

THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES

During 1967, 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 in previous years.

The Special Committee held 89 plenary meetings between 9 February and 5 December 1967 (including 32 in Africa), during the course of which it examined and made recommendations on the implementation of the Declaration.

In the pages that follow, an account is given

of the Special Committee's work in general during 1967, and of the consideration of its report by the General Assembly. Following that, details are given of its consideration of, and recommendations on, individual territories.

Details of the action taken in 1967 by the General Assembly, the Special Committee of Twenty-four and other bodies on matters concerning Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa, the territories under Portuguese administration and Oman will be found elsewhere in this volume of the Yearbook (see pp. 99-119, 689-713, 713-25, and 269-72).

GENERAL ASPECTS

SYSTEM OF EXAMINATION

During 1967, 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 Peoples¹ 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 general and in individual territories, the order of priority being decided on the basis of recommendations made by its Working Group.

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 73 e of the United Nations Charter.²

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

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

² For text of Article 73 e of the Charter, see

Committee to participate in its examination of the territories concerned. 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 missions 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 Special 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, as well as on special questions which it has decided to take up separately. 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.

IMPLEMENTATION OF DECLARATION

CONSIDERATION BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE

In 1967, the Special Committee considered the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence with respect to the following territories: Aden, French Somaliland,³ Ifni, Spanish Sahara, territories under Portuguese Administration, Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa,⁴ Gibraltar, Fiji, Equatorial Guinea, Swaziland, Oman, Mauritius, Seychelles, St. Helena, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Pitcairn, Solomon Islands, New Hebrides, American Samoa, Guam, Niue, Tokelau Islands, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Trust Territory of Nauru, Papua and the Trust Territory of New Guinea, Cocos (Keeling) Islands, United States Virgin Islands, British Virgin Islands, Antigua,

Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Bermuda, Bahamas, Montserrat, Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands, and Falkland Islands (Malvinas).

In some cases, because of new developments, the Special Committee considered the situation in territories more than once. In other cases, because of lack of time, the Special Committee was unable to complete its consideration. Also, special studies were carried out on factors impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and the Committee continued to discharge the function, entrusted to it by the General Assembly in 1963, of examining information on Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter.

In its report to the General Assembly's twenty-second session, which opened on 19 September 1967, the Special Committee said that its session away from United Nations Headquarters had made it easier for representatives of national liberation movements to express their views and to acquaint the Committee with the progress of their struggle. Further, the Committee had been enabled to acquire more direct knowledge than would otherwise have been available to it of the realities of the situation in the African colonial territories, particularly those in southern Africa, and thus to strengthen its own capacity to assist the people in their efforts to achieve freedom and independence. The Committee had also been enabled to assess the extent to which the provisions of previous United Nations resolutions had been implemented and to recommend such additional measures as were necessary for the fulfilment of the Declaration.

The Special Committee stated in its report to the General Assembly that, at the outset of

³ The new name of the territory formerly known as French Somaliland is "French Territory of the Afars and the Issas." This designation was introduced in United Nations terminology as from 15 April 1968, at the request of the administering power.

⁴ On 12 June 1968, with the adoption of resolution 2372(XXII), the General Assembly proclaimed that South West Africa should henceforth be known as Namibia. As this edition of the Yearbook covers United Nations proceedings in the calendar year 1967, it consequently continues to refer to the area as South West Africa.

its meetings in 1967, it was aware that some constitutional progress had taken place in a few of the colonial territories to which the Declaration applied, and that Bechuanaland (Botswana), Basutoland (Lesotho) and Barbados, to which it had given close consideration in previous years, had acceded to independence during the latter part of 1966. However, many members had observed that these developments served only to intensify their regret at the continued delay in the complete and effective implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence. They had noted that although more than six years had passed since the adoption of that Declaration, many territories remained under colonial rule, some of them with little prospect of emancipation in the near future. Indeed, in disregard of the pertinent United Nations resolutions, the administering powers had persisted in their denial of the right of the people of these territories to self-determination and had in some instances extended their repressive policies. Many members had viewed this state of affairs as a serious threat to international peace and security. In this connexion, special concern was expressed regarding the situation in the colonial territories in southern Africa where the authorities concerned, supported by foreign economic and other interests, continued flagrantly to stifle the legitimate aspirations of the indigenous inhabitants to freedom and independence.

During 1967, the Special Committee noted that one territory, Aden (Southern Yemen) had attained its independence.

The Special Committee maintained its Working Group, which continued to make recommendations to it on the organization of work. It also maintained its Sub-Committee on Petitions which, in 1967, considered a total of 479 communications, 427 of which it circulated as petitions. These petitions included 36 requests for hearings, which the Sub-Committee recommended to the Special Committee for approval. The Special Committee also maintained its Sub-Committees I, II and III. Sub-Committees II and III were again responsible for considering and making recommendations to the Special Committee on small territories in the Pacific and Caribbean respectively, while Sub-Committee I was responsible for other small ter-

ritories and for special studies requested by the Special Committee.

The Special Committee held a further series of meetings away from United Nations Headquarters. At meetings held at Kinshasa (Democratic Republic of the Congo), Kitwe (Zambia) and Dar es Salaam (United Republic of Tanzania) between 29 May and 21 June 1967, the Special Committee heard petitioners and adopted resolutions concerning Southern Rhodesia, the territories under Portuguese Administration, South West Africa, and Mauritius, Seychelles and St. Helena.

On 20 June 1967, the Special Committee adopted a resolution relating to all the African colonial territories it had considered during its series of meetings in Africa. By this resolution, which reiterated various provisions of the General Assembly's resolution of 13 December 1966 concerning the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence,⁵ the Committee, *inter alia*, requested the Secretary-General to promote continuous and large-scale publicizing of the Declaration and the work of the Committee—including in particular the preparation, in consultation with the Committee, of publications covering the Committee's work at its session away from Headquarters—in order that world opinion might be sufficiently aware of the situation in the colonial territories and of the continuing struggle for liberation waged by colonial peoples.

As requested by the General Assembly on 13 December 1966, the Special Committee paid particular attention in 1967 to the situation of small territories with a view to enabling their populations to exercise fully their right to self-determination and independence. While recognizing that the small size and population of the territories, as well as their geographical location and limited resources, presented peculiar problems requiring special attention, the Special Committee expressed its firm opinion that the provisions of the Declaration on the granting of independence were fully applicable to them. Accordingly, the Special Committee requested the administering powers responsible for these territories to ensure that the peoples

⁵ See Y.U.N., 1966, pp. 558-60, text of resolution 2189(XXI).

concerned were enabled, in complete freedom and in full knowledge of the possibilities open to them in keeping with the Declaration, to express their wishes without delay concerning the future of their countries. The Committee also stressed the urgent need for measures to strengthen the economic infra-structure of these territories and to promote their social and economic development for the purpose of fostering federations. The Committee stated it had been deeply concerned by reports pointing to preparations for the use of a few of these territories for military purposes.

The Special Committee again laid special stress on the value of sending visiting missions to the small territories as a means of securing adequate information on conditions in the territories and on the views, wishes and aspirations of the people. Accordingly, the Committee had once again requested the administering powers to extend their full co-operation by permitting access to the territories under their administration. The Committee noted with regret that the responses of most of the administering powers to this request were either negative or qualified in character. The Committee, therefore, expressed the view that the General Assembly should again urge the administering powers to reconsider their attitudes. The Committee also stressed the importance and desirability of a United Nations presence during the procedures for the exercise of the right to self-determination.

Having regard to a General Assembly decision of 13 December 1966⁶ on the subject, the Special Committee decided to undertake a study of the activities of foreign economic and other interests which were impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and territories under Portuguese domination and in all other colonial territories. The study was made by the Special Committee's Sub-Committee I. The debate on the report submitted by Sub-Committee I and the conclusions and recommendations adopted by the Special Committee are summarized below (see pp. 634-41).

The Special Committee also decided to undertake a study of military activities and arrangements by colonial powers which might be impeding the implementation of the Declara-

tion in territories under their administration; it referred the item to Sub-Committee I, which subsequently reported that owing to the refusal of the administering powers to co-operate and in view of the lack of time and information available, it had decided to continue its consideration of this item at its next session. The Special Committee endorsed this decision of Sub-Committee I and agreed that, subject to any decision which the General Assembly might take at its twenty-second session later in 1967, it would continue consideration of the item at its next session.

Reservations concerning the Sub-Committee's report were expressed by Australia, Finland, Iran, Italy, the Ivory Coast, Madagascar, the United Kingdom, the United States and Uruguay. The representative of Venezuela said that his delegation had not entered any reservations on the report since it contained no conclusions. This did not mean, however, that Venezuela had altered its position on the question.

The Special Committee continued, in 1967, to consider the list of territories to which the Declaration was applicable. On 17 and 19 April 1967, it took up a report of its Working Group, which had referred to the main Committee the question of including Puerto Rico and the Comoro Archipelago in the list. The Working Group had discussed this question in 1966, at which time the Special Committee had agreed that the question required further detailed study at its next session. This decision had been endorsed subsequently by the General Assembly by its resolution of 13 December 1966 wherein it approved the action taken and envisaged for 1967 by the Special Committee with respect to the list of territories to which the Declaration applied.⁷

During the Special Committee's debate on the report, the representative of the United States said that in the 1948 general elections the people of Puerto Rico had voted unequivocally, by a vote of almost 6 to 1 for the party favouring commonwealth status over the party favouring independence, to become a commonwealth, or free state, associated with the United States. The Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico had come into force on 25 July 1952. Since

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

Puerto Rico had thereby achieved full self-government, the Government of the United States had concluded that it would no longer be appropriate to submit information on it under Article 73 e of the Charter and had duly informed the United Nations of that decision. On 27 November 1953, he continued, the General Assembly had adopted a resolution⁸ wherein it explicitly recognized that the people of Puerto Rico had effectively exercised their right to self-determination and stated that it was considered appropriate that the transmission of information under Article 73 e of the Charter should cease. Since the General Assembly itself had found that Puerto Rico was no longer a colonial or non-self-governing territory but a self-governing territory with a constitutional and international status chosen by the people themselves, it was difficult to understand how a subsidiary body of the General Assembly established to implement a declaration pertaining to colonial territories could inscribe Puerto Rico on its agenda. The question was one of the utmost importance since a proposal to inscribe Puerto Rico on the Special Committee's agenda would not only violate the basic rules and provisions of the United Nations Charter but would also constitute interference in a matter of direct concern to the United States and all its citizens, including those in Puerto Rico. The United States delegation therefore formally proposed that Puerto Rico should not be considered by the Special Committee.

The representative of Uruguay said that since the Assembly had decided that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico fell outside the category of colonial territories which had not attained independence, the Special Committee, being a subordinate organ, should therefore limit itself to stating its lack of competence in the matter.

The USSR representative maintained that the proposal to include the question on the Special Committee's agenda was well founded since it was based on the fact that the people of Puerto Rico were being deprived of the opportunity of exercising their inalienable right to self-determination, and that the island continued to be a colonial territory. The procedural argument put forward by Uruguay was invalid since the Special Committee had informed the Assembly of its decision to study the question of the in-

clusion of Puerto Rico and the Comoro Archipelago at its next session, and the General Assembly had endorsed that decision. The substantive argument put forward by the United States was also invalid. An analysis of the relevant documents and the present situation in the territory showed that the people had not been given the opportunity of deciding the question of their future and that Puerto Rico continued to be a dependent territory. It was clear that the United States Congress, in which Puerto Rico was not represented, continued to exercise legal control over that territory.

Furthermore, the USSR could not accept the argument that the merits of a decision previously adopted by the General Assembly could not be discussed. By adopting its resolution of 27 November 1953 (748(VIII)) the General Assembly had in essence adopted the point of view of the colonial power, which in creating the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico had trampled on the principle of the equality of human rights embodied in the Charter. The Committee should be guided by the Charter rather than by the above-mentioned resolution, which was contrary to the basic provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. Puerto Rico clearly came within the third category of territories mentioned in paragraph 5 of the Assembly's resolution of 14 December 1960 (1514(XV)) containing the Declaration on the granting of independence,⁹ and it was the duty of the Committee to include the question in its agenda.

