, Greece
and Sweden, among others. While supporting
the need to give special aid to the territories,
they did not feel that establishment of a sepa-
rate fund would accord with the efforts being
made to co-ordinate United Nations pro-
grammes of development.

On 9 November 1965, the Fourth Commit-
tee approved the 31-power draft resolution by 84
votes to 1, with 6 abstentions. Before this, the
paragraph calling for establishment of a spe-
cial fund was approved in a separate vote, by
roll call, by 79 to 0, with 12 abstentions. At
a plenary meeting on 16 December 1965, the
Assembly adopted the text as a whole as reso-
lution 2063 (XX), by 86 votes to 1, with 7 ab-
stentions. (For full text of resolution, see DOCU-
MENTARY REFERENCES below.)
TRUST AND NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES
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RESOLUTION 2063 (XX), as recommended by Fourth Committee, A/6106, adopted by Assembly on 16 December 1965, meeting 1398, by 86 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

The General Assembly,

"Having examined the chapters of the reports 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 relating to the Territories of Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland, and with the co-operation and assistance of the specialized agencies concerned;"

"Noting with deep concern the economic and social situation prevailing in the three Territories and their imperative and urgent need for United Nations assistance;"

"Having regard to the grave threat to the territorial integrity and economic stability of these Territories constituted by the policies of the present regime in the Republic of South Africa;"

"Regretting that the administering Power of these Territories has not taken effective and complete steps to implement General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV), 1817(XVII) and 1954(XVIII),

"1. Approves the chapters of the reports 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 relating to the Territories of Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland, and endorses the conclusions and recommendations contained therein;"

"2. Reaffirms the inalienable rights of the peoples of Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland to freedom and independence;"

"3. Once again invites the administering Power to take urgent steps to implement fully General Assembly resolutions 1514(XV), 1817(XVII) and 1954 (XVIII) in conformity with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples of the three Territories;"

"4. Renews its request that the administering Power should take immediate steps to return to the indigenous inhabitants all the land taken from them, whatever the form of or pretext for such alienation;"

"5. Requests the Special Committee to consider, in co-operation with the Secretary-General, what measures are necessary for securing the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland, and to report to the General Assembly at its twenty-first session;"

"6. Expresses its satisfaction to the Secretary-General for his efforts and endorses the recommendations contained in his report;"

"7. Decides to establish a Fund for the Economic Development of Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland, to be made up of voluntary contributions and to be administered by the Secretary-General in close consultation with the Governments of the three Territories and with the co-operation and assistance of the Special Fund, the Technical Assistance Board, the Economic Commission for Africa and the specialized agencies concerned;"

"8. Considers that the efforts to provide economic, financial and technical assistance, through United Nations programmes of technical co-operation and the specialized agencies, should continue in order to remedy the deplorable economic and social situation of the three Territories;"

"9. Requests the Secretary-General to appoint resident representatives in the three Territories, as
British Guiana

British Guiana, situated on the north-east coast of the South American continent, had a population in 1962 estimated at 600,000, of whom 289,790 were East Indians, 192,660 were of African descent, 68,240 were of mixed descent, 23,000 were Amerindians, 12,150 were Europeans and 3,520 were Chinese.

Elections under a system of proportional representation were held in the territory on 7 December 1964 for the 53 seats in the single-chamber Legislature, the House of Assembly. The People's Progressive Party (PPP) won 24 seats, the People's National Congress (PNC) 22, and the United Force (UF) 7. The Government was formed from a coalition of the PNC and the UF. Forbes Burnham was named Premier.

CONSIDERATION BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The question of British Guiana was considered in September and October 1965 by the General Assembly's 24-member Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

The Special Committee heard one petitioner, Felix Cummings, representative of the People's Progressive Party (PPP), who drew the Committee's attention to the manner in which British Guiana was being brought to independence by the administering power. He also said, among other things, that the United States was interfering in the internal affairs of the country. He charged that the present Government of British Guiana had come to power illegally, was incompetent and prodigal of the country's resources, endangering the future of the country and arresting people arbitrarily. His party, he said, demanded: the inclusion of the question of proportional representation in the agenda of the November 1965 conference to be held on the territory, as well as the holding of fresh elections before a date was fixed for independence; the removal of all foreign troops and of all military bases; and the restructuring and democratization of governmental institutions dealing with law and order. He particularly emphasized that the correction of the present racial imbalance within branches of the civil service (such as the police and security forces) was essential to preserve national unity.

In October, the Sub-Committee of Good Offices (established by the Special Committee in 1964) reported that it had been unable to visit the territory to carry out its mission, owing to a refusal by the United Kingdom. The Sub-Committee nevertheless considered that the United Nations should continue its efforts to ensure that British Guiana accede to independence without delay, in an atmosphere of harmony and peace. It recommended that the Special Committee should reaffirm its resolution of 23 June 1964 and should authorize the Sub-Committee to carry out its task.

(By its resolution of 23 June 1964, the Special Committee had, among other things, expressed distress at the grave and tragic situation prevailing in the territory and considered that the delay in the granting of independence by the administering power was the main cause for the situation. It had also called on the United Kingdom to fix without delay the date for the independence of British Guiana; appealed to political leaders to take immediate steps to restore peaceful conditions; requested the administering power to release all political prisoners and detainees, to create conditions of peace and tranquillity and end the state of emergency;
and called upon the administering power to refrain from taking action which would aggravate the situation.)

The representative of the United Kingdom reserved his Government's position with regard to the Sub-Committee's conclusion and in particular with regard to a reaffirmation of the resolution adopted by the Special Committee on 23 June 1964 against which the United Kingdom had voted. The United States Government's position in this connexion was also reserved by its representative.

The Special Committee adopted the report of the Sub-Committee, without objection, and it was then incorporated in the report of the Special Committee to the General Assembly.

CONSIDERATION BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY

At a plenary meeting of the General Assembly, on 6 October 1965, the Foreign Minister of Venezuela repudiated the arbitration findings of 1899 and reiterated his country's claim to Guyana Esequiba which he stated was "Venezuelan territory occupied by a colonial power and incorporated into a colony." This was further elaborated in a statement made by the representative of Venezuela in the Assembly's Fourth Committee on 7 December 1965. (Guyana Esequiba is a parcel of land within the boundaries of British Guiana of approximately 50,000 square miles and extending to include the left bank of the Esequibo River.)

On 6 October, the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom wrote to the Secretary-General stating that his Government had no doubt as to its sovereignty over the territory of British Guiana and he wished formally to reserve the rights of his Government on this question.

During the Fourth Committee's debate, Cuba registered its concern with the situation in British Guiana, charging that the administering power had ignored the resolutions of the United Nations.

Tunisia stated that the case of British Guiana was an illustration of United Kingdom intervention in territories it administered in order to direct events towards a situation which would be favourable to it in the future.

India considered that British Guiana had, on one pretext or another, been denied freedom and independence for almost 15 years by the administering power. There was no doubt that, with the full co-operation of the administering power, the Sub-Committee and Special Committee would be able to play an important role in assisting the people of the territory to achieve freedom and independence. The General Assembly, India added, should call upon the United Kingdom to grant Independence to British Guiana without further delay.

Pakistan said that for Asian and African countries the evolution of a multi-racial community in British Guiana was a challenging possibility. The representative of Yugoslavia believed that the cause of the difficulties in British Guiana was basically political, not racial, and thus required a political solution. The solution found, however, was racial in character, and this had given rise to the present difficulties.

The petitioner, Felix Cummings, also appeared before the Fourth Committee.

The United Kingdom representative said his Government had publicly expressed its regret that one of the two main forces in British Guiana, the People's Progressive Party, had not felt able to attend the constitutional conference on that territory taking place in London at the moment. Many of the points made by the petitioner would surely have been more appropriately and effectively made in London. Concerning detainees still in custody in the territory, he wished to make it clear that the responsibility for internal security rested with the British Guiana Ministry and not with the United Kingdom Government. British Guiana had, moreover, enjoyed more stability over the past year than for some time. A conference to fix an independence date was in progress; intervention from outside might have unfortunate consequences and even increase racial and political divisions. A comprehensive survey of racial tensions had just been carried out by the International Commission of Jurists, and the British Guiana Government was now working to give effect to the Commission's recommendations.