Following further debate on the question, in which Bulgaria, Poland and the United Republic of Tanzania favoured discussion of the situation in the two territories in the Special Committee—to which the representatives of Australia, Italy, the United Kingdom and Venezuela were opposed—the Special Committee

⁸ See Y.U.N., 1953, p. 539, text of resolution 748(VIII).

⁹ Paragraph 5 of resolution 1514(XV) states:

"5. 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 powers 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."

decided, on the proposal of Syria, to adjourn the debate on the question *sine die*.

The Special Committee also had before it in 1967 an item concerning the implementation of resolutions of the General Assembly and the Special Committee by the specialized agencies and other international institutions. An account of the consideration of this item by the Special Committee and the General Assembly is set out below. (See pp. 629-33.)

The Special Committee continued to discharge the function entrusted to it by the General Assembly in 1963¹⁰ of examining information on non-self-governing territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter. (See also pp. 727-28.)

By the General Assembly's resolution of 13 December 1966, the Special Committee had also been requested to apprise the Security Council of developments in any territory examined by it which might threaten international peace and security and to make concrete suggestions which might assist the Security Council in considering appropriate measures under the Charter of the United Nations.

In accordance with this decision, the Special Committee, by a consensus adopted on 6 June 1967, transmitted to the President of the Security Council the records of its debates on the question of Southern Rhodesia, including the testimony submitted by the petitioners. In a resolution adopted on 9 June 1967, the Special Committee also made specific recommendations to the Council on this question (see pp. 106-07). On 20 June 1967, it drew the urgent attention of the Security Council to the continued deterioration of the situation in the territories under Portuguese administration, as well as to the consequences of the aggressive acts committed by Portugal against the independent African States that bordered the Portuguese colonies. The Special Committee made specific recommendations relating to the territories under Portuguese administration (see pp. 713-17), as well as to the colonial territories considered by it during its meetings away from United Nations Headquarters in 1967.

In 1967, the Special Committee also maintained close contact with the Trusteeship Council, with the United Nations Council for South

West Africa and with the specialized agencies. In addition, it continued its co-operation with the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the League of Arab States.

The Special Committee of Twenty-four also co-operated with the General Assembly's Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa by assisting the Secretary-General in arranging for a seminar on the problems of apartheid, racial discrimination and colonialism in southern Africa, which took place from 25 July to 4 August 1967 in Kitwe, Zambia. (For additional details, see pp. 119-23.)

CONSIDERATION BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY

GENERAL ASPECTS

General aspects of the question of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples were considered by the General Assembly at plenary meetings held between 11 and 16 December 1967.

The General Assembly had before it the report of its Special Committee of Twenty-four, covering its work in 1967. Chapters of the Special Committee's reports dealing with the situations in specific territories, with the exception of the chapter concerning South West Africa, were referred to the Fourth Committee.

Many representatives who spoke in the general debate on this item noted that seven years had passed since the adoption of the Declaration in 1960 and, while acknowledging that progress had been made—as witnessed by the number of former colonial territories that had attained independence and taken their places as members of the Organization—they felt that the situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration was far from satisfactory. The attainment of independence by the People's Republic of Southern Yemen and the impending independence of Nauru were, in this connexion, noted with satisfaction.

The representative of the USSR noted that there were still some 30 million people living

¹⁰ See Y.U.N., 1963, pp. 441-42, text of resolution 1970 (XVIII).

in Africa, Asia, South America and in the islands of the Pacific, Indian and Atlantic Oceans under colonial domination. He and other representatives, including those of Bulgaria, Poland and the Ukrainian SSR, believed that there had recently been an intensification of the opposition to decolonization, particularly in southern Africa. The United Kingdom, however, pointed out that in the seven years since the adoption of the Declaration, 19 former British colonies with a population of nearly 50 million had advanced to independence.

Special attention was paid by the speakers to the situation in southern Africa. The representative of the United Republic of Tanzania said that in Angola, Mozambique, Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and, indeed, in the Republic of South Africa, colonialism was inextricably linked with racism. The political systems there—which were based on racism and oppression—were controlled by the white minority, which also controlled the means of production and dominated economic and social life. The great majority of the people were deprived of their fundamental human and political rights and had been robbed of their land and mineral resources. There existed in the area an "unholy alliance" of the Portuguese settlers with the racist settlers of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, which was reinforced by powerful economic, financial and other interests profiting from the oppression of the African people and protected by the connivance of powerful nations outside Africa. The situation in southern Africa was explosive and demanded urgent United Nations action before it was too late.

This view of the situation in the area was shared by other Members, including Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Poland, the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and Sierra Leone.

Some of these Members accused Western powers, particularly those associated with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), of paying lip-service to anti-colonialism while at the same time extending support to the régimes by, among other things, increasing their investments there and thus contributing to the failure of United Nations efforts to put an end to colonialism in the area. The representative of the USSR, for example, said that the Federal

Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States were supporting the colonialist régimes and were planning to establish a military and economic complex to serve as a base from which to crush the national liberation movements in the territories and to apply pressure, in the interests of the foreign monopolies, against the independent African States. In the view of this group of Members, the Assembly should call for united and urgent action to end colonialism in southern Africa by seeking to enforce its decisions calling for the elimination of all support for the colonial régimes, and for the unequivocal recognition of the legitimacy of the struggle of the oppressed people.

These Members and others, including the Democratic Republic of the Congo, also felt that the specialized agencies of the United Nations had a duty to assist the colonial peoples in their struggle. They therefore welcomed the new item on this subject that had been included in the agenda of the Assembly. (See following section.)

The representative of the United Kingdom agreed with the United Republic of Tanzania on the gravity of the problem in southern Africa but believed that the United Nations should endeavour to take action within its capacity, and not attempt to do too much too soon or to delude itself by thinking that empty resolutions were a substitute for effective action. The problems of southern Africa, he said, were not colonial but racial and it would not help in finding solutions if the distinction were not made between colonialism, which was near its end, and racial domination, which continued to be the greatest menace among all the dangers of the world.

A number of delegations expressed satisfaction with the work done by the Special Committee of Twenty-four in making a study of the activities of the foreign economic and other interests in colonial territories. This study, according to the representative of Czechoslovakia, among others, provided ample evidence of the ways in which these foreign monopolies were impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence. (For additional details, see below.)

Many Members also believed that the United

Nations should pay particular attention to the problem of small territories. The representative of the United Republic of Tanzania emphasized that whatever solution was found should be in accordance with the principles of the Declaration on the granting of independence. Madagascar and the Philippines stressed the importance of explaining to the people of the small territories the possibilities which were open to them, so that they could express themselves freely on their future status.

Czechoslovakia and the USSR were among those which said that the administering powers were transforming the small territories into a system of military bases and strategic points from which they did not intend to leave voluntarily. The Assembly should demand that the administering powers dismantle their bases and refrain from establishing new ones.

Other Members, however, were of a different view. The Philippines, for instance, stated that the questions of decolonization and disarmament were separate ones and that military bases fell within the concept of decolonization only when there was clear proof that particular bases were being used by the administering powers to suppress the aspirations of the people to self-determination and independence. A general provision calling for the removal of all military bases from dependent territories, however, fell within the concept of disarmament.

Almost all Members emphasized the importance of visiting missions from the United Nations to dependent territories and urged the administering powers to reconsider their present positions and co-operate with the Special Committee by facilitating such visits.

The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, commenting—as did others—on the series of meetings the Special Committee had held away from Headquarters, said they had enabled the oppressed peoples to make themselves heard directly and had made it possible for them to give the Special Committee a clear picture of the way in which the United Nations resolutions were being implemented.

Also discussed was the need to publicize the work of the United Nations in the field of decolonization so as to inform world public opinion of the situation with regard to the

colonial territories and of the progress of the national liberation movements. This was emphasized by Hungary, among others.

Many delegations addressed themselves to the question of how the Special Committee might best carry out its work in the forthcoming year. The representatives of Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland and the USSR, among others, suggested that the Special Committee might attempt an analysis of some of the most important topics involved in decolonization, in similar fashion to the way in which it had studied the foreign economic interests that were impeding the implementation of the Declaration. The representative of Czechoslovakia suggested that the Special Committee might examine the implementation of the resolutions already adopted in the United Nations on the question of decolonization. Such an examination, he said, would be conducive to an analysis of the factors impeding the implementation of those resolutions.

On 15 December 1967, the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania—the Chairman of the Special Committee of Twenty-four—introduced a draft resolution which, after having been revised by its 38 sponsors, was adopted on 16 December 1967 by the General Assembly by 86 votes to 6, with 17 abstentions, as resolution 2326(XXII). Separate votes were taken on a number of paragraphs as indicated below.

By one of the preambular paragraphs of this resolution the General Assembly deplored the negative attitude of certain powers which refused to recognize the right of colonial peoples to self-determination, freedom and independence and, in particular, the intransigence of the Government of Portugal which, in defiance of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, persisted in perpetuating its oppressive foreign domination, and of the Government of South Africa, which flagrantly repudiated the validity of General Assembly resolutions adopted in 1960 and 1967 concerning South West Africa. (This paragraph was adopted by 90 votes to 2, with 13 abstentions.)

By the operative part of the resolution, the General Assembly approved the report of the Special Committee covering its work during 1967 and urged the administering powers to give effect to the recommendations contained

DECLARATION ON INDEPENDENCE FOR COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES 627

therein and to take all other necessary steps for the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence and the relevant United Nations resolutions. (This paragraph was adopted by 79 votes to 2, with 27 abstentions.)

The Assembly also approved the programme of work envisaged by the Special Committee during 1968, including the sending of visiting missions, the study of military activities and arrangements by colonial powers, in territories under their administration, which might be impeding the implementation of the Declaration, and the review of the list of territories to which the Declaration applied. (The words "the study of military activities" were adopted by 75 votes to 8, with 22 abstentions; the paragraph as a whole was adopted by 90 votes to 3, with 15 abstentions.)

By another operative paragraph, the General Assembly reiterated its declaration that the continuation of colonial rule threatened international peace and security, and that the practice of apartheid and all forms of racial discrimination constituted a crime against humanity. It reaffirmed the legitimacy of the struggle of the colonial peoples to exercise their right to self-determination and independence and urged all States to provide moral and material assistance to them. It requested the appropriate international organizations and institutions to increase their economic, social and humanitarian assistance to the refugees from territories under colonial domination.

The General Assembly requested all States, directly and through action in the respective international institutions, to withhold assistance of any kind from the Governments of Portugal and South Africa and from the illegal racist minority régime of Southern Rhodesia until they renounced their policy of colonial domination and racial discrimination. It drew the attention of all States to the grave consequences of the development in southern Africa of the entente between the Governments of South Africa and Portugal and the illegal racist minority régime of Southern Rhodesia, the activities of which ran counter to the interests of international peace and security, and called upon all States, particularly the main trading partners of the

entente, to withhold any support or assistance to the members of the entente. (The above two provisions were adopted by 80 votes to 8, with 22 abstentions.)

By yet another operative paragraph of the resolution, the General Assembly requested the colonial powers to dismantle their military bases and installations in colonial territories, and to refrain from establishing new ones and from using those that still existed to interfere with the liberation of the peoples in colonial territories. (This provision was adopted by 72 votes to 22, with 14 abstentions.) It condemned the policies, pursued by certain administering powers in the territories under their domination, of imposing non-representative régimes and constitutions, strengthening the position of foreign economic and other interests, misleading world public opinion and encouraging the systematic influx of foreign immigrants while displacing, deporting and transferring the indigenous inhabitants to other areas, and it called upon those powers to resist from such manoeuvres.

The General Assembly, in addition, requested the Special Committee to continue to perform its tasks. It also requested the Committee to make concrete suggestions with a view to assisting the Security Council in considering appropriate measures under the Charter of the United Nations with regard to developments in colonial territories which were likely to threaten international peace and security. (The provision to this effect was adopted by 84 votes to 2, with 24 abstentions.)

The Assembly invited the Special Committee, whenever it considered it appropriate, to recommend a deadline for the accession to independence of each territory in accordance with the wishes of the people and the provisions of the Declaration on the granting of independence. It further invited the Special Committee to pay particular attention to the small territories and to recommend to the General Assembly the most appropriate methods and also the steps to be taken to enable the populations of those territories to exercise fully their right to self-determination and independence. The Assembly urged the administering powers to co-operate with the Special Committee by permitting access to the colonial territories by visiting missions, in

accordance with decisions previously taken by the Assembly and by the Special Committee.