The outcome of the discussions was the adoption of a resolution (2071 (XX)) at a plenary meeting of the Assembly on 16 December 1965. By this resolution, the Assembly: endorsed the conclusion and recommendations concerning British Guiana contained in the report of the Special Committee of Twenty-Four; reaffirmed the inalienable rights of the people of the territory to freedom and independence in accordance with the provisions of the General Assembly's resolution of 14 December 1960 containing the Declaration on the ending of colonialism; requested the administering power to end the state of emergency and to release all political prisoners and detainees so as to enable them to participate in the political life of the territory; appealed to the main political parties to resolve existing differences so as to enable the territory to achieve independence in an atmosphere of peace and unity; and noted the announcement of the administering power that British Guiana would attain independence on 26 May 1966 and requested the administering power not to take any action which might delay independence. (For full text of resolution, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

The Assembly approved this text by a roll-call vote of 87 to 0, with 19 abstentions. It did so on the recommendation of the Fourth Committee, where it was approved on 10 December 1965 on the proposal of Algeria, Ceylon, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Iran, Iraq, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syria, Togo, the United Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

The vote in the Fourth Committee on the resolution as a whole followed separate votes on: (a) the paragraph endorsing the recommendations of the Special Committee of Twenty-Four (approved by 74 votes to 0, with 17 abstentions) and (b) the paragraph requesting the administering power to end the state of emergency and to release all political prisoners and detainees (approved by 67 votes to 0, with 25 abstentions).

Many of the Members abstaining in the vote were Latin American States which, in both the Fourth Committee and at the plenary debates, had expressed the hope that the draft resolution would have made some reference to the existence of the Venezuelan territorial claim, although, they added, they were not making their support of independence for British Guiana conditional upon the achievement of a solution to such a claim.

In this connexion, the General Assembly decided, on 16 December 1965, without objection, to take note of a statement by the Chairman of the Fourth Committee which itself noted the discussions taking place between the Governments concerned with the territorial claim (the United Kingdom, Venezuela and British Guiana) and stated that these discussions were a continuation of those agreed upon in 1962 and were in accordance with the statement of the Chairman of the Special Political Committee reporting that direct discussions had been arranged, which had been noted by the Assembly on 11 December 1962.
Cook Islands

The Cook Islands are widely scattered throughout an area of some 850,000 square miles of ocean in the South Pacific. They have a total land area of approximately 93 square miles. Thirteen are inhabited, with a population in 1964 estimated to total 19,944

In 1901, the Cook Islands were formally included within the boundaries of New Zealand. Since 1915, they have been administered under the provisions of the Cook Islands Act, 1915, as amended. This provided for the appointment by the Governor-General of a Resident Com-
missioner of the Cook Islands, who was charged, subject to the control of the Minister of Island Territories, with the administration of the executive government of the islands.

At its nineteenth session, by resolution 2005 (XIX) of 18 February 1965, the General Assembly had authorized the Secretary-General to appoint a United Nations representative to supervise the elections to be held in the territory, to observe the proceedings concerning the draft constitution in the Legislative Assembly and to report to the General Assembly's 24-member Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and to the General Assembly.

Accordingly, the Secretary-General appointed Omar A. H. Adeel as United Nations Representative. The election were held on 21 April 1965 and the discussions in the Legislative Assembly on the draft constitution took place between 10 and 19 May 1965. The United Nations Representative, accompanied by observers and staff, arrived in the Cook Islands on 6 April 1965.

REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS REPRESENTATIVE

In his report to the Secretary-General dated 30 June 1965, the United Nations Representative stated that the administrative and physical arrangements concerning the conduct of the elections were in accordance with the regulations, and the impartiality of the electoral officials was impeccable. He believed that there was, in a fairly large section of the population, a fair degree of awareness of the significance of the elections. During the time he was in the territory he was satisfied that the people were able to exercise their rights prior to and during polling in complete freedom. The Administration's precautions for the security of the ballot papers provided a foolproof safeguard, and he was satisfied that a correct count of the votes and an accurate report of the results had been made. He also reported that, at its first meeting, the Cook Islands legislature had reaffirmed its acceptance of the principle of full internal self-government, as outlined in the draft constitution and had requested certain amendments.

In a letter dated 13 August to the Secretary-General, the Permanent Representative of New Zealand stated that the amendments requested by the Cook Islands legislature had been enacted by the New Zealand Parliament. The amended draft constitution had been approved by the Cook Islands legislature and the new Constitution providing for a self-governing Cook Islands in free association with New Zealand had come into force on 4 August 1965.

CONSIDERATION BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Following its consideration of the report of the United Nations Representative, the Special Committee of Twenty-Four, on 30 August 1965, adopted a resolution by 20 votes to 0, with 3 abstentions, taking note of the United Nations Representative's report and the statements made to the Special Committee by the Premier of the Cook Islands and by the representative of New Zealand with regard to the future status of the Cook Islands.

CONSIDERATION BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The report of the United Nations Representative and the report of the Special Committee of Twenty-Four concerning the Cook Islands were considered later in the year at the General Assembly's twentieth session, mostly in the Assembly's Fourth Committee. China, Denmark, Ireland, Iraq, Pakistan, the Philippines and Uruguay, among others, expressed the opinion that with the coming into force of the new Constitution in the Cook Islands, the administering power had carried out its obligations under the General Assembly's Declaration of 14 December 1960 on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (contained in resolution 1514(XV)).

The representative of Ceylon considered that the new Constitution could serve as a model for small territories which had not achieved self-government.

A number of Members, including China, noted that this was the first time that the United Nations had played an active role in supervising elections in a non-self-governing territory,

— See Y.U.N., 1960, pp. 49-50, for text of resolution 1514(XV).
and congratulated the New Zealand Government on having invited the United Nations to do so. Jamaica considered that the role of the United Nations in the Cook Islands and the decision of its people regarding their future would be an inspiration for the people of other small non-self-governing territories.

The USSR representative said that the Constitution did not grant complete independence to the territory and that the administering power had not fulfilled the provisions of the Assembly's Declaration of 14 December 1960 on the granting of independence, particularly those contained in that Declaration which pertained to the transfer of all powers to the people of the territories. The United Nations could not be satisfied with playing a passive role and endorsing the decisions of the administering power. It should seek, in the spirit of the Charter and the Assembly's Declaration of 14 December 1960, to create conditions in the Cook Islands which would enable the population to decide freely on the territory's future form of government.

Mali considered that, in deciding their future, a referendum rather than an election would have been preferable for the people of the territory. Yugoslavia agreed, declaring that, before releasing an administering power from its obligations under the Charter in respect of a given territory, the United Nations should take adequate steps to ascertain the real wishes of the population concerning their status.

Liberia said that the people of the territory had made a choice regarding their future and that in any event both Governments had agreed that the people could decide at any time to change their status, in accordance with the General Assembly's resolution of 14 December 1960 on granting independence.

A draft resolution was sponsored in the Fourth Committee by the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guinea, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines, Rwanda, Togo and Zambia. By this, the Assembly, among other things, would: (1) note that the Constitution of the Cook Islands came into force on 4 August 1965, "from which date the Cook Islanders have had control of their internal affairs and of their future"; and (2) reaffirm the responsibility of the United Nations (under the General Assembly resolution of 14 December 1960 containing the Declaration on granting independence) to assist the people of the Cook Islands in the eventual achievement of full independence, if they so wished, at a future date.

An amendment was submitted by Ghana to delete the words "from which date the Cook Islands have had control of their internal affairs and of their future" from the operative paragraph whereby the Assembly would note that the Constitution of the Cook Islands came into force on 4 August 1965.

Introducing the amendment, the representative of Ghana said that a study of the Constitution revealed that the Cook Islands did not have full control of their internal affairs; he referred in particular to the powers retained by New Zealand through the High Commissioner.

The representative of New Zealand denied this assertion, stating that it was based on a misinterpretation of the High Commissioner's powers. He added that the Cook Islanders were free to fill this post from among themselves, and once a Polynesian was chosen as High Commissioner all the objections now raised would disappear.

The Ghana amendment was rejected by a roll-call vote of 28 in favour, to 29 against, with 43 abstentions.

Liberia also submitted amendments to the 12-power draft resolution. By these amendments, the General Assembly would: (1) express its appreciation of the co-operation extended to the United Nations by the New Zealand Government in the study of the question of the Cook Islands; (2) consider that since the Cook Islands had attained full internal self-government, the transmission of information in respect of the Cook Islands under Article 73e of the

---

15 Paragraph 5 of the Declaration on the granting of independence (contained in resolution 1514(XV)) reads: "Immediate steps shall be taken, in Trust and Non-Self Governing Territories or all other territories which have not yet attained independence, to transfer all power to the peoples of those territories, without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire, without any distinction as to race, creed or colour, in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom."
DECLARATION ON INDEPENDENCE FOR COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES

Charter was no longer necessary; and (3) express the hope that the United Nations Development Programme and the specialized agencies would endeavour to contribute in every way possible to the development and strengthening of the economy of the Cook Islands. These amendments were all adopted by the Fourth Committee.

The draft text as a whole, as amended, was approved by the Fourth Committee on 8 December 1965 by a roll-call vote of 76 to 0, with 24 abstentions. On 16 December it was approved at a plenary meeting of the Assembly by a roll-call vote of 78 to 0, with 29 abstentions, as resolution 2064(XX).

By this resolution, the Assembly, among other things, noted that the Constitution of the Cook Islands came into force on 4 August 1965, from which date the Cook Islanders had had control of their internal affairs and of their future; considered that since the Cook Islands had attained full internal self-government, the transmission of information in respect of the Cook Islands under Article 73e of the Charter of the United Nations was no longer necessary; reaffirmed the responsibility of the United Nations under the General Assembly's resolution (1514 (XV)) of 14 December 1960 on the granting of independence to assist the people of the Cook Islands in the eventual achievement of full independence, if they so wished, at a future date; and expressed the hope that the United Nations Development Programme and the specialized agencies would endeavour to contribute in every way possible to the development and strengthening of the economy of the Cook Islands. (For full text, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

The votes on the resolution as a whole in both the Fourth Committee and the plenary meeting of the Assembly took place after votes on separate paragraphs.

Thus, both the Fourth Committee and the Assembly approved by roll-call votes the operative paragraph whereby the Assembly noted that the Constitution of the Cook Islands came into force on 4 August 1965, from which date the Cook Islanders had had "control over their internal affairs and of their future." The Fourth Committee approved this by 65 votes to 16, with 18 abstentions, and the Assembly agreed to it by 77 votes to 16, with 14 abstentions.

The Fourth Committee also approved, by a roll-call vote of 86 votes to 4, with 6 abstentions, the operative paragraph reaffirming the responsibility of the United Nations to assist the people of the Cook Islands in the eventual achievement of full independence, if they so wished, at a future date.

There was no separate vote on this paragraph in the plenary meeting, but there was a separate vote on that paragraph stating that as the Cook Islands had attained full internal self-government, the transmission of information in respect of the Cook Islands under Article 73e of the United Nations Charter was no longer necessary. The Assembly agreed to this by a roll-call vote of 66 to 19, with 21 abstentions.

See footnote 14.

DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES

Special Committee on Situation with regard to Implementation of Declaration on Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, meetings 375, 376, 378-382.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY — 20TH SESSION

Fourth Committee meetings 1517, 1560-1563, 1579-1581.
Plenary Meeting 1398.
A/5800/Rev.1. Report of Special Committee to 19th Assembly session, Chapter VIII.
A/6000/Rev.1. Report of Special Committee to 20th Assembly session, Chapter VIII.
vote of 76 to 0, with 24 abstentions, as follows:
In favour: Afghanistan, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.
Against: None.
Abstaining: Algeria, Australia, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, Ghana, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.


THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
Recalling its resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960.
Recalling its resolution 2005 (XIX) of 18 February 1965, authorizing the Secretary-General, to appoint a United Nations representative to supervise the elections to be held in the Cook Islands under New Zealand administration and to observe the proceedings concerning the Constitution in the newly elected Legislative Assembly,
Having examined the chapters of the reports 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 relating to the Cooks Islands, including the statements made in the Special Committee by the Premier of the Cook Islands,
Having considered the report of the United Nations Representative for the Supervision of the Elections in the Cook Islands and the information on subsequent developments,
Having heard the statements made by the United Nations Representative for the Supervision of the Elections in the Cook Islands and the representative of New Zealand,
Noting that, under the Constitution which came into force on 4 August 1965, the people of the Cooks Islands have reserved their right to move to a status of complete independence,
1. Approves the chapters of the reports 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 relating to the Cook Islands;
2. Notes the findings and conclusions of the United Nations Representative for the Supervision of the Elections in the Cook Islands and expresses its high appreciation to the Representative and his staff;
3. Expresses its appreciation of the co-operation extended to the United Nations by the Government of New Zealand in the study of the question of the Cook Islands;
4. Notes that the Constitution of the Cook Islands came into force on 4 August 1965, from which date the people of the Cook Islands have had control of their internal affairs and of their future;
5. Considers that since the Cook Islands have attained full internal self-government, the transmission of information in respect of the Cook Islands under Article 73 of the Charter of the United Nations is no longer necessary;
6. Reaffirms the responsibility of the United Nations, under General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), to assist the people of the Cook Islands in the eventual achievement of full independence, if they so wish, at a future date;
7. Expresses the hope that the United Nations Development Programme and the specialized agencies will endeavour to contribute in every way possible to the development and strengthening of the economy of the Cook Islands.
Equatorial Guinea

Equatorial Guinea, administered by Spain, consists of Rio Muni, on the west coast of the African continent, and the islands of Fernando Poo and Annobon, in the Gulf of Guinea. According to a 1960 census, the total population of the territory of Equatorial Guinea numbered 246,000.

Following a referendum held in December 1963, Rio Muni and the islands of Fernando Poo and Annobon were joined to form Equatorial Guinea under a new constitution by which they ceased to be Spanish provinces and were granted their own legislative and executive institutions. Spain was henceforth represented in the territory by a High Commissioner responsible for external relations and defence.

The situation in Equatorial Guinea was considered in November and December 1965 during the twentieth session of the General Assembly—mostly in the Assembly's Fourth Committee—on the basis of reports of the Assembly's Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

During its consideration of the situation in the territory, the Fourth Committee heard as a petitioner Atanasie Ndong Niyone, representing the Mouvement national de liberation de la Guinee equatoriale (MNLGE). The Committee was also addressed by Bonifacio Ondo Edu, President of the Governing Council of the territory, who spoke as a member of the Spanish delegation.

Mr. Ondo Edu stated that the Government of Spain had made it clear that Equatorial Guinea was free to choose its own future at any time, including complete independence, and that his Government felt it was desirable for the country to pass through a period of preparation leading to complete independence.

The representative of Gabon and Mauritania felt that the leaders and the people of the territory were working with determination towards the goal of independence.

The representatives of Mali and the Philippines considered that the birth of the autonomous State of Equatorial Guinea constituted a positive factor. The representatives of Mali, Nigeria and Cameroon noted that Spain still retained the attributes of sovereignty in the territory and that the competence of the territory's authorities was restricted. They considered that immediate measures towards the full implementation of the Assembly's resolution 1514 (XV) of 16 December 1960 (containing the Declaration on granting independence) should be taken by Spain and that the people of the territory should be able to determine their future in accordance with democratic processes.