Finally, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to take concrete measures through all the media at his disposal in order to promote the widespread and continuous publicizing of the work of the United Nations in the field of decolonization, of the situation in the colonial territories and of the continuing struggle for liberation being waged by the colonial peoples. It also requested the administering powers to co-operate with the Secretary-General in promoting the large-scale dissemination of information on the work of the United Nations in the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence.

(For text of resolution, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

The sponsors of the resolution were: Algeria, Burundi, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Cyprus, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iraq, the Ivory Coast, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, the United Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

Various Members spoke in explanation of vote. The representative of Portugal said that his delegation rejected the provisions of the resolution since they were divorced from fact and reality. The references in the debate to the Portuguese way of life in the context of racial discrimination could arise only from blind partisanship, since the whole world knew that the pattern of Portuguese social life was truly non-racial. Furthermore, the allegations concerning the "unholy alliance" in southern Africa in which Portugal was supposed to be involved and those concerning the heavily fortified military bases being constructed in Angola and Mozambique required emphatic denial.

The United Kingdom said that while there were parts of the resolution with which it disagreed and other parts which it could not support, its vote should not be interpreted as a vote against decolonization.

Chile did not believe that the Special Committee was the most appropriate body to study

military activities and it had therefore abstained in the vote on that paragraph. Also, while it had no doubts that the continuation of colonial rule was a threat to peace and security, it would have preferred that such a statement be reserved for the Security Council, since that was the body charged with the determination of such questions.

The representative of Mexico said that because the resolution contained a number of paragraphs about which his delegation had previously found it necessary to reserve its position, it had not been possible to support the resolution. However, since the motives of the sponsors and the general objectives were so praiseworthy, Mexico had not voted against the resolution.

The representative of South Africa said that his delegation had voted against the resolution since, in so far as it pertained to his country, it was based on fabrications and distortions of the aims and objectives of his Government. He denied that there was an alliance between the countries of southern Africa in the sense that the Assembly implied in the resolution. There was, however, co-operation in the sense in which the term was used in the United Nations Charter. He also rejected the claim that apartheid constituted a crime against humanity. Finally, he recalled the reasons why his Government regarded the Assembly's decisions of 1966 and 1967 concerning South West Africa to be illegal and said his Government would continue to administer the territory in the spirit of the Mandate until the peoples of the territory, by the exercise of their right to self-determination, decided their own future.

The USSR representative said that although his delegation had voted for the resolution it did not consider the text adequate in some aspects. The resolution did not specifically name the colonial powers whose policies and practices were impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence. He then drew attention to the fact that Australia, New Zealand, Portugal, South Africa, the United Kingdom and the United States had voted against the resolution as a whole. These delegations and the others which had voted with them, he said, had thus facilitated the question of identifying those opposed to the

removal of military bases and their use for purposes contrary to the legitimate rights of the people of the colonial territories.

IMPLEMENTATION OF DECLARATION BY
SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND OTHER
INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

The Special Committee of Twenty-four, which in 1966 had initiated a study of the implementation of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Special Committee by the specialized agencies and other international institutions, continued its consideration of this question during 1967. At the request of Bulgaria, the General Assembly inscribed an item on the agenda of its twenty-second session entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations."

In the explanatory memorandum attached to his letter of 28 September 1967, the Permanent Representative of Bulgaria drew attention to a number of resolutions concerning the implementation of the Declaration which called upon United Nations Member States, the organs of the United Nations, the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations to take various measures in assisting the process of decolonization. In spite of these appeals, he stated, only a few of the specialized agencies and international institutions had actively participated in assisting the process of decolonization. Some guidelines were needed to enable them to play a full part, and a discussion of the question would enable the General Assembly to make recommendations.

During its consideration of the question in 1967, the Special Committee examined notes prepared by the Secretariat concerning: (a) action taken by the specialized agencies and international institutions in response to requests addressed to them by the General Assembly and the Special Committee in 1966 and 1967; and (b) measures taken to extend assistance to refugees from Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (called Portuguese Guinea) by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the specialized agencies concerned and other inter-

national relief organizations in response to a resolution adopted by the Special Committee on 22 June 1966.

In October 1967, the Special Committee decided to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the notes prepared for it by the Secretariat, as well as to the report by the Secretary-General on his consultations with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (see pp. 86-88).

General Assembly discussion of this question was held mainly in the Assembly's Fourth Committee. The representative of Bulgaria, opening the debate, said that the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations could play a role of prime importance in the process of decolonization. He regretted to note, however, that the generous assistance provided by international agencies did not go to help the peoples who had most need of it—namely, the peoples in countries still under colonial domination. This state of affairs existed despite the attempts made by the General Assembly and the Special Committee of Twenty-four to enlist the support and assistance of those agencies.

In its Declaration on the granting of independence adopted on 14 December 1960,¹¹ the General Assembly had said that "the continued existence of colonialism prevents the development of international economic co-operation, impedes the social, cultural and economic development of dependent peoples and militates against the United Nations ideal of universal peace." It therefore followed, the Bulgarian representative argued, that all the organizations of the United Nations and all the agencies should contribute in their activities towards bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations. Moreover, the idea that the specialized agencies and international institutions closely related to the United Nations should apply the policies and decisions of the United Nations in economic, educational and scientific matters had been developed in several articles of the Charter. Thus, Article 57 of the United Nations Charter provided that the specialized agencies were to be brought into relationship with the United Nations in accord-

¹¹ See footnote 1.

ance with Article 63 which, in turn, provided for agreements between the Economic and Social Council and the agencies which would be subject to approval by the General Assembly. Article 58 reserved to the Organization the right to make recommendations for the co-ordination of the policies and activities of the specialized agencies. In principle, therefore, the United Nations and its organs made recommendations to the specialized agencies and co-ordinated their activities under the agreements concluded with the specialized agencies in pursuance of Article 63 of the Charter.¹² These agreements included articles concerning the power of the United Nations to make recommendations. Such a provision was included, for instance, in the agreement between the United Nations and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). These same agreements also explicitly mentioned co-operation in the implementation of Chapter XI of the Charter, which implied a duty to assist peoples under foreign domination.

The adoption in 1960 of the Declaration on the granting of independence, the Bulgarian representative continued, had placed new emphasis on the specialized agencies' obligations to the non-self-governing peoples, and in recent years the Assembly had made specific recommendations to the specialized agencies for assistance. Some of the agencies, such as the International Labour Organisation (ILO), the World Health Organization (WHO) and UNESCO had made efforts in this direction. Others had merely taken note of the request, while a third group had paid no attention to the policy and decisions of the United Nations on the subject. In particular, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund had continued to grant loans to Portugal and South Africa and thus to prejudice the cause of the peoples under the domination of those two countries.

Bulgaria felt that a thorough discussion of the problem as a whole would enable the General Assembly to decide upon suitable measures and to make more specific recommendations which would facilitate the work of the specialized agencies and the international institutions so that they could actively assist the national

liberation movements and the whole process of decolonization.

To this end, Bulgaria proposed the following for the consideration of the General Assembly: (1) the General Assembly should state that the specialized agencies and international institutions should lend their full co-operation in the realization of the objectives of the Assembly's resolution of 14 December 1960 on the granting of independence; (2) an appeal should be made to all agencies and institutions concerned to take adequate steps as a matter of urgency to assist the colonial peoples; (3) the Assembly might reiterate its request that assistance to those peoples of southern Africa should be rendered in co-operation with the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the national liberation movements; (4) an urgent request should be made that in future no organization affiliated with the United Nations should give any assistance whatsoever to the racist and colonial régimes in southern Africa; (5) an appeal should be made to the Governments of all States members of the specialized agencies to encourage them in the implementation of the pertinent resolutions of the General Assembly; (6) the Economic and Social Council should be requested to provide adequate measures to support the specialized agencies in carrying out their tasks; and (7) the Secretary-General should be requested to assist the specialized agencies and to submit a report on implementation to the General Assembly at its twenty-third (1968) session.

Members taking part in the debate, including Algeria, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ghana, Hungary, India, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Syria, the USSR, the United Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania and Yugoslavia, welcomed the initiative by Bulgaria in proposing the inclusion of the item in the agenda. They also supported the arguments developed by the representative of Bulgaria and the suggestions he had made. They emphasized that the agencies should deny assistance to the colonial régimes in southern Africa and increase their assistance to the colonial peoples.

¹² For text of Charter articles referred to herein, see APPENDIX II.

The representative of New Zealand said that in his Government's view the burden of implementing the Declaration rested with the administering powers, not with the specialized agencies, although they certainly had a role in helping to promote conditions that would speed decolonization. The specialized agencies had been extending such assistance before the adoption of the Declaration and had continued to do so. His delegation would be happy to support an appeal to them to increase their assistance but would be reluctant to see them denied a role in the territories of southern Africa under minority rule.

Portugal observed that the specialized agencies were being asked to adopt measures against States which, it had been asserted, had not implemented the Declaration on the granting of independence contained in the General Assembly's resolution of 14 December 1960. Portugal questioned the outcome if a precedent was established for requesting the specialized agencies to adopt measures against States which did not implement resolutions. The United Nations should refrain from making recommendations of a political nature which could hamper the technical activities of the agencies.

The representative of Argentina said that it was important not to generalize or assume that the relations of all the agencies with the United Nations were the same. Neither the United Nations nor the specialized agencies could reciprocally claim other rights and obligations beyond those set forth in the individual agreements. An examination of the agreements distinguished three types of relations. First, there was a very close relationship by which the agency concerned had agreed to submit the recommendations of the United Nations to its governing body and to report on the steps taken to comply with those recommendations. UNESCO, ILO, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), WHO and the Universal Postal Union (UPU) fell within this category. Second, there was the relationship laid down in the agreements with four agencies of a special nature: the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Finance Corpora-

tion and the International Development Association. Under these agreements the agencies were not bound to comply with the recommendations of the United Nations in questions of loans and the terms and conditions of financing, but the United Nations was competent to make recommendations on the technical aspects of plans. However, there were interpretations of these agreements referring to the prohibition of intervention in political affairs which were irreconcilable. One might ask whether these agencies could go beyond the political orientations of the United Nations; on that subject he believed it was incumbent on Member States to be responsible for observing the political orientations of the United Nations. Third, there was the category of entities such as the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) which dealt with questions of security and had a direct link with the Security Council. In the light of these considerations Argentina considered that while it was possible for the General Assembly to make recommendations to the specialized agencies and international institutions, those recommendations must be of a general nature and in keeping with the terms of the agreements approved by the General Assembly.

Norway's representative pointed out that for many years competent United Nations bodies had exercised their power to make specific recommendations to the specialized agencies with great restraint. The appeals made to them in recent years had led in some cases to positive results but in other cases questions of principle had been raised. It was therefore time to consider questions of principle concerning the relationship between the United Nations and the specialized agencies. He drew to attention that that relationship was already being considered by another Committee of the Assembly—namely, the Enlarged Committee for Programme and Co-ordination established in 1966. The latter body had reported to the Economic and Social Council and the Assembly that the first topics it would consider were the constitutional, legal and organizational issues, including the relations of the specialized agencies and other organizations with the United Nations, the adequacy of the agreements between them and the autonomy of each organization. His delegation

was concerned lest any decision of substance adopted by the Fourth Committee and the General Assembly might be understood as one which would affect the issue of principle or prejudice any subsequent consideration of that issue. Norway also felt that it would be premature to take any specific stand on the constitutional question of the relationship between the United Nations and the specialized agencies and other institutions since delegations had not had time to prepare for it.

Speaking in reply, the representative of Bulgaria said he could not deny that there were differences among the agreements concluded with the specialized agencies, but he fully supported the position of the Secretary-General who, in his report to the General Assembly on his consultations with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, had said that it was "incongruous" that the International Bank would grant loans to Portugal when the whole international community had condemned that country's colonial aims. He did not agree with the representative of Norway that a consideration of the question would prejudice the work of other United Nations bodies in that field. On the contrary, it was all the more important for the Fourth Committee and the Special Committee of Twenty-four, which dealt with decolonization, to state their positions to the other organs which dealt with the wider problems of the relations between the specialized agencies and the United Nations.