A draft resolution was introduced by 22 Members, whereby the General Assembly, among other things, would: (1) reaffirm the inalienable right of the people of Equatorial Guinea to self-determination and independence; (2) request the administering power to set the earliest possible date for independence after consulting the people on the basis of universal suffrage under the supervision of the United Nations; and (3) invite the Special Committee to follow the progress of the implementation of this resolution and to report thereon to the General Assembly's twenty-first session (in 1966).

The following were the 22 sponsors of this proposal: Algeria, Cameroon, Ceylon, the Congo (Brazzaville), Dahomey, Ghana, Guinea, the Ivory Coast. Liberia, Mali, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria. Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, the United Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, and Zambia.

The representative of Spain observed that the process which would lead to the independence of Equatorial Guinea was already very advanced, and the people of the territory already held their future in their own hands. It was implicit in the principle of self-determination that the people of the territory should themselves decide which moment should be chosen. He reserved his delegation's position regarding the scope and significance of the draft resolution.

Several delegations expressed reservations about the paragraph in the 22-power text on setting the earliest possible date for independence. Argentina did not think it accorded with

the actual situation in the territory or with the powers at present held by the administering power. Colombia, El Salvador, Gabon, Guatemala, the United States and Venezuela, among others, felt that the people of Equatorial Guinea themselves should set the date for independence. The United Kingdom pointed out that the basis of any popular consultation and any association of the United Nations with such consultation were matters to be dealt with by the administering power in question.

On 26 November 1965, the Fourth Committee approved the 22-power draft resolution by 90 votes to 0, with 3 abstentions, the paragraph on setting the earliest possible date for independence being approved by 77 votes to 0, with 16 abstentions.

On 16 December 1965, the text was approved at a plenary meeting of the Assembly by 103 votes to 0, with 2 abstentions, as resolution 2067 (XX). This decision followed a roll-call vote on the paragraph on setting an early date for independence, which was approved by 77 votes to 4, with 20 abstentions. (For full text of resolution, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

**DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES**

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY——20TH SESSION**

Fourth Committee, meetings 1549-1552, 1556-1559, 1566, 1570.

Plenary Meeting 1398.

A/5800/Rev.1. Report to 19th Assembly session of Special Committee on Situation with regard to Implementation of Declaration on Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, Chapter IX.

A/6000/Rev.1. Report of Special Committee to 20th Assembly session, Chapter X.

A/C.4/656. Statement by Bonifacio Ondo Edu, President of Governing Council of Equatorial Guinea, on 8 November 1965, meeting 1550.


A/C.4/L.807 and Add. 1-3. Algeria, Cameroon, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville), Dahomey, Ghana, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Mali, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia: draft resolution, adopted by Fourth Committee on 26 November 1965, meeting 1570 by 90 votes to 0, with 3 abstentions.

A/6160. Report of Fourth Committee, draft resolution III.

RESOLUTION 2067(xx), as recommended by Fourth Committee, A/6160, adopted by Assembly on 16 December 1965, meetings 1398 by 103 votes to 0, with 2 abstentions.

**Falkland Islands (Malvinas)**

The Falkland Islands (Malvinas), administered by the United Kingdom, are situated in the South Atlantic, some 480 miles off Cape Horn. The population, almost exclusively of British origin, numbers slightly over 2,000.

The question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) was considered by the General Assembly at its twentieth session at meetings held in November and December 1965, on the basis of reports of the Assembly's 24-member Special
Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Discussions at that Assembly session took place mainly in the Assembly’s Fourth Committee.

The representative of Argentina said that the Malvinas, which had formed a natural part of the Spanish colonial establishments, had come under the dominion of Argentina in 1810 but had been occupied by the United Kingdom in 1833. The Malvinas should be decolonized, in accordance with the Assembly’s resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960 (containing the Declaration on the granting of independence). The only course of action, he stated, was to return them to Argentina, in compliance with the provisions of that resolution which affirmed the right of all peoples to the integrity of their national territory. In 1964, he added, the Special Committee had recommended negotiations with a view to finding a solution. Accordingly, on 21 September 1965, the Government of Argentina had invited the United Kingdom Government to enter into negotiations. If the United Kingdom agreed to discuss the problem with a sincere desire to find a solution, there could be no difficulty in finding a formula which would guarantee the rights and aspirations of the inhabitants of the territory.

The United Kingdom representative did not accept the arguments of the representative of Argentina, and stated that his government had no doubts as to its sovereignty over the territory. The question of disrupting Argentina’s territorial integrity therefore did not arise. The important issue was the interests and wishes of the inhabitants, who were genuine, permanent inhabitants having no other home but the islands, and who did not wish to sever their connexions with the United Kingdom. The question of disrupting Argentina’s territorial integrity therefore did not arise. The only course of action, he stated, was to return them to Argentina, in compliance with the provisions of that resolution which affirmed the right of all peoples to the integrity of their national territory. In 1964, he added, the Special Committee had recommended negotiations with a view to finding a solution. Accordingly, on 21 September 1965, the Government of Argentina had invited the United Kingdom Government to enter into negotiations. If the United Kingdom agreed to discuss the problem with a sincere desire to find a solution, there could be no difficulty in finding a formula which would guarantee the rights and aspirations of the inhabitants of the territory.

Several Members of the Fourth Committee who participated in the discussion felt that the question should be resolved through negotiations between Argentina and the United Kingdom. This, for instance, was the view expressed by Bulgaria, Israel, Mali, Morocco, the United Arab Republic and others.

To Italy, there appeared to be a conflict between the principles set out in the United Nations Charter and those set out in Assembly resolution 1514(XV), namely, the principle of territorial integrity and the principle of self-determination. The origin of the inhabitants of the islands and the fluctuations of the population, he added, gave rise to serious doubts about the possibility of strict application in this case of the principle of self-determination.

Turkey felt that the resolution on decolonization could only be implemented once the dispute over sovereignty had been settled through negotiations.

Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela supported the position of Argentina and considered that the question should be resolved in accordance with the provisions of Assembly resolution 1514(XV) concerning the right of all peoples to their territorial integrity.

On 18 November 1960, the Fourth Committee approved a draft resolution on the matter which was later adopted at a plenary meeting of the Assembly on 16 December as resolution 2065 (XV).

By this text, the Assembly, considering that the Assembly’s resolution 1514(XV) was prompted by the aim of ending colonialism everywhere in all its forms, "one of which covers the case of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)," noted the existence of a dispute between the Governments of Argentina and of the United Kingdom concerning sovereignty over the Falkland Islands (Malvinas). It invited the two Governments to proceed without further delay with the negotiations recommended by the
TRUST AND NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES

Special Committee with a view to finding a peaceful solution to the problem, bearing in mind the provisions and objectives of the United Nations Charter and of resolution 1514 (XV) and the interests of the population of the islands. (For full text, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

The resolution to this effect was sponsored in the Fourth Committee by Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela.

The Fourth Committee approved it by a roll-call vote of 87 to 0, with 13 abstentions. The vote for it in the plenary meeting of the Assembly on 16 December, by roll call, was 94 to 0, with 14 abstentions.

DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES

GENERAL ASSEMBLY——20TH SESSION
Fourth Committee, meetings 1552-1554, 1556-1560. Plenary meetings 1337, 1338.
A/5800/Rev.1. Report to 19th Assembly session of Special Committee on Situation with regard to Implementation of Declaration on Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, Chapter XXIII.
A/6000/Rev.1. Report of Special Committee to 20th Assembly session, Chapter XXII.
A/6020. Letter of 27 September 1965 from United Kingdom.
A/C.4/L.802. Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela: draft resolution, adopted by Fourth Committee on 18 November 1965, meeting 1560, by roll-call vote of 87 to 0, with 13 abstentions, as follows:
In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Democratic Republic of the Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somaliland, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.
Against: None.
Abstaining: Australia, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Iceland, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States.