At the conclusion of the debate, representatives of several specialized agencies made statements. The representative of UNESCO drew attention to the latest resolution adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO relating to the liquidation of colonialism which, he said, was the logical continuation of resolutions and action taken during the previous six years. The representative of WHO recalled a number of decisions taken recently by the World Health Assembly, including its decision to suspend Portugal's right to participate in the WHO Regional Committee for Africa until it had shown proof of its willingness, to conform to the injunctions of the United Nations, and to suspend all technical assistance to Portugal in implementation of the General Assembly's decision of 21 December 1965.¹³ The representa-

tive of ILO also described action which his organization had taken in line with the decisions of the General Assembly. The representative of the International Bank reiterated the statement by the President of the Bank to the Secretary-General of the United Nations in which he expressed the earnest desire of the Bank to co-operate with the United Nations to the extent consistent with its Articles of Agreement. FAO's representative said that FAO was ready at all times to co-operate. He added that since the 116 members of FAO represented almost the same membership as the General Assembly of the United Nations it was reasonable to conclude that the FAO Conference would establish policy guidelines broadly similar to those established by the General Assembly.

On 11 December, the Fourth Committee approved a 40-power draft resolution by a roll-call vote of 83 to 2, with 17 abstentions. Separate votes were taken on two operative paragraphs as indicated below.

On 14 December, the text was adopted at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly by a recorded vote of 81 to 2, with 18 abstentions, as resolution 2311 (XXII). The same two operative paragraphs voted on separately in the Fourth Committee were adopted by separate recorded votes in the Assembly's plenary meeting as detailed below.

By the operative part of this resolution, the Assembly recognized that the specialized agencies, the International Atomic Energy Agency and the international institutions associated with the United Nations should extend their full co-operation to the United Nations in achieving the objectives of the General Assembly's resolution of 14 December 1960 on the granting of independence and expressed its appreciation to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and to the specialized agencies which had co-operated with the United Nations in seeking to implement the relevant resolutions of the Assembly.

The Assembly recommended that the specialized agencies and international institutions concerned take urgent and effective measures to assist the peoples struggling for their liberation

¹³ See Y.U.N., 1965, pp. 614-15, text of resolution 2107(XX).

from colonial rule, and in particular to extend, within the scope of their respective activities, all necessary aid to the oppressed peoples of Southern Rhodesia and the territories under Portuguese domination and to work out, in co-operation with the Organization of African Unity and, through it, with the national liberation movements, concrete programmes to this end. (The paragraph to this effect was approved by the Fourth Committee by a separate roll-call vote of 68 to 7, with 23 abstentions, and adopted by the Assembly by a separate recorded vote of 63 to 7, with 24 abstentions.)

The General Assembly further recommended that the specialized agencies and international institutions not grant any assistance to South Africa and Portugal until they renounced their policy of racial discrimination and colonial domination. (The paragraph to this effect was approved by the Fourth Committee by a separate roll-call vote of 68 to 7, with 25 abstentions, and adopted by the Assembly by a separate recorded vote of 66 to 7, with 27 abstentions.)

The Assembly also requested all States, directly and through action in the specialized agencies and international institutions of which they were members, to facilitate the implementation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly; it requested the Economic and Social Council to consider, in consultation with the Special Committee of Twenty-four, appropriate measures for the co-ordination of the policies and activities of the specialized agencies in implementing the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly. It also requested the Secretary-General to assist the specialized agencies and the international institutions concerned in working out appropriate measures to implement the relevant resolutions and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its twenty-third (1968) session. Finally, the Assembly requested the Special Committee of Twenty-four to examine the question and to report to the General Assembly at its twenty-third session.

(For text of resolution, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

The sponsors of the resolution in the Fourth Committee, were: Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo (Brazzaville), the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Ghana,

Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, the United Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

Sweden, explaining its abstention in the vote on the resolution, said that legal and administrative problems had been raised, some of which would be discussed by the Enlarged Committee for Programme and Co-ordination. Sweden did not wish to take a definite stand on the questions raised in the draft resolution until the result of that and other studies were made.

Explaining his negative vote, the representative of South Africa said that the resolution virtually directed the General Assembly to compel the specialized agencies to take political considerations rather than technical criteria into account in deciding on requests for assistance and, in some cases, to act in violation of their constitutions.

With regard to the operative paragraphs voted on separately, which contained recommendations to the specialized agencies concerning the granting and withholding of assistance (see above), the representatives of Argentina, Greece, Mexico, Uruguay and Venezuela said that although they had abstained on these paragraphs, they had voted for the draft resolution as a whole because it was directed towards the elimination of colonialism. The United States explained that it had abstained on the draft resolution as a whole because it had serious reservations, in particular about the paragraphs voted on separately, which contained provisions inconsistent not only with the agreements between the United Nations and the agencies but with the basic instruments governing the activities of several agencies.

Ceylon said it had voted in favour in the separate votes and for the draft resolution as a whole because it regarded the resolution as providing guidelines for the consideration of the specialized agencies alongside their respective basic instruments. The resolution could not be regarded as giving directives to the agencies, in Ceylon's view.

ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN
ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS

CONSIDERATION BY
SPECIAL COMMITTEE

In September 1967, 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 considered a report by its Sub-Committee I on the activities of foreign economic and other interests impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa, the territories under Portuguese administration, Fiji, Mauritius, Papua and New Guinea and the Bahamas. The Sub-Committee presented conclusions and recommendations, and it annexed to the report the background papers which it had used and excerpts from statements of petitioners.

The Sub-Committee stated it had found that:

(a) With the support and encouragement of the colonial powers, foreign economic and other interests not only dominated the economies of Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and the territories under Portuguese administration but controlled all the major sectors of production in these and other colonial territories.

(b) The foreign interests in the territories had a close relationship with influential international financial groups. While it was in southern Africa, which was the last stronghold of colonialism, that the activities of groups of predominantly South African, United Kingdom, United States and Belgian nationality, together with growing interests from France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy and Japan, most clearly showed their characteristic features, in other colonial territories foreign economic activities followed the same pattern and were similarly linked to the international market.

(c) The foreign interests and the colonial governments were linked by a system, of mutual benefit; through concessions and privileges provided by the colonial governments, cheap labour made available by the discriminatory legislation and practices and the denial of legitimate indigenous trade union activities, foreign interests exploited the natural and human resources in the

territories with the sole aim of amassing profits, and at the same time the colonial governments shared in the profits, which were used to further their colonial domination and suppression of the peoples.

(d) By their control of the major resources and the concentrated exploitation of mineral and agricultural production solely for export to world markets, foreign economic interests operated without concern for the balanced economic development of the territories where they had contributed to the stagnation of the traditional sector of the economy and had furthered the impoverishment of the great majority of the indigenous people. Foreign economic interests therefore shared responsibility with the colonial powers for the sufferings of the colonial people.

(e) In contradiction to the recommendation; of the General Assembly, foreign economic activities in the territories in southern Africa and all other colonial territories had not withdrawn but, on the contrary, had continued their expansion and consolidation and were speeding up the processes of exploitation which deprived the people of the natural resources needed for a viable independence. What was even more serious was that, as past experience had shown, these close relationships established at this stage of the evolution of the colonial territories not only impeded independence but affected, as well, the future of these territories.

(f) The countries having the largest foreign interests in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and Angola and Mozambique were the same countries which were providing support to the illegal Southern Rhodesia régime in its defiance of international sanctions, to the South African Government in its expansion of apartheid policies throughout southern Africa, and to the Portuguese Government in its suppression of the national liberation movements to retain its domination in its territories in Africa. It was therefore evident that through their economic activities in the colonial territories foreign interests contributed to the threat to international peace and security by impeding the independence of the colonial peoples.

(g) It was of the utmost urgency that every effort should be made to ensure the full and rapid implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries

and Peoples¹⁴ in all the territories where anachronistic colonialism continued to deny the people their right to freedom and self-determination.

The Sub-Committee also considered that, in view of the common characteristic features of foreign interests in southern Africa as well as in all other colonial territories, the Special Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it: (a) reaffirm the inalienable right of the peoples of the territories over their natural resources and their right to enjoy the benefits thereof; (b) strongly condemn the policies of the colonial powers which deprived the colonial peoples of these rights; (c) condemn the colonial governments for supporting and promoting foreign economic activities which exploited the natural and human resources of the territories without regard to their need for balanced economic development; (d) draw the attention of the colonial powers to the fact that, so long as the people of the territories were denied full political rights and participation in a government of their own choice, concessions to foreign economic and other interests in disregard of the interests of the people ran counter to the recommendations of the General Assembly and were a violation of the provisions of the Charter, especially those of Article 73 which affirmed the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of the non-self-governing territories were paramount; (e) call upon the colonial powers to put a stop to all discriminatory measures affecting the use and enjoyment of the natural resources, including in particular land ownership and settlement, and to halt all measures aimed at granting concessions to foreign companies, establishing more European immigrants and foreign interests in the territories to perpetuate colonial and economic domination; (f) strongly condemn the present activities and operating methods of foreign economic interests aimed solely at amassing large profits; (g) express concern that foreign economic interests were directly and indirectly assisting colonial powers to continue their domination; (h) appeal to the Governments of the United Kingdom, the United States, Belgium, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and other powers to take legislative, administrative and other measures with respect to their nationals who owned and operated enterprises in the colonial

territories, and particularly in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and the territories under Portuguese administration, so as to put an end to their activities which were detrimental to the interests of the inhabitants of the territories; (i) request the United Nations Council for South West Africa urgently to consider measures for ending the activities of foreign economic and other interests in South West Africa, and especially the illegal activities of South Africa; (j) appeal to all States to put a stop to all forms of assistance and the sale of arms and ammunition, through whatever channels, which were intended for (i) the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia, (ii) the Government of South Africa, and (iii) the Government of Portugal, so long as they continued their present policy of colonial domination in Africa; (k) appeal to all the specialized agencies of the United Nations, and in particular to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund, and request them to withhold from South Africa, Portugal and the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia any further financial, economic or technical assistance so long as they continued their policies of apartheid, colonialism and racial discrimination; (l) urge all Member States to co-operate with the United Nations in rapidly implementing the Declaration on the granting of independence; (m) request the Secretary-General to give the widest possible publicity to the information on the role of foreign economic and other interests in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa, the territories under Portuguese administration and all other colonial territories, and to the conclusions and recommendations adopted; and (n) retain the question of foreign economic and other activities on the agenda of the Assembly's twenty-third session.

During the discussions in the Special Committee of Twenty-four, several members said the Sub-Committee's report was unacceptable to them because of its generalizations and oversimplifications. Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States considered that the report was based on preconceived theoretical concepts and did not give an accurate picture of the situation in the respective territories for which

¹⁴ See footnote 1.

they were responsible. They considered that there was no evidence to support the theory that the presence of foreign economic interests impeded decolonization. In most cases the territories needed foreign capital to develop their natural resources and, as conditions in the territories differed widely, a careful analysis was needed to distinguish between investments which were beneficial and met with the aspirations of the people and those which were detrimental.

The representative of the United Kingdom pointed out that in the territories under United Kingdom administration foreign investments were carefully controlled in the interests of the territories themselves. In his view, which was supported by Finland and Italy, there was no evidence to support the theory that the presence of foreign economic interests impeded the colonial peoples' progress towards independence. It was the peoples' political will to independence which was the determining factor in the decolonization process. Australia and the United States both considered that the Sub-Committee's information had been inadequate; for instance, there was no information on wage trends, cost of living indices, policies of the administering powers. Furthermore, as the subject was a highly complex one, the information available should have been studied and interpreted by qualified experts. The United States representative objected to the tendentious and doctrinaire terminology of the report as well as its substance, and he wondered how the Sub-Committee had arrived at such sweeping generalizations on the economic activities of foreign companies in all dependent territories when it had studied only eight territories.

Australia maintained that the Sub-Committee's report did not satisfy the normal criteria of economic analysis and research, as, for example, it had not touched upon the experience of independent countries whose problems were similar.

The representative of Italy, who shared many of these views and who reserved his position, said that the effort to apply generalizations to the largest possible number of countries about the effects of the activities of a few foreign interests was self-defeating and could only harm the decolonization process. Also, the report seemed to seek to prove that the colonial prob-

lem was essentially economic. In Italy's view that was not the case; the colonial problem was above all a political problem.