"The General Assembly,

"Having examined the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas),

"Taking into account the chapters of the reports 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 relating to the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), and in particular the conclusions and recommendations adopted by the Committee with reference to that Territory,

"Considering that its resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960 was prompted by the cherished aim of bringing to an end everywhere colonialism in all its forms, one of which covers the case of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas),

"Noting the existence of a dispute between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom
DECLARATION ON INDEPENDENCE FOR COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES

of Great Britain and Northern Ireland concerning sovereignty over the said Islands,

"1. Invites the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to proceed without delay with the negotiations recommended by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples with a view to finding a peaceful solution to the problem, bearing in mind the provisions and objectives of the Charter of the United Nations and of General Assembly resolution 1514(XV) and the interests of the population of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas);

"2. Requests the two Governments to report to the Special Committee and to the General Assembly at its twenty-first session on the results of the negotiations."

Fiji

Fiji, a group of islands in the central South Pacific administered by the United Kingdom, has a population of 456,390, consisting of 189,169 Fijians, 228,176 persons of Indian origin and 39,045 others. It has a Legislative Council consisting of a majority of nominated members. The elected members are elected by the three communities.

The situation in Fiji was considered at the General Assembly's twentieth session in November and December 1965 on the basis of reports by the Assembly's 24-member Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

Discussion at the Assembly's twentieth session took place mainly in the Assembly's Fourth Committee.

The representative of the United Kingdom informed the Fourth Committee that, following a constitutional conference in August 1965, agreement had been reached on an elected majority in the Legislative Council and the introduction of universal adult suffrage. The communal rolls would be maintained, but a system of cross-voting would be introduced. More responsibility would be given to elected members in the Executive Council. Proposals by the Fijian Indian representatives for a common roll and for the immediate granting of full internal self-government, he added, were not acceptable to some of the other representatives at the conference. The United Kingdom Government hoped that the new system would encourage political co-operation and make it possible to move towards a national rather than a communal attitude in the future.

The representative of India, however, maintained that the constitutional conference had failed to move in the direction of the goals of the Declaration. Instead of the universally accepted system of "one man, one vote," the present arrangement in Fiji would give one man one vote in the case of some but, in the case of others, it would give one man six or eight votes. The administering power had instituted a complicated system of cross-voting, with equal division of seats among unequal communities, with a view to protecting the interests of the European minority. The new Legislative Council would not be a fully democratic body and would have little effective power. He deprecated the administering power's policy of separate electorates which, he said, retarded progress towards integrating the peoples of the Territory.

Twenty-seven Members introduced a draft resolution whereby the Assembly, considering that the constitutional changes contemplated by the administering power would foment separatist tendencies and stand in the way of the political, economic and social integration of the people as a whole, would, among other things: (1) reaffirm the inalienable right of the people of Fiji to freedom and independence in conformity with the provisions of the Declaration; and (2) request the administering power to take, as a matter of urgency, measures to repeal all discriminatory laws and to establish an unqualified system of democratic representation based on the principle of "one man, one vote."

The 27 Members sponsoring the proposal to this effect were: Algeria, Ceylon, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Iran, Iraq, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nigeria, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, the United Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

Ceylon considered that the present constitu-
tion of Fiji should be amended to discourage separatist tendencies and encourage the awakening of a national consciousness. The present system of voting, it believed, could only accentuate rather than eliminate the political differences between different communities of Fiji and therefore it should be replaced by a system based on universal adult suffrage.

The representative of Liberia stated that the sponsors of the draft resolution had taken note of positive and negative aspects of the situation in Fiji. They found it difficult to believe that the existence of separatist tendencies among the various ethnic groups of the population of the territory was impeding the development of Fiji towards self-government and independence. For this reason, the draft resolution requested the administering power, for the sake of territorial unity, to repeal all discriminatory laws, as it had done in other territories which had now attained independence.

The representative of the United Kingdom could not agree that the constitutional changes contemplated would introduce divisions into political life in the territory. The constitutional changes which were to be introduced were designed to help bring the communities in the territory together. It was perverse to suggest that they would foment separatist tendencies.

He pointed out that such discriminatory laws as existed were designed to allay the mutual fears among the various communities and were necessary until the growth of national unity and co-operation made that protection unnecessary. The demand for the immediate abolition of all communal voting, he added, was tantamount to asking for a political revolution which would intensify racial bitterness and suspicions. The administering power was not prepared to do what the sponsors of the draft resolution wanted in that regard, and he would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

Australia, Canada and New Zealand, while concurring with the intentions of the sponsors of the 27-power proposal, could not support their draft resolution because it did not take into account the realities of the situation in Fiji and because of the need to avoid endangering the delicate basis that existed for co-operation between the ethnic groups.

On 26 November 1965, the Fourth Committee approved the draft resolution by a roll-call vote of 80 to 3, with 12 abstentions.

On 16 December 1965, the text was adopted at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly as resolution 2068 (XX), by 90 votes to 3, with 14 abstentions. (For full text, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)
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A/C.4/L.808 and Add.1. Algeria, Ceylon, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Iran, Iraq, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nigeria, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, Zambia: draft resolution, adopted by Fourth Committee on 26 November 1965, meeting 1570, by roll-call vote of 80 to 3, with 12 abstentions, as follows:
In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Democratic Republic of the Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libya, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.
Against: Australia, United Kingdom, United States.
Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, South Africa, Sweden.
A/6160. Report of Fourth Committee, draft resolution IV.
RESOLUTION 2068(xx) as recommended by Fourth
DECLARATION ON INDEPENDENCE FOR COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES

Committee, A/6160, adopted by Assembly on 16 December 1965, meeting 1398, by 90 votes to 3, with 14 abstentions.

"The General Assembly,
"Having examined the question of Fiji,
"Having studied the chapters of the reports 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 relating to the Territory of Fiji,
"Recalling its resolutions 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960, 1654(XVI) of 27 November 1961, 1810(XVII) of 17 December 1962 and 1951(XVIII) of 11 December 1963 and the resolution adopted by the Special Committee on 5 November 1964,
"Noting with regret that the administering Power has not yet taken effective measures to implement the resolutions of the General Assembly,
"Taking into account the fact that any further delay in the implementation of those resolutions would create further hardships for the people of the Territory,
"Considering that the constitutional changes contemplated by the administering Power would foment separatist tendencies and stand in the way of the political, economic and social integration of the people as a whole,
"1. Approves the chapters of the reports 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 relating to the Territory of Fiji, and endorses the conclusions and recommendations set forth therein;
"2. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of Fiji to freedom and independence in conformity with the provisions of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;
"3. Invites the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, as the administering Power, to implement immediately the resolutions of the General Assembly;
"4. Requests the administering Power to take, as a matter of urgency, measures to repeal all discriminatory laws and to establish an unqualified system of democratic representation based on the principle of 'one man, one vote';
"5. Further requests the administering Power to report to the Special Committee and to the General Assembly on the implementation of the present resolution;
"6. Invites the Special Committee to keep the question under consideration and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its twenty-first session;
"7. Decides to include the question of Fiji in the provisional agenda of its twenty-first session."

Gibraltar

Gibraltar, administered by the United Kingdom, has an area of 21/4 square miles and a population of about 24,500.

In 1964, the General Assembly's 24-member Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples noted that there was a disagreement or dispute between the United Kingdom and Spain regarding the status and situation of Gibraltar and invited the two Governments to begin talks without delay, in order to reach a negotiated solution in conformity with the provisions of the Declaration, bearing in mind the interests of the people of the territory.

In a letter dated 30 August 1965, the Deputy Permanent Representative of Spain informed the Secretary-General that his Government was ready, at any time the United Kingdom Government wished, to begin the talks recommended by the Assembly's Special Committee. Spain had so informed the United Kingdom in November 1964 but the United Kingdom had not responded to its suggestions for initiating the talks.

The Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom informed the Secretary-General in a letter dated 27 October 1965 that his Government remained ready to entertain proposals by Spain for conversations but could not hold such conversations so long as the abnormal situation on the frontier between Gibraltar and Spain continued. The United Kingdom regarded the restrictions imposed at the border by Spain as a deliberate attempt to influence the situation. Spain, he said, had also suggested that, as a prior condition, the constitutional situation in Gibraltar should be restored to its condition before the establishment of a Legislative Council (in 1950).

In a letter dated 5 November 1965, addressed to the Secretary-General, the Permanent Representative of Spain expressed surprise that the United Kingdom had attempted to hold Spain responsible for the failure to begin negotiations. The only reason it had not been possible to begin negotiations was that the United King-
dom had not wished to do so. Spain had not and did not set any prior condition to the holding of talks and had adopted no measure designed to prevent their being held. The measures referred to by the United Kingdom Representative were a reflection of the normal exercise of Spain's sovereignty in its own territory.

The question of Gibraltar was considered by the General Assembly's Fourth Committee and at several plenary meetings during the Assembly's twentieth session in 1965.

During the Fourth Committee's debate, Spain stated that Gibraltar was Spanish territory, which was conquered in 1704 and on which a British military base was established. After the occupation of Gibraltar the Spanish population was expelled and was replaced by an imported population. It was for this population that the United Kingdom was now invoking the right to self-determination. The Special Committee of Twenty-Four had recommended that the problem of Gibraltar should be resolved through bilateral negotiations that would take into account the interests of its inhabitants. Spain had always made itself available to negotiate and to respect the interests of the present inhabitants of Gibraltar. Spain was prepared to open negotiations with the United Kingdom, as recommended by the Assembly's Special Committee of Twenty-Four and was not setting or accepting any prior conditions for such negotiations.

The United Kingdom representative described the position of his Government regarding its sovereignty over Gibraltar. He said that the measures taken by the Spanish authorities at the frontier had altered the circumstances prevailing at the time of the adoption of the consensus by the Special Committee of Twenty-Four. Although the Spanish Government had asserted that those measures were a mere reflection of the exercise of Spain's sovereignty in its own territory, the restrictions nonetheless constituted an attempt to influence the situation. He reaffirmed that the principle of self-determination applied to the inhabitants of Gibraltar as to any other people. The United Kingdom Government was always ready to discuss questions of territorial sovereignty in a friendly and constructive spirit, but the wishes of the peoples concerned were paramount and the principles of consultation and consent should be applied. The United Kingdom was willing to enter into negotiations with the Spanish Government as soon as the situation on the frontier between Gibraltar and Spain returned to normal.

The majority of Members who spoke on the subject, Mali and the United Arab Republic among them, expressed support for the consensus of the Special Committee and felt that the question of Gibraltar should be resolved through negotiations between Spain and the United Kingdom. Mauritania and the Philippines were among those which believed that the principle of territorial integrity was necessary for a true understanding of the principle of self-determination; they felt it should be taken into consideration in the negotiations.

Australia favoured negotiations in order to ease the situation between the two countries, but considered that questions of sovereignty over colonial territories did not fall within the competence of the Fourth Committee.

The USSR said that, since Gibraltar had been transformed into a military base, the main issue was not whether it would be under the control of the United Kingdom, under control of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) powers or under Anglo-Spanish control. The interest of the Spanish people and the peoples of all Mediterranean countries, as well as the cause of peace and security, would be better served by the liquidation of the military base and the demilitarization of the territory.

Following the debate, the Fourth Committee, by a roll-call vote of 90 to 0, with 11 abstentions, approved a draft resolution sponsored by Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Mauritania, Morocco, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, Syria, the United Arab Republic, Uruguay and Venezuela. By this text—which was subsequently adopted at a plenary meeting of the Assembly on 16 December 1965—the General Assembly invited the Governments of Spain and of the United Kingdom to begin without delay the talks envisaged in the consensus adopted on 16 October 1964 by the Special Committee of Twenty-Four. It also requested the two Governments to inform the Special Committee of Twenty-Four and the General...
Assembly at its twenty-first (1966) session of the outcome of their negotiations.

The Assembly approved this resolution (2070 (XX)) by a roll-call vote of 96 to 0, with 11 abstentions. (For full text of resolution, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)
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A/C.4/L.814/Rev.1 and Add.1. Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Mauritania, Morocco, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Syria, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Venezuela: revised draft resolution adopted by Fourth Committee on 7 December 1965, meeting 1578, by roll-call vote of 90 to 0, with 11 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, France, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Ukrainian SSR, USSR.

"The General Assembly,

"Having considered the question of Gibraltar,

"Having studied the chapters of the reports 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 relating to Gibraltar,

"Having heard the statements made in the Fourth Committee,

"1. Invites the Governments of Spain and of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to begin without delay the talks envisaged under the terms of the consensus adopted on 16 October 1964 by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

"2. Requests the two Governments to inform the Special Committee and the General Assembly, at its twenty-first session, of the outcome of their negotiations."
Ifni and Spanish Sahara

Ifni, with some 50,000 inhabitants, is a small territory on the north-west coast of Africa bordered by Morocco. Spanish Sahara, with a population of about 24,000, is south of Ifni and is bordered by Morocco and Mauritania. The two territories are administered by Spain. Ifni is the subject of territorial claims by Morocco, and Spanish Sahara by Morocco and Mauritania.

In 1965, at its twentieth session, the General Assembly considered the situation in these two territories on the basis of the reports of the Assembly's 24-member Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Discussion at the Assembly session took place mainly in the Assembly's Fourth Committee.

The representatives of Mauritania, Morocco and Spain restated the positions of their respective Governments concerning sovereignty over the territories.20

A draft resolution on the question of Ifni and Spanish Sahara was submitted in the Fourth Committee by the following 33 Members: Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, the Congo (Brazzaville), the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dahomey, Ghana, Guinea, Iraq, the Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, the United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen and Zambia. By this text, the Assembly, among other things, would: (1) approve the provisions of a resolution on this subject adopted by the Special Committee of Twenty-Four on 16 October 196421 which urged Spain to implement the provisions of the Declaration on the granting of independence in these two territories; and (2) urgently request the Government of Spain, as the administering power, to take immediately all necessary measures for the liberation of the territories of Ifni and Spanish Sahara from colonial domination and, to this end, to enter into negotiations on the problems relating to sovereignty presented by these two territories.

The representatives of Spain considered that the 33-power proposal did not take into account that the two territories were geographically different. As the Fourth Committee had not discussed the situation in these territories, he considered that it should confine itself to endorsing the decisions of the Special Committee which had considered the question at length. The 33-power draft resolution, however, went further than the Special Committee's recommendation and requested Spain to enter into negotiations on the problems relating to sovereignty presented by these two territories. For this reason, he asked for deletion of the operative paragraph in that text whereby the Assembly would address an urgent request to Spain to take immediate measures to liberate the two territories and to enter into negotiations on the problems of sovereignty involved. Failing that, this operative paragraph should be voted on separately.

On 10 December, that part of the operative paragraph specifically asking Spain "to enter into negotiations on the problems relating to sovereignty presented by these two territories" was approved in the Fourth Committee by a roll-call vote of 35 to 2, with 55 abstentions. The operative paragraph as a whole was approved by 79 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions. The draft resolution as a whole was then approved by a roll-call vote of 88 to 2, with 4 abstentions.

On 16 December, the text was approved at a plenary meeting by a roll-call vote of 100 to 2, with 4 abstentions, as resolution 2072 (XX).

This decision followed separate votes on (a) the wording requesting Spain "to enter into negotiations on the problems relating to sovereignty presented by these two territories" which was agreed to by a roll-call vote of 33 to 2, with 69 abstentions—and (b) the whole operative paragraph at issue—which was agreed to by a roll-call vote of 99 to 2, with 4 abstentions. (For full text of resolution, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

20 Ibid.
21 Ibid.
The United Kingdom-administered territory of Mauritius, consisting of the island of Mauritius and its dependencies, lies in the western Indian Ocean, and has a multi-racial population, mostly Indo-Mauritians.