Finland maintained the reservations concerning the report which it had expressed in the Sub-Committee.

Several members of the Special Committee, while supporting the report as a whole, expressed some doubts on points of detail. The representatives of Madagascar and the Ivory Coast felt that it would have been better to avoid systematic generalizations and to have gone into much more detail on some points. The representative of Venezuela felt that a more thorough analysis of the subject was needed, while the representative of Uruguay said that the Sub-Committee's condemnation should have been restricted to specific facts proving that foreign investments were impeding independence. His delegation could not accept any false generalizations. The representative of Chile said that the situation would have been more accurately reflected if the Sub-Committee had dealt with each territory separately.

Other representatives expressed surprise at the strong criticisms of the report voiced by the administering powers since, they said, the negative effects of foreign economic interests in colonial territories were well known. It was in these territories that foreign interests had special privileges and in their own interests supported the colonial governments. Syria and Yugoslavia, among others, said that despite their criticisms, the administering powers had not put forward specific facts to refute the Sub-Committee's report. Ethiopia commented that the report did not condemn all foreign investments, as the representative of an administering power had implied. In fact, foreign investments, as such, were encouraged by the developing countries. What was intolerable was the use of certain methods, as for example when enterprises financed by foreign capital helped to perpetuate a political climate contrary to the aspirations of the population or when, under the guise of foreign investment, territories were exploited without the population deriving any appreciable benefit.

Replying to the charge that the Sub-Committee had not taken into account the beneficial effects of foreign investments, several represen-

tatives, including the spokesman of the United Republic of Tanzania, recalled that the Sub-Committee had been asked specially to study activities impeding independence. It was also pointed out, by the representatives of India and the Ivory Coast, among others, that the benefits which the indigenous population derived from foreign economic activities were in most cases incidental, as the main goal of those interests was to amass profits.

The representative of Syria, also defending the report, suggested that in considering the activities of foreign economic interests it was necessary to ask whether the indigenous inhabitants were thereby being helped to prepare for independence; whether their incomes were such as to enable them to promote the economic and technical development of their country; and whether the economic policy of the administering power aimed to ensure the welfare of the indigenous inhabitants or was centred on making maximum profits.

The representative of the USSR said that the Western powers, being unable to refute the Sub-Committee's conclusions concerning the role of foreign monopolies in colonial territories, were evading the main issue and quibbling over minor points in an effort to make it appear that the report was not based on fact. He considered the Sub-Committee justified in concluding that foreign economic interests in colonial territories had certain common features. He cited profit figures and said these profits were obtained through merciless exploitation of cheap labour and utilization of cheap raw materials. The profits obtained were not used to the advantage of the indigenous population, whose economy was kept at a primitive level. Moreover, the activities of the foreign economic interests had an adverse effect on the political, economic and social conditions of the indigenous population; in order to preserve their position, the foreign monopolies condemned the peoples of colonial territories to political injustice, depriving them of electoral rights, trade union rights and the right to education and public health. The entire machinery of colonial exploitation was supported not only by the state structure but also by the military forces maintained in colonial territories.

On 18 October, the Special Committee endorsed the Sub-Committee's conclusions and

recommendations by a roll-call vote of 19 to 3, with 2 abstentions.

CONSIDERATION BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY

In accordance with the General Assembly's decision of 13 December 1966¹⁵ an item entitled "Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and Territories under Portuguese domination and in all other Territories under colonial domination" was included in the provisional agenda of the twenty-second session. In September 1967, the General Assembly agreed to a recommendation by its General Committee to include the item in its agenda with the following revised wording: "Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and Territories under Portuguese domination and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa." This item was allocated to the Fourth Committee for consideration and report.

During the consideration of the item at the twenty-second session of the General Assembly, the Fourth Committee heard one petitioner, James Forman, representing the Student Non-Violent Co-ordinating Committee (SNCC).

The debate in the Fourth Committee, in which some 30 members took part, followed the main lines of argument in the Special Committee.

The representatives of Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States repeated the criticisms that the Sub-Committee's report had failed to take into account the policies and efforts of the administering powers and the different situations in individual territories. Norway, while sharing many of these views, expressed sympathy and support for the indigenous peoples and said it was necessary to ensure that action taken would not deprive the colonial territories of material benefits.

¹⁵ See Y.U.N., 1966, pp. 558-60, text of resolution 2189(XXI).

The United Kingdom considered the report a piece of propaganda aimed at discrediting all foreign investment; in fact, there was an astonishing divergence between the material prepared by the Secretariat and the conclusions reached by the Sub-Committee. Although in previous years the Sub-Committee had studied the implications of foreign economic activities in southern Africa with justification, the United Kingdom representative said, the generalizations as extended to all territories were false and irrelevant. In the United Kingdom territories the Government ensured that investments should benefit the local economies. Investments were taxed and royalties were used for the benefit of the population. Foreign investors, though interested in profits, nevertheless provided both the much-needed capital for development of resources, and training in skills. There was no evidence that foreign investments had impeded independence of United Kingdom territories, as 35 territories with a total population of 740 million had been decolonized. In fact, experience had shown that territories with the greatest volume of foreign investment had achieved independence first. Charges of cheap labour and denial of political rights were irrelevant to the United Kingdom territories where trade unions had been encouraged since the 1930's. It was also well known that under the British system free elections took place in the territories frequently long before independence.

The representative of Australia maintained that the Special Committee should have established criteria for judging whether foreign investments were harmful or beneficial, since capital was needed to develop the resources of the territories. He also criticized the report for omitting any reference to Australia's grants to the territories and its efforts to promote economic development and lead the inhabitants to self-government.

The majority of the representatives who took part in the debate supported the Sub-Committee's report. They considered most of the criticisms groundless, as they believed the report clearly set out the ways in which foreign economic activities were impeding independence of the colonial territories. The most important fact—according to the representatives of the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia,

Guinea, Kenya, Hungary, the Ukrainian SSR and Zambia, among others—was that in colonial territories the peoples had no control over their own resources which foreign interests exploited mainly for profit, while little or no benefits accrued to the peoples themselves. Detailed figures on profits earned and descriptions of the ways in which foreign interests collaborated with colonial governments were also cited.

Replying to the points made by the United Kingdom, Syria argued that even in territories with elected governments financial control had usually been retained by the metropolitan power, which was responsible for authorizing foreign investments. Moreover, contributions made by foreign activities to the territorial revenues were of doubtful benefit to the colonial peoples. Other Members—including Bulgaria, Poland and Romania—noted that international monopolies which realized profits at the expense of Africans, also gave direct support to the colonial powers enabling them to maintain armies which were used to suppress the colonial peoples. In this connexion, the USSR stressed that the question was important because it was part of the broad struggle between capital and labour, and that as a result of plundering by the monopolies, development in the colonial territories had been delayed by four decades.

The USSR representative also considered it essential that the General Assembly decisively condemn the criminal activities of foreign monopolies directed towards supporting colonial régimes, and their greedy exploitation of the natural wealth and of the peoples of colonial countries. In his view, it was essential that the Assembly demand the cessation of these criminal activities, which were a serious obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence and to the final elimination of colonialism and its consequences.

It was important, he said, for the General Assembly to condemn the support given to international monopolies by the colonial powers—in the first place Portugal and South Africa, and also the United States and the United Kingdom—to the detriment of the indigenous populations of the colonial countries. The Assembly should call on all States whose monopolies were participating in the plundering of colonial peoples—particularly the United States,

the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany—to take steps, by legislative and other action, to put an end to the criminal activities of their monopolies in the colonies. The Assembly should require the States concerned, at long last, to take effective measures to limit substantially the transfer of profits out of colonial territories by foreign monopolies, and to adopt legislative measures to enable the greater part of those profits to be used to promote the economic and social development of the colonies, raise the level of living of the indigenous people and improve health services and public education.

In the view of the USSR, the General Assembly should also instruct the Special Committee of Twenty-four to continue to consider the problem and formulate measures to combat the harmful activities of monopolies in the colonial territories.

A number of representatives who supported the Sub-Committee's report because it sought to implement the General Assembly's resolution of 14 December 1960 on the granting of independence,¹⁶ nevertheless shared the view that foreign economic interests alone could not impede independence. The representative of Turkey believed it was necessary to distinguish between foreign interests which helped development and those which ran counter to the interests of the inhabitants. Several representatives, including the spokesman for Senegal, pointed out that the situation in the territories differed from that in independent countries because foreign interests, in the former, were allied with colonialism. Norway considered that the main problem was colonialism itself.

Argentina suggested that the United Nations should define the principles of economic decolonization; it should guarantee to the indigenous peoples the conservation of the natural wealth belonging to them and facilitate their access to that wealth; it should also guarantee their education, fair wages and working conditions, and help them prepare a sound economy.

A draft resolution sponsored by 60 Members was placed before the Fourth Committee.

By this draft resolution, the Assembly would: (1) approve in general the report of the Special Committee of Twenty-four on this item; (2) reaffirm the inalienable right of the peoples

of the colonial territories to self-determination and independence and to their natural resources; (3) declare that the colonial powers which deprived the colonial peoples of the exercise and the full enjoyment of those rights or which subordinated them to the economic or financial interests of their nationals or of nationals of other countries, were violating their obligations under the Charter and impeding the full and prompt implementation of the General Assembly resolution of 14 December 1960 on the granting of independence (1514(XV)); (4) strongly condemn the exploitation of the colonial territories and peoples and the methods practised there by foreign interests which were designed to perpetuate colonial régimes; (5) deplore the policies of the colonial powers which permitted exploitation of natural resources contrary to the interests of the indigenous population and which promoted or tolerated unjust work practices; (6) call upon all States concerned to ensure that concessions, investments and enterprises permitted did not run counter to the present or future interests of the indigenous inhabitants, and to prohibit the following practices: (a) the exploitation of human and natural resources contrary to the interests of the indigenous inhabitants; (b) the obstruction of the access of the inhabitants to their natural resources; and (c) the promotion and tolerance of injustice and discrimination in the remuneration of labour and in the establishment of working conditions; (7) also call upon the colonial powers to review, in accordance with these provisions, all the privileges and concessions which were against the interests of the indigenous inhabitants; (8) request the United Nations Council for South West Africa to take urgent and effective measures to put an end to laws and practices established in the territory of South West Africa by South Africa contrary to the purposes and principles of the Charter; (9) request the colonial powers to stop immediately the practice of alienation of lands and return these lands to the indigenous inhabitants; (10) urge all States to co-operate with the United Nations in implementing the resolution of 14 December 1960 on the granting of in-

¹⁶See footnote 1.

dependence so as to ensure the exercise of the right to self-determination and to the use of their natural resources by the colonial peoples; and (11) ask the Special Committee of Twenty-four to continue its study of the question and decide to maintain the item on its agenda.

On 1 December 1967, the Fourth Committee voted separately on the first operative paragraph of the draft, whereby the Assembly would approve in general the report of the Committee of Twenty-four. The paragraph was adopted by a roll-call vote of 84 to 5, with 16 abstentions. The Fourth Committee then approved the draft resolution as a whole by a roll-call vote of 86 to 2, with 17 abstentions.

Ireland and Peru stated that they disagreed with some wording of the draft resolution, although they had voted in favour of it.

On 7 December, the text was adopted at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly as resolution 2288 (XXII); the first operative paragraph, approving in general the report of the Special Committee of Twenty-four, was accepted by a roll-call vote of 87 to 5, with 16 abstentions; the draft as a whole was adopted by a roll-call vote of 91 to 2, with 17 abstentions. (For text of resolution, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

The sponsors of the resolution in the Fourth Committee were: Algeria, Argentina, Barbados, Burundi, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dahomey, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, the Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines, 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, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

In connexion with this question, various communications were addressed to the President of the General Assembly by the Permanent Representatives of the Byelorussian SSR,

Czechoslovakia, France, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR, the United Kingdom, the United States and also by the Permanent Observer to the United Nations of the Federal Republic of Germany.

In a letter dated 21 November 1967, the Permanent Representative of Bulgaria referred to a statement by the Government of the German Democratic Republic addressed to the twenty-second session of the General Assembly concerning the agenda items dealing with: (1) the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence; and (2) the activities of foreign economic interests impeding the implementation of that Declaration. He requested that his letter, containing the statement, be circulated as an official document of the General Assembly. The statement supported all measures to implement the Declaration and made the point that the international monopolist groups and the economic and military-strategic interests of the principal imperialist powers were among the main causes for the slow liquidation of colonialism. They, and West German monopolies, also backed the efforts to form a bloc of racist régimes in the south of Africa.

On 11 December 1967, the Permanent Representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the United States sent a letter to the President of the General Assembly stating that the letter of 21 November of the Permanent Representative of Bulgaria implied that there existed a State or a Government other than that of the Federal Republic of Germany which was entitled to speak on behalf of the German people in international affairs. That was not the case, these representatives stated in their letter. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany was the only freely and lawfully elected German Government and, consequently, was authorized to speak on behalf of Germany as the representative of the German people in international affairs.

On 12 December, the Permanent Observer of the Federal Republic of Germany wrote to the President of the General Assembly saying that the Government of the Federal Republic regretted that in the Bulgarian communication of

21 November the Assembly agenda items concerning implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence were used to launch slanderous and distorting attacks against the Federal Republic.

In a letter of 18 December 1967 to the President of the General Assembly, the Permanent Representative of Bulgaria stated that the letter from the Permanent Representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the United States was a reiteration of the unfounded allegations with regard to the international status of the two German States which had been in existence since 1949. Any attempt to ignore this historical fact was incompatible with the political reality with regard to post-war Germany. The German Democratic Republic, the Bulgarian letter continued, was a sovereign and independent State and, as an equal member of the international community, had full capacity to conduct its own policy and to take an active part in international affairs. It had always adhered to the principles of the United Nations Charter and had persistently carried out a policy of peace, collective security and broad international co-operation.

The Permanent Representative of the USSR, in a communication of 11 January 1968 to the President of the General Assembly, said that the Permanent Representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the United States had taken upon themselves the impossible task of trying to make it appear as if the German Democratic Republic did not exist. It was an unalterable fact that for almost 20 years a sovereign and independent State, the German Democratic Republic, had existed and successfully developed in central Europe. Most countries represented in the United Nations maintained broad and varied relations with the German Democratic Republic. As to the statements to the effect that the Federal Republic of Germany was authorized to speak as the representative of the German people in international affairs, the USSR communication expressed regret that the Western powers should help to spread at the United Nations revanchist views and ideas emanating from the ruling circles in the Federal Republic.

Other communications on the matter were sent to the President of the General Assembly by the Byelorussian SSR, the Ukrainian SSR, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Romania.

CONSOLIDATION OF TRAINING PROGRAMMES

Results of a study made on the question of consolidating and integrating existing educational and training programmes for South West Africa, for the territories under Portuguese administration and for South Africans were reported to the twenty-second session of the General Assembly on 17 November 1967 by the Secretary-General. Separate reports on the educational and training programmes for South West Africa and for the territories under Portuguese administration were also submitted. (See pp. 708 and 722.)

The Secretary-General's report stated that the experience of the United Nations showed that there were several problems common to the three programmes. Perhaps the fundamental problem had been the absence of solid financial support for the programmes, which had adversely affected their stability and development. The problem of the proper placement of students who were awarded scholarships, the legal status of applicants who had fled from their countries of origin and the issue of adequate travel documents had also presented serious difficulties. The placement and employment of students upon completion of their training had become a major issue because a large number of students had in the past chosen fields of study or training for which there was only a low priority in Africa, and because refugee students who had been trained outside Africa were generally unwilling to return there. The report stated that the establishment of a bureau for placement and education within the framework of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and of the consultative board composed of OAU, the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the International Labour Organisation (ILO), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and observers from non-govern-

mental organizations would contribute effectively in promoting the settlement and employment of African refugees. The bureau and the consultative board would also, it was hoped, solve the problem of the lack of co-ordination among the various agencies, both governmental and voluntary, active in the field, in order to ensure proper planning and avoid duplication.

The Secretary-General endorsed the view expressed in the General Assembly's resolution of 20 December 1966¹⁷ that the proposed consolidation and integration of the three programmes would ensure increased efficiency and promote their further development and expansion. He had put administrative integration into effect on 1 June 1967, with operational responsibilities for all three programmes entrusted to the Office of Technical Co-operation and a single official in charge of all three programmes with over-all responsibility for fund-raising and policy planning. The actual selection of candidates was to be undertaken by a Secretariat interdepartmental group.

As for financial integration, the Secretary-General expressed the view that it would be appropriate to finance the integrated programme from a consolidated trust fund supported by voluntary contributions to cover the operational costs but with related administrative costs to be provided for in the United Nations budget. On that basis he recommended that the General Assembly authorize him to appeal for funds to achieve a target of \$3 million for the three-year period 1968-1970.

Commenting on his consultations with related agencies and OAU, the Secretary-General expressed his conviction that the programme's success depended largely on the active co-operation of, and continuing consultations with, the specialized agencies, in particular UNESCO, which was in close contact with bodies responsible for training in particular functional areas on a world-wide scale.

On means to develop and expand an integrated programme, the Secretary-General had received the valuable assistance of the Advisory Committee (Botswana, Canada, Colombia, Iran, the Ivory Coast, Sweden, the United Kingdom, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States and Zambia) which he had established in June 1967 in accordance with

the Assembly's resolution of 20 December 1966. He stated that mere integration, while undoubtedly increasing efficiency of operation, could not by itself promote development and expansion of the integrated programme. In this connexion, he observed that the emphasis on individual awards of scholarships had had the effect of orienting the programmes to educational and training institutions outside the African continent. The Secretary-General felt that while the system of awarding individual grants should continue, they should be restricted to those fields of study and training where facilities within the continent were non-existent or inadequate. A special effort should be made to orient the programme to Africa by placing students there to the maximum extent possible. It might become necessary to use available resources to grant subventions to African institutions to enable expansion and improvement of their facilities. The Secretary-General also raised the question of extending the coverage of the integrated programme to include persons from Southern Rhodesia.

The question of consolidating the training programmes was referred by the General Assembly to its Fourth Committee which discussed it in conjunction with items on the special educational and training programmes for South West Africa and the special training programme for territories under Portuguese administration.

On 16 December 1967, the Fourth Committee approved a draft resolution, as orally revised by the sponsors, by 83 votes to 2, with 1 abstention. The text was adopted by the Assembly at a plenary meeting on 19 December as resolution 2349(XXII) by a vote of 113 to 2, with 1 abstention.

The Assembly thereby: (1) decided to integrate the educational and training programmes for South West Africa, for territories under Portuguese administration and for South Africans; (2) decided to include in the United Nations Educational and Training Programme assistance to persons from Southern Rhodesia; (3) requested the Secretary-General to continue to study the means to promote the further development and expansion of the Programme,

¹⁷ See Y.U.N., 1966, pp. 560-61, text of resolution 2235(XXI).

and, to this end, continue his consultations with the heads of various organizations concerned; (4) decided that the United Nations should cooperate closely with the bureau for placement and education of refugees which was to be set up within the Organization of African Unity; (5) requested the Secretary-General to include in the Programme the granting of subventions to educational and training institutions in Africa in order to make it possible for persons coming under the Programme to be trained in Africa as far as practicable; (6) requested the Assembly President to nominate seven Member States to a committee to advise the Secretary-General on the granting of such subventions; (7) decided that the Programme be financed from a trust fund made up of voluntary contributions to be used, at least initially, entirely for the operational costs; (8) authorized the

Secretary-General to appeal for funds to achieve a target of \$3 million for the three-year period from 1968 to 1970; (9) decided that, as a transitional measure, provision should be made in the regular budget for the year 1968 to ensure the continuity of the Programme pending the receipt of adequate voluntary contributions; and (10) requested the Secretary-General to report to the twenty-third (1968) session of the Assembly on the progress of the Programme. (For text of resolution, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

The resolution was sponsored in the Fourth Committee by Algeria, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Iran, the Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Norway, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Tunisia and the United Republic of Tanzania.

DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES

Special Committee on Situation with regard to Implementation of Declaration on Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, meetings 484-572.

Sub-Committee on Petitions, meetings 96-121. A/AC.109/L.367, L.369, L.375, L.376, L.382, L.389, L.390, L.396, L.399, L.402-L.406, L.408, L.409 and Corr.1, L.421, L.425, L.426, L.430, L.435, L.436 and Corr.1, L.438, L.440, L.441. Reports (94-118) of Sub-Committee on Petitions.

IMPLEMENTATION OF DECLARATION

GENERAL ASSEMBLY—22ND SESSION

Plenary Meetings 1624, 1627, 1628, 1630, 1631, 1633, 1634, 1636.

A/6700/Rev.1. Report of Special Committee (covering its work during 1967).

A/L.541. Algeria, Burundi, Chad, Democratic Republic of Congo, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Zambia: draft resolution.

A/L.541/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1. Algeria, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Democratic Republic of Congo, Cyprus, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab

Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, Zambia: revised draft resolution. A/C.5/1160, A/6999. Financial implications of proposals in 38-power draft resolution, A/L.541/Rev.1. Statement by Secretary-General and report of Fifth Committee.

RESOLUTION 2326(XXII), as proposed by 38 powers, A/L.541/Rev.1, adopted by Assembly on 16 December 1967, meeting 1636, by 86 votes to 6, with 17 abstentions.

"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,

"Recalling its resolutions 1654(XVI) of 27 November 1961, 1810(XVII) of 17 December 1962, 1956(XVIII) of 11 December 1963, 1970(XVIII) of 16 December 1963, 2105(XX) of 20 December 1965 and 2189(XXI) of 13 December 1966,

"Having considered the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples covering its work on this item during 1967 and having adopted resolutions on specific Territories considered by that Committee,

"Having considered also the relevant report of the Special Committee and General Assembly resolution 2288(XXII) of 7 December 1967 concerning the item entitled 'Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of

the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and Territories under Portuguese domination and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa.'

"Taking into account the report of the International Seminar on Apartheid, Racial Discrimination and Colonialism in Southern Africa, held at Kitwe, Zambia, from 25 July to 4 August 1967,

"Noting with grave concern that seven years after the adoption of the Declaration many Territories are still under colonial domination,

"Deploring the negative attitude of certain colonial Powers which refuse to recognize the right of colonial peoples to self-determination, freedom and independence and, in particular, the intransigence of the Government of Portugal, which in defiance of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations persists in perpetuating its oppressive foreign domination, and of the Government of South Africa, which flagrantly repudiates the validity of General Assembly resolutions 2145(XXI) of 27 October 1966 and 2248(S-V) of 19 May 1967,

"Concerned at the policy followed by colonial Powers of promoting the systematic influx of foreign immigrants and displacing, deporting or transferring the indigenous inhabitants in violation of the economic and political as well as the basic human rights of these people,

"Bearing in mind that the continuation of colonialism and its manifestations, including racism and apartheid, and the attempts of some colonial Powers to suppress national liberation movements by repressive activities and the use of armed force against colonial peoples are incompatible with 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,

"Deploring the attitude of certain States which, in disregard of the pertinent resolutions of the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Special Committee, continue to co-operate with the Governments of Portugal and South Africa and with the illegal racist minority régime of Southern Rhodesia, which are continuing to repress the African peoples,

"Convinced that further delay in the speedy and effective implementation of the Declaration remains a source of international conflicts and differences, which are seriously impeding international co-operation and endangering world peace and security,

"Recalling its resolution 13(I) of 13 February 1946 concerning the public information activities of the United Nations and the relevant provisions of its resolutions 2105(XX) of 20 December 1965, 2189(XXI) of 13 December 1966, 2262(XXII) of 3 November 1967, 2270(XXII) of 17 November 1967 and 2288(XXII) of 7 December 1967, stressing the need for large-scale and continuous publicizing of the work of the United Nations in the field of decolonization, of the situation in the colonial Territories and

of the continuing struggle for liberation being waged by the colonial peoples,

"Recalling its conviction that the celebration in 1968 of the International Year for Human Rights, including the holding of the International Conference on Human Rights, will contribute significantly to the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion,

"1. Reaffirms its resolutions 1514(XV), 1654(XVI), 1810(XVII), 1956(XVIII), 1970(XVIII), 2105(XX) and 2189(XXI);

"2. Notes with satisfaction 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 expresses its appreciation to the Special Committee for its efforts to secure the complete and effective implementation of the Declaration;