In 1965, the General Assembly considered conditions in Mauritius on the basis of recommendations contained in reports of its 24-member Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on Independence for Colonial Countries and Peoples relating to Ifni and Spanish Sahara.
tion on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In its recommendations, the Special Committee, among other things, urged the administering power to hold a fully representative conference immediately to draw up a constitution for Mauritius and fix an early date for its independence.\textsuperscript{22}

Speaking in the General Assembly's Fourth Committee, the representatives of Cuba, the United Republic of Tanzania, and Yugoslavia drew attention to reports that the United Kingdom had decided to create a new colony to be made up of parts of the territories of Mauritius and the Seychelles that would be used for the installation of military and naval bases by the United Kingdom and the United States. This, they maintained, was contrary to the Declaration and to the principle of self-determination. It was recalled that, in its Cairo Declaration of 1964, the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries had stated that the existence of bases in dependent territories which might serve to perpetuate colonialism was unacceptable.

The representative of the United Kingdom informed the Fourth Committee that a new constitution had been approved at a constitutional conference held in September 1965 at which all parties in the legislature had been represented. Procedures had also been announced whereby the territory could become independent six months after general elections had been held under an electoral system yet to be agreed upon.

The islands to which reference had been made in the debate, he added, had been uninhabited when the United Kingdom first acquired them and had been attached to the Mauritius and Seychelles administrations as a matter of administrative convenience. After discussions with the Governments of Mauritius and the Seychelles, new arrangements for their administration had been introduced in November 1965. Compensation would be paid to these Governments, and great care would be taken to look after the welfare of the few inhabitants. There was thus no question of splitting up natural territorial units.

During the debate in the Assembly's Fourth Committee, 33 Members submitted a draft resolution whereby, among other things, the Assembly, noting with deep concern that any step by the administering power to detach certain islands from the territory of Mauritius to establish a military base would be in contravention of the Declaration on the granting of independence, would: (1) reaffirm the inalienable right of the people of the territory of Mauritius to freedom and independence; (2) invite the United Kingdom Government to take effective measures for the immediate and full implementation of the Assembly's resolution of 14 December 1960\textsuperscript{23} (which contained the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples); and (3) invite the administering power to take no action that would dismember Mauritius and violate its territorial integrity.

The draft resolution to this effect was submitted by: Algeria, Cameroon, Ceylon, Cyprus, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, the United Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

Introducing the 33-power proposal, the representatives of India and the United Republic of Tanzania stated that its sponsors considered that the United Kingdom Government's plans to grant independence to Mauritius had not yet become concrete and that the Assembly's resolution of 14 December 1960 should be implemented fully and immediately. They also considered dismemberment of the territory undesirable and contrary to the resolution of 14 December 1960.

Argentina, Bulgaria and Venezuela, among others, were in general agreement with the 33-power proposal before the Fourth Committee and attached particular importance to that part of the text dealing with the detachment of certain islands from the territory for the establishment of a military base. The representative of Argentina said that this action would be in contravention of article 6 of the Declaration\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{22} See Y.U.N., 1964, p. 428.
\textsuperscript{23} See Y.U.N., 1960, pp. 49-50, text of resolution 1514 (XV).
\textsuperscript{24} Article 6 of the Declaration states: "Any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations."
whether military bases were involved or not. The representative of Venezuela added that it was also in contravention of the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter.

On 26 November 1965 the Fourth Committee approved the draft resolution by a roll-call vote of 77 to 0, with 17 abstentions.

On 16 December 1965, it was adopted at a plenary meeting of the Assembly by 89 votes to 0, with 18 abstentions, as resolution 2066 (XX). (For full text, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)
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A/6000/Rev.l. Report of Special Committee, Chapter XIII (to 20th Assembly session).


RESOLUTION 2066 (XX), as recommended by Fourth Committee, A/6160, adopted by Assembly on 16 December 1965, meeting 1398, by 89 votes to 0, with 18 abstentions.

"The General Assembly,

"Having considered the question of Mauritius and other islands composing the Territory of Mauritius,

"Having examined the chapters of the reports 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 relating to the Territory of Mauritius,

"Recalling its resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960 containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

"Regretting that the administering Power has not fully implemented resolution 1514(XV) with regard to that Territory,

"Noting with deep concern that any step taken by the administering Power to detach certain islands from the Territory of Mauritius for the purpose of establishing a military base would be in contravention of the Declaration, and in particular of paragraph 6 thereof,

"1. Approves the chapters of the reports 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 relating to the Territory of Mauritius, and endorses the conclusions and recommendations of the Special Committee contained therein;

"2. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of the Territory of Mauritius to freedom and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514(XV);

"3. Invites the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to take effective measures with a view to the immediate and full implementation of resolution 1514(XV);

"4. Invites the administering Power to take no action which would dismember the Territory of Mauritius and violate its territorial integrity;

"5. Further invites the administering Power to report to the Special Committee and to the General Assembly on the implementation of the present resolution;

"6. Requests the Special Committee to keep the question of the Territory of Mauritius under review and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its twenty-first session."
In 1965, the General Assembly also considered the situation in: American Samoa, Antigua, the Bahamas, Barbados, Bermuda, the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands, the Cocos (Keeling) Islands, Dominica, the Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Grenada, Guam, Montserrat, New Hebrides, Niue, Papua, Pitcairn, St. Helena, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, the Seychelles, the Solomon Islands, the Tokelau Islands, the Turks and Caicos Islands and the United States Virgin Islands. It did so on the basis of the recommendations contained in the 1964 report of its 24-member Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The Assembly also had before it additional information contained in the Special Committee's report for 1965. As the Special Committee did not during 1965 consider the situation in British Honduras, Brunei and Hong Kong, it made no recommendations and the Assembly took no action on them. (General Assembly deliberations on the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea and the Territory of Papua, are described in the preceding chapter, pp. 538-39 and pp. 542-43.)

During the general debate which took place in 1965 in the Assembly's Fourth Committee on the situation in the territories referred to above, a number of representatives, including those of Italy and the Philippines, noted the progress that had been made in these territories. However, other Members—among them, Mali, the USSR, the United Arab Republic and the United Republic of Tanzania—criticized the administering powers for lack of progress in implementing the United Nations Declaration on granting independence and drew attention to the continued existence in these territories of what they described as typical colonial features, such as control of the executive and legislative functions by the administering powers and racial discrimination.

Many members referred to the problem of the future of the smaller territories. Thus, the representative of the USSR, supported by those of Cuba, the United Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania and Yugoslavia, emphasized that the Assembly's Declaration of 14 December 1960 on the granting of independence was equally applicable to all territories and that the cardinal principle in any approach to the problem of future status should be the undisputed recognition of the right of all peoples to self-determination and independence regardless of size, population or stage of development. The representatives of Cuba, Ghana and the USSR opposed the merger of territories with the colonial powers. Mali, Syria and Yugoslavia called for special procedures to enable the United Nations to supervise consultations with the inhabitants on their future.

Albania, Cuba, Ghana, India, Mali, Syria, the USSR, the United Republic of Tanzania and Yugoslavia called for the elimination of the military bases existing in some of these territories, stating that their existence was inconsistent with the Declaration on granting independence.

At the conclusion of the general debate, a draft resolution on the situation in these territories was submitted by 26 Members. By this, the Assembly would: endorse the conclusions and recommendations contained in the reports of the Special Committee; call upon the administering powers to implement without delay the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly; request the administering powers to allow United Nations visiting missions to visit the territories and to extend to them full co-operation and assistance; reaffirm the inalienable right of the people of these territories to decide their constitutional status; and decide that the United Nations should render all help to the people of these territories in their efforts freely to decide their future status. The draft resolution also contained two operative paragraphs whereby the Assembly would: (c) state that the existence or establishment of military bases constituted an obstacle to the freedom and independence of these territories; and (b) request the administering powers to dismantle existing military bases and to refrain from establishing new ones.

The 26 sponsors of the draft resolution were: Algeria, Ceylon, the Congo (Brazzaville), the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Morocco, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Uganda, the United Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

Most of the debate on the draft resolution centred on the operative paragraphs concerning military bases.