"3. Approves the report of the Special Committee covering its work during 1967 and urges the administering Powers to give effect to the recommendations contained therein and to take all other necessary steps for the implementation of the Declaration and the relevant United Nations resolutions;

"4. Approves the programme of work envisaged by the Special Committee during 1968, including the sending of visiting missions, the study of military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers in Territories under their administration which might be impeding the implementation of the Declaration, and the review of the list of Territories to which the Declaration applies;

"5. Reiterates its declaration that the continuation of colonial rule threatens international peace and security and that the practice of apartheid and all forms of racial discrimination constitute a crime against humanity;

"6. Reaffirms its recognition of the legitimacy of the struggle of the colonial peoples to exercise their right to self-determination and independence and notes with satisfaction the progress made in the colonial Territories by the national liberation movements, both through their struggle and through reconstruction programmes, and urges all States to provide moral and material assistance to them;

"7. Expresses its appreciation to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the specialized agencies concerned and other international relief organizations for the help they have so far given, and requests them to increase their economic, social and humanitarian assistance to the refugees from Territories under colonial domination;

"8. Requests all States, directly and through action in the international institutions of which they are members, including the specialized agencies, to withhold assistance of any kind from the Governments of Portugal and South Africa and from the illegal racist minority régime of Southern Rhodesia until they renounce their policy of colonial domination and racial discrimination;

"9. Draws the attention of all States to the grave

DECLARATION ON INDEPENDENCE FOR COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES 645

consequences of the development in southern Africa of the entente between the Governments of South Africa and Portugal and the illegal racist minority régime of Southern Rhodesia, the activities of which run counter to the interests of international peace and security, and calls upon all States, particularly the main trading partners of the entente, to withhold any support or assistance to the members of the entente;

"10. Requests the colonial Powers to dismantle their military bases and installations in colonial Territories and to refrain from establishing new ones and from using those that still exist to interfere with the liberation of the peoples in colonial Territories in the exercise of their legitimate rights to freedom and independence;

"11. Once again condemns the policies, pursued by certain administering Powers in the Territories under their domination, of imposing non-representative régimes and constitutions, strengthening the position of foreign economic and other interests, misleading world public opinion and encouraging the systematic influx of foreign immigrants while displacing, deporting and transferring the indigenous inhabitants to other areas, and calls upon those Powers to desist from such manoeuvres;

"12. Requests the Special Committee to continue to perform its task and to seek suitable means for the immediate and full implementation of the Declaration in all Territories which have not yet attained independence;

"13. Requests the Special Committee to make concrete suggestions with a view to assisting the Security Council in considering appropriate measures under the Charter of the United Nations with regard to developments in colonial Territories which are likely to threaten international peace and security, and recommends the Council to take such suggestions fully into consideration;

"14. Invites the Special Committee, whenever it considers it proper and appropriate, to recommend a deadline for the accession to independence of each Territory in accordance with the wishes of the people and the provisions of the Declaration;

"15. Requests the Special Committee, in the performance of its tasks, to take account of the special activities envisaged in connexion with the International Year for Human Rights and in particular to participate, as it considers appropriate, in the International Conference on Human Rights to be held at Teheran in April 1968;

"16. Requests the Special Committee to examine the compliance of Members States with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and other relevant resolutions on the question of decolonization, particularly those relating to the Territories under Portuguese domination, Southern Rhodesia and South West Africa, and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its twenty-third session;

"17. Invites the Special Committee to pay particular attention to the small Territories and to

recommend to the General Assembly the most appropriate methods and also the steps to be taken to enable the populations of those Territories to exercise fully their right to self-determination and independence;

"18. Urges the administering Powers to co-operate with the Special Committee by permitting access to the colonial Territories by visiting missions, in accordance with decisions previously taken by the General Assembly and by the Special Committee;

"19. Requests the Special Committee to consider and submit recommendations to the General Assembly at its twenty-third session regarding the holding early in 1969 of a special conference of representatives of colonial peoples for the purpose, inter alia, of considering the most effective means by which the international community can intensify its assistance to them in their efforts to achieve self-determination, freedom and independence;

"20. Requests the Secretary-General to take concrete measures through all the media at his disposal, including publications, radio and television, to give effect to the provisions of its resolutions 2105(XX), 2189(XXI), 2262(XXII), 2270(XXII) and 2288(XXII) concerning the widespread and continuous publicizing of the work of the United Nations in the field of decolonization, of the situation in the colonial Territories and of the continuing struggle for liberation being waged by the colonial peoples;

"21. Requests the administering Powers to co-operate with the Secretary-General in promoting the large-scale dissemination of information on the work of the United Nations in the implementation of the Declaration;

"22. Requests the Secretary-General to provide all the financing and facilities necessary for the implementation of the present resolution."

GENERAL ASSEMBLY—22ND SESSION

General Committee, meeting 171.

Fourth Committee, meetings 1682, 1683, 1708, 1721, 1722, 1726, 1728, 1729, 1732-1734, 1736, 1737, 1739, 1742, 1744, 1746.

Plenary Meetings 1583, 1631.

A/6700/Rev.I. Report of Special Committee (covering its work during 1967), Chapter I, Annex III (Implementation of General Assembly resolutions 2151(XXI), 2184(XXI), 2189(XXI) and 2248(S-V) and pertinent resolutions of Special Committee: Requests addressed to specialized agencies and international institutions. Note by Secretariat).

A/6700/Rev.I. Report of Special Committee (covering its work during 1967), Chapter V, Annex (Territories under Portuguese Administration: Question of Refugees. Note by Secretariat).

A/6825. Policies of apartheid of Government of Republic of South Africa: Question of territories under Portuguese administration. Consultation with International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Report of Secretary-General.

A/6835. Letter of 28 September 1967 from Bulgaria, requesting inclusion in agenda of item entitled:

"Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations."

A/C.4/688. Statement by Chairman of Fourth Committee on 2 October 1967, meeting 1682.

A/C.4/689. Statement by Under-Secretary for Trusteeship and Non-Self-Governing Territories on 4 October 1967, meeting 1683.

A/C.4/L.882 and Add.1. Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo (Brazzaville), Democratic Republic of Congo, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia: draft resolution, adopted by Fourth Committee on 11 December 1967, meeting 1744, by roll-call vote of 83 to 2, with 17 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Democratic Republic of Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldive Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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: Portugal, South Africa.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States.

A/6954. Report of Fourth Committee.

RESOLUTION 2311(XXII), as proposed by Fourth Committee, A/6954, adopted by Assembly on 14 December 1967, meeting 1631, by recorded vote of 81 to 2, with 18 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon,

Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldive Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Portugal, South Africa.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States.

"The General Assembly,

"Having considered the item entitled 'Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations,'

"Having examined the relevant reports of the Secretary-General and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

"Recalling the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples contained in General Assembly resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960, and in particular paragraph 1 of the Declaration and the fifth preambular paragraph of the resolution,

"Considering that, by virtue of the Charter of the United Nations and in conformity with the agreements between the United Nations and the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency, the United Nations shall make recommendations for the co-ordination of the policies and activities of the specialized agencies,

"Recalling further its resolutions 2105(XX) of 20 December 1965, 2107(XX) of 21 December 1965, 2151(XXI) of 17 November 1966, 2184(XXI) of 12 December 1966 and 2189(XXI) of 13 December 1966, requesting the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the specialized agencies concerned to increase the economic, social and humanitarian assistance to the refugees from colonial Territories,

"Taking note of the fact that the national liberation movements in some colonial Territories of Africa have asked the specialized agencies for urgent assistance in various social fields, particularly education, health and nutrition,

"1. Recognizes that the specialized agencies, the International Atomic Energy Agency and the international institutions associated with the United Nations should extend their full co-operation to the United Nations in achieving the objectives of General Assembly resolution 1514(XV) ;

"2. Expresses its appreciation to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and

to the specialized agencies which have co-operated with the United Nations in seeking to implement the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly;

"3. Recommends the specialized agencies and international institutions concerned to take urgent and effective measures to assist the peoples struggling for their liberation from colonial rule, and in particular to extend within the scope of their respective activities, all necessary aid to the oppressed peoples of Southern Rhodesia and the Territories under Portuguese domination and to work out, in co-operation with the Organization of African Unity and through it with the national liberation movements, concrete programmes to this end;

"4. Also recommends the specialized agencies and international institutions not to grant any assistance to South Africa and Portugal until they renounce their policy of racial discrimination and colonial domination;

"5. Requests all States, directly and through action in the specialized agencies and international institutions of which they are members, to facilitate the implementation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly;

"6. Requests the Economic and Social Council to consider, in consultation with the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, appropriate measures for the co-ordination of the policies and activities of the specialized agencies in implementing the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly;

"7. Requests the Secretary-General to assist the specialized agencies and the international institutions concerned in working out appropriate measures to implement the relevant resolutions and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its twenty-third session;

"8. Requests the Special Committee to examine this question and to report to the General Assembly at its twenty-third session."

ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS

Special Committee on Situation with regard to Implementation of Declaration on Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, meetings 488, 565, 568.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY—22ND SESSION

Fourth Committee, meetings 1718-1725, 1730, 1732, 1735, 1736.

Plenary Meeting 1622.

A/6868 and Add.1. Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding implementation of Declaration on Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and territories under Portuguese domination and in all other territories under colonial domination. Report of Special Com-

mittee on Situation with regard to Implementation of Declaration on Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

A/6941. Letter of 21 November 1967 from Bulgaria. A/C.4/699. Requests for hearings.

A/C.4/700. Statement by International Affairs Director, Student Non-Violent Co-ordinating Committee (SNCC) on 17 November 1967, meeting 1721.

A/C.4/L.875. Argentina, Barbados, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chile, Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Dahomey, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, India, Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia: draft resolution.

A/C.4/L.875/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1.2. Algeria. Argentina, Barbados, Burundi, Cameroon. Central African Republic. Ceylon. Chad, Chile, Colombia. Congo (Brazzaville), Democratic Republic of Congo, Dahomey, Dominican Republic. Ecuador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica. Jordan. Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago. Tunisia. Uganda, United Arab Republic. United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay. Venezuela. Yemen. Yugoslavia, Zambia: revised draft resolution, adopted by Fourth Committee on 1 December 1967, meeting 1735, by roll-call vote of 86 to 2, with 17 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Democratic Republic of Congo, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, 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, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Portugal, South Africa.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Cuba, Denmark, Finland, France, Iceland, Italy, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States.

A/6939. Report of Fourth Committee.

RESOLUTION 2288(XXII), as proposed by Fourth Committee, A/6939, adopted by Assembly on 7 December 1967, meeting 1622, by roll-call vote of 91 to 2, with 17 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian SSR, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Democratic Republic of Congo, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldive Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, 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, Zambia.

Against: Portugal, South Africa.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Canada, Cuba, Denmark, Finland, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States.