Several Members, including Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States could not accept these two paragraphs. The United Kingdom held the view that the bases were not morally or militarily defensible unless they were supported by the people of the territory in which they were situated. It was therefore for the people concerned, and not for the Assembly, to decide whether the bases should be dismantled or retained. Other delegations could find nothing in the United Nations Charter or in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples that condemned the establishment of military bases as an obstacle to the freedom and independence of non-self-governing territories. In their view, the matter of military bases was not related to the question of decolonization.

Spain, although opposed to the establishment of military bases in a territory against the wishes of the population, feared that, pending general and complete disarmament, it would be impossible for all military bases to be dismantled without creating an imbalance that would threaten world peace.

Other representatives—including those of Dahomey, Mauritania, Nigeria, Pakistan and Sierra Leone—agreed with those who had called for elimination of military bases in the general debate—stated that the position set out in the two operative paragraphs in question was just, correct and essential and was designed to enable the people of the territories to decide their future status.

A number of Members abstained in the roll-call votes on these two paragraphs, considering that it was for the future independent countries to decide on the maintenance or removal of such bases and that any position on the matter adopted by the United Nations would be prejudging the decision of future independent States.

On 7 December 1965, the Fourth Committee approved the draft resolution by 76 votes to 8, with 14 abstentions. The operative paragraph stating that the existence of military bases constituted an obstacle to the freedom and independence of these territories, was adopted by a roll-call vote of 50 to 26, with 23 abstentions. The operative paragraph on dismantling existing military bases was adopted by a roll-call vote of 50 to 27, with 22 abstentions.

When the draft resolution was considered at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 16 December 1965, separate votes were again requested on these two operative paragraphs. The first, terming the military bases an obstacle to freedom and independence, received 48 votes in favour to 37 against, with 24 abstentions; the second, calling for the dismantling of bases, received 48 votes in favour to 37 against, with 19 abstentions.

Both paragraphs were rejected following a ruling by the President that they had failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority in accordance with paragraph 2 of Article 18 of the United Nations Charter (which states in part that General Assembly decisions on "important questions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting . . ."). In explanation, the President stated that the General Assembly had always regarded the question of implementing the Declaration on granting independence as an important question. Moreover, the paragraphs in question related to the maintenance of peace.

The representative of the USSR challenged the President's ruling. The President's ruling was, however, upheld by 56 votes to 30, with 9 abstentions. The Assembly then adopted the draft resolution, as amended, as resolution 2069 (XX), by 91 votes to 0, with 10 abstentions.

The Assembly thereby: endorsed the conclusions and recommendations of the Special Committee of Twenty-Four; called upon the administering powers to implement all relevant

27 For full text of Article 18, paragraph 2 of United Nations Charter, see APPENDIX II.
General Assembly resolutions; requested administering powers to allow United Nations Visiting Missions to visit the territories; reaffirmed the right of the people of these territories to decide their constitutional status in accordance with the United Nations Charter and the provisions of the Declaration on granting independence; decided that the United Nations should render all help to the people of these territories in their efforts freely to decide their future status; and asked its Special Committee of Twenty-Four to report on implementation at the next Assembly session. (For full text of resolution, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

(See also pp. 551-54.)

DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES

GENERAL ASSEMBLY——20TH SESSION

Fourth Committee, meetings 1549-1551, 1553, 1556-1558, 1560, 1576, 1578.

Plenary Meeting 1398.

A/5800/Rev.1. Report to 19th Assembly session of Committee on Situation with regard to Implementation of Declaration on Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: Chapter XIV, Seychelles and St. Helena; Chapter XV, Niue and Tokelau Islands; Chapter XVI, American Samoa; Chapter XVII, Guam; Chapter XIX, Cocos (Keeling) Islands; Chapter XX, New Hebrides, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Pitcairn Island and Solomon Islands; Chapter XXIV, Bermuda, Bahamas, Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands; Chapter XXV, United States Virgin Islands, British Virgin Islands, Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, Montserrat, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Barbados.

A/6000/Rev.1. Report of Special Committee to 20th Assembly session: Chapter XIII, Seychelles and St. Helena; Chapter XIV, Niue and Tokelau Islands; Chapter XV, American Samoa; Chapter XVI, Guam; Chapter XVIII, Papua and Cocos (Keeling) Islands; Chapter XIX, New Hebrides, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Pitcairn and Solomon Islands; Chapter XXIII, Bermuda, Bahamas, Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands; Chapter XXIV; United States Virgin Islands, British Virgin Islands, Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, Montserrat, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Barbados.

A/C.4/L.810 and Corr.1 and Add.1. Algeria, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville), Democratic Republic of Congo, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Morocco, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia: draft resolution, adopted by Fourth Committee on 7 December 1965, meeting 1578, by 76 votes to 8, with 14 abstentions.

A/6160. Report of Fourth Committee, draft resolution V.

RESOLUTION 2069 (xx), as recommended by Fourth Committee, A/6160, and as amended by Assembly, adopted by Assembly on 16 December 1965, meet-
render all help to the people of these Territories in their efforts freely to decide their future status; "5. Requests the Special Committee to examine the situation in these Territories and to report on the implementation of the present resolution to the General Assembly at its twenty-first session; "7. Requests the Secretary-General to give all assistance in the implementation of this resolution.”

CHAPTER III

QUESTIONS RELATING TO TRANSMISSION OF INFORMATION ON NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES

TERRITORIES ON WHICH INFORMATION WAS TRANSMITTED DURING 1965

Under Chapter XI of the United Nations Charter, the United Nations Members responsible for the administration of territories whose people have not yet attained a full measure of self-government recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount. (For text of Chapter XI of the Charter, see APPENDIX III.)

In keeping with this principle, the administering Members undertake, among other obligations, to develop self-government in the territories, taking into account the political aspirations of the people. In accordance with the provisions of Article 73e of the Charter, they also send information each year to the Secretary-General on the economic, social and educational conditions in the territories. Some administering Members also inform the General Assembly’s 24-member Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples about political and constitutional developments in the territories for which they are responsible. These, in 1965, included Australia, New Zealand, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States.

During 1965, information relating to 1964 was transmitted to the Secretary-General with respect to the following territories:

Australia: The Cocos (Keeling) Islands; Papua France: The New Hebrides (Condominium with United Kingdom)
New Zealand: The Cook Islands; Niue Island; the Tokelau Islands
Spain: Equatorial Guinea (Fernando Poo and Rio Muni); Ifni; Spanish Sahara

United Kingdom: Aden; Antigua; Bahamas; Barbados; Basutoland; Bechuanaland; Bermuda; British Guiana*; British Honduras; the British Virgin Islands; Brunei; the Cayman Islands; Dominica; the Falkland Islands; Fiji; Gibraltar; the Gilbert and Ellice Islands; Grenada; Hong Kong; Mauritius; Montserrat; the New Hebrides (Condominium with France); Pitcairn; St. Helena; St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla; St. Lucia; St. Vincent; the Seychelles; the Solomon Islands; Swaziland; the Turks and Caicos Islands

United States: American Samoa; Guam; the United States Virgin Islands

* British Guiana attained its independence as Guyana on 26 May 1966.

No information was transmitted on the territories under Portuguese administration, namely, Angola (including Cabinda), the Cape Verde Archipelago, Guinea (Portuguese), Macau and dependencies, Mozambique, Sao Tome and Principe and dependencies, and Timor (Portuguese) and dependencies. By resolution 1542 (XV) of 15 December 1960, the General Assembly considered that these were non-self-governing territories within the meaning of Chapter XI of the United Nations Charter. Nor was information transmitted by the Government of the United Kingdom on Southern Rhodesia, which, the General Assembly affirmed by resolution 1747 (XVI) of 28 June 1962, was a non-self-governing territory within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter.

STUDY OF INFORMATION TRANSMITTED BY ADMINISTERING MEMBERS

Up to 1963, the information transmitted by

1 For text, see Y.U.N., 1960, p. 513.