"The General Assembly,

"Having considered the item entitled 'Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and Territories under Portuguese domination and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa,'

"Having examined the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples concerning the activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and Territories under Portuguese domination and in all other Territories under colonial domination,

"Having heard the statement of the petitioner,

"Recalling its resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960, and in particular the eighth preambular paragraph thereof,

"Recalling further its resolution 2105(XX) of 20 December 1965 and 2189(XXI) of 13 December 1966, and other relevant resolutions,

"Considering that the colonial Powers have the

obligation to ensure the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the Territories under their administration and to protect the population and the natural resources of these Territories against abuses, in conformity with Chapters XI and XII of the Charter of the United Nations,

Convinced that any economic or other activity which impedes the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV) is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter,

"1. Approves in general the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples concerning the activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and Territories under Portuguese domination and in all other Territories under colonial domination;

"2. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the peoples of the colonial Territories to self-determination and independence and to the natural resources of their Territories, as well as their right to dispose of these resources in their best interests;

"3. Declares that the colonial Powers which deprive the colonial peoples of the exercise and the full enjoyment of those rights, or which subordinate them to the economic or financial interests of their own nationals or of nationals of other countries, are violating the obligations they have assumed under Chapters XI and XII of the Charter of the United Nations and are impeding the full and prompt implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514(XV);

"4. Strongly condemns the exploitation of the colonial Territories and peoples and the methods practised in the Territories under colonial domination by the foreign financial, economic and other interests which are designed to perpetuate the colonial régimes contrary to the principles embodied in resolution 1514 (XV);

"5. Deplores the policies of the colonial Powers which permit the exploitation of the natural resources of the Territories under their administration contrary to the interests of the indigenous population and which promote or tolerate unjust and discriminatory work systems and other practices;

"6. Calls upon all States concerned to fulfil their fundamental obligation to ensure that the concessions granted, the investments authorized and the enterprises permitted to their nationals in the Territories under colonial domination do not run counter to the present or future interests of the indigenous inhabitants of those Territories;

"7. Further calls upon the colonial Powers to prohibit the following practices, which run counter to the principles of the Charter, violate the economic and social rights of the peoples of the Territories under colonial domination and impede the rapid implementation of resolution 1514(XV) :

"(a) The exploitation of human and natural re-

sources contrary to the interests of the indigenous inhabitants;

"(b) The obstruction of the access of the indigenous inhabitants to their natural resources;

"(c) The promotion and tolerance of injustice and discrimination in the remuneration of labour and in the establishment of working conditions;

"8. Calls upon the colonial Powers to review, in accordance with the provisions of the present resolution, all the privileges and concessions which are against the interests of the indigenous inhabitants;

"9. Requests the United Nations Council for South West Africa to take urgent and effective measures to put an end to laws and practices established in the Territory of South West Africa by the Government of South Africa contrary to the purposes and principles of the Charter;

"10. Requests the colonial Powers to stop immediately the practice of alienation of lands from the indigenous inhabitants and to take immediate action to return to them all such alienated lands;

"11. Urges all States concerned to co-operate fully with the United Nations in the rapid and effective implementation of resolution 1514(XV) so as to ensure to the peoples the exercise of their right to self-determination and independence and to the use of the natural resources of their own Territories;

"12. Requests the Special Committee to continue its study of the problem and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its twenty-third session;

"13. Decides to maintain this item on its agenda."

A/6985. Letter of 11 December 1967 from France, United Kingdom and United States.

A/6994 and Corr.1. Letter of 12 December 1967 from Federal Republic of Germany.

A/7030. Letter of 18 December 1967 from Bulgaria.

A/7036. Note verbale of 11 January 1968 from USSR.

A/7037. Note Verbale of 12 January 1968 from Byeloreussian SSR.

A/7038. Note verbale of 12 January 1968 from Ukrainian SSR.

A/7049. Note verbale of 24 January 1968 from Poland.

A/7056. Note verbale of 15 February 1968 from Czechoslovakia.

A/7063. Note verbale of 2 March 1968 from Romania.

CONSOLIDATION OF TRAINING PROGRAMMES

GENERAL ASSEMBLY—22ND SESSION

Fourth Committee, meetings 1706, 1754, 1755.

Fifth Committee, meeting 1229.

Plenary Meeting 1641.

A/6890 and Corr.1-3. Question of consolidation and integration of special educational and training programmes for South West Africa, special training programme for territories under Portuguese administration and educational and training programme

for South Africans. Report of Secretary-General.

A/6899 and Add.1. Special educational and training programmes for South West Africa. Report of Secretary-General.

A/6900 and Add.1. Special training programme for territories under Portuguese administration. Report of Secretary-General.

A/C.4/L.891 and Add.1. Algeria, Democratic Republic of Congo, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Iran, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Norway, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania: draft resolution, as orally revised, adopted by Fourth Committee on 16 December 1967, meeting 1755, by 83 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

A/C.4/L.900, A/C.5/1166, A/7026. Administrative and financial implications of draft resolution recommended by Fourth Committee, A/7010. Statements by Secretary-General and report of Fifth Committee.

A/7010. Report of Fourth Committee.

RESOLUTION 2349(XXII), as recommended by Fourth Committee, A/7010, adopted by Assembly on 19 December 1967, meeting 1641, by 113 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

"The General Assembly,

"Recalling its resolution 2235(XXI) of 20 December 1966 concerning the question of the consolidation and integration of the special educational and training programmes for South West Africa, the special training programme for Territories under Portuguese administration and the educational and training programme for South Africans,

"Taking note with appreciation of the report submitted by the Secretary-General in accordance with paragraph 1 of the said resolution,

"Considering that a consolidation and integration of the programmes is desirable as a basis for the further development and expansion of assistance for education and training,

"Taking note of the recommendations of the Conference on African Refugee Problems, held at Addis Ababa in October 1967, and in particular its recommendation for the establishment within the Organization of African Unity of a bureau for the placement and education of refugees,

"1. Decides to integrate the special educational and training programmes for South West Africa, the special training programme for Territories under Portuguese administration and the educational and training programme for South Africans;

"2. Decides further to include in the United Nations Training and Educational Programme assistance to persons from Southern Rhodesia, provided that this is done only in so far as it does not interfere with existing United Nations schemes for educational assistance for such persons and that it is done with due regard to Security Council resolutions 216(1965) of 12 November 1965 and 217 (1965) of 20 November 1965 relating to non-recognition of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia;

"3. Requests the Secretary-General to continue to study the means of promoting the further development and expansion of the Programme and, to this end, to continue his consultations with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the heads of other appropriate agencies and organs, and the Administrative Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity;

"4. Decides that in the implementation of the present resolution the United Nations shall co-operate closely with the bureau for the placement and education of refugees that is being set up within the Organization of African Unity;

"5. Requests the Secretary-General to include in the Programme the granting of subventions to educational and training institutions in Africa in order to enable those institutions to provide places for persons who come under the Programme and to make it possible for those persons to be trained in Africa as far as practicable;

"6. Requests the President of the General Assem-

bly to nominate seven Member States, each of which should appoint a representative to serve on a committee which will advise the Secretary-General on the granting of such subventions,

"7. Decides that the Programme shall be financed from a trust fund made up of voluntary contributions and that, at least initially, those contributions shall be used entirely for the operational costs of the Programme;

"8. Authorizes the Secretary-General to appeal to States Members of the United Nations and members of the specialized agencies for funds to achieve a target of \$US 3 million for the three-year period from 1968 to 1970;

"9. Decides that, as a transitional measure, provision shall be made under section 12 of the regular budget for the year 1968 to ensure the continuity of the Programme pending the receipt of adequate voluntary contributions;

"10. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its twenty-third session on the progress of the Programme."

QUESTIONS CONCERNING INDIVIDUAL TERRITORIES

The following pages give a brief account of decisions concerning various individual territories taken in 1967 by the General 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, and by the

General Assembly. (See also pp. 99-119, 689-725 and 598-618 for details on questions concerning; Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa,¹⁸ territories under Portuguese administration, Papua, and the Trust Territory of New Guinea, the Trust Territory of Nauru and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.)

Aden

By a decision taken on 12 December 1966,¹⁹ the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General, in consultation with 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 and the administering power—the United Kingdom—to appoint a special mission to be sent to Aden for the purpose of recommending practical steps for the full implementation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, and in particular for the purpose of determining the extent of United Nations participation in the preparation and supervision of elections. On 23 February 1967, the Secretary-General appointed the United Nations Special Mission on Aden as follows:

Manuel Perez Guerrero (Venezuela), Chairman; Abdussattar Shalizi (Afghanistan); and, Moussa Leo Keita (Mali).

As the Special Committee subsequently stated in its report to the Secretary-General, the situation in the territory—which the General Assembly in its resolution of 12 December 1966 had described as critical and explosive—had shown further deterioration at the time the

¹⁸On 12 June 1968, with the adoption of resolution 2372(XXII), the General Assembly proclaimed that South West Africa should henceforth be known as Namibia. As this edition of the Yearbook covers United Nations proceedings in the calendar year 1967, it consequently continues to refer to the area as South West Africa.

¹⁹ See Y.U.N., 1966, pp. 568-69, text of resolution 2183(XXI).

Special Committee undertook its assignment in March 1967. Disturbances and incidents involving loss of life, particularly in Aden, were occurring almost daily. The state of emergency in the "Federation of South Arabia" had been in force since December 1963, and hundreds of people had been placed in detention.

Before leaving New York, the Special Mission on Aden had discussions with the Permanent Representatives to the United Nations of the United Kingdom and of several Arab countries. In March, the Mission visited London (United Kingdom), where it had talks with officials of the United Kingdom. It then went to Cairo (United Arab Republic), and Jeddah (Saudi Arabia) where it met with political groups and petitioners from the territory, and with officials of the United Arab Republic, Saudi Arabia and the League of Arab States.

The Mission arrived in Aden on 2 April 1967; it left on 7 April stating that conditions did not permit it to discharge effectively its responsibilities inside the territory at that time. Following discussions in Geneva, Switzerland, with representatives of the United Kingdom, the Mission accepted an invitation to visit London for talks with the United Kingdom Foreign Secretary. In July, the Mission had conversations in New York with the British High Commissioner in Aden, and an exchange of views with a delegation of the Front for the Liberation of Occupied South Yemen (FLOSY). In August, the Mission went to Geneva, where it heard the views of groups representing the traditional authorities in the territory and had further discussions with representatives of the United Kingdom Government. In September, the Mission visited Beirut (Lebanon) and Cairo, where it met again with representatives of some political groups from the territory. The Mission continued its work at United Nations Headquarters and submitted its report to the Secretary-General on 10 November 1967.

In its report, the Mission stated that it had tried to act in consultation with and enlist the co-operation of the administering power, but, unfortunately, the failure of the administering power to establish a climate of confidence in the territory had added to the difficulties faced by the Mission. Moreover, the administering

power, at times, seemed to have chosen a course of action not in keeping with the efforts of the Mission. The Mission also considered that the maintenance of the state of emergency in the territory had prejudiced the successful discharge of its tasks.

The Mission recalled that the so-called "Federal Government" had been described in United Nations resolutions as an unrepresentative régime and therefore the Mission had made it clear that all its official contacts in respect of the territory would have to be made through the United Kingdom as the administering power. The United Kingdom Government had given the Mission the assurance that it accepted these considerations as the basis for the Mission's activities in the territory, but it had failed to ensure that the authorities in Aden co-operated with the Mission on that basis, or facilitated free and unimpeded contact with the people.

The Mission stated that it had been unable to hear all shades of opinion in the territory because conditions in the territory had not been conducive to performing that task, and not all elements had come forward to meet with it; in particular, the National Liberation Front for the Occupied South of Yemen (NLF) had not wished to co-operate with the Mission. Because of these and other circumstances outlined in its report, the Mission had been unable to fulfil its mandate.

The Mission recalled that in public statements it had expressed the hope that agreement between nationalist movements would pave the way for the formation of a broadly-based transitional government before independence. It noted that on 2 November 1967, the United Kingdom had announced that the independence of South Arabia would take place in the second half of November and that all British forces would be withdrawn at that time. It also noted that after a preliminary agreement had been reached between delegations of FLOSY and NLF meeting in Cairo, heavy fighting had broken out in Aden and that on 6 November the Army of the territory had recognized the NLF as "the only organization representing the people of South Arabia." The Mission concluded that since the Army was still under the control of the administering power, the an-

nouncement that FLOSY would not be recognized as a nationalist element was a cause of serious concern, and that the United Kingdom should be requested to deal directly with the nationalist movements.

The Mission also stressed the need to give effect to the principle of territorial integrity as defined in the General Assembly's resolution of 12 December 1966, which had affirmed that the Eastern Aden Protectorate and the Islands of Perim, Kuria Muria, Kamaran and other off-shore islands were an integral part of the territory. The Mission pointed out that it had rejected a proposal for the internationalization of Perim, submitted to it by the United Kingdom on 11 August 1967.

The Special Committee of Twenty-four considered the Mission's report on 21 November 1967. Speaking on that occasion, the representative of the United Kingdom said that it seemed obvious that the Mission had been prevented from carrying out its task by a number of circumstances, chief of which had been the failure until too late of the two main political groupings in South Arabia to offer co-operation to the Mission and, finally, the tide of events. He regretted that instead of giving due weight to those factors, the Mission had sought to place responsibility principally on the United Kingdom Government. He further stated that, on 11 November, the NLF had informed the British Government it would negotiate the transfer of power. The British Government had agreed to open negotiations in Geneva, and had also decided that South Arabia should become independent by 30 November 1967.

At the same meeting, the Special Committee took note of the Mission's report and transmitted it to the General Assembly to enable that body to consider the question prior to the imminent accession of the territory to independence.

The General Assembly's Fourth Committee took up the question on 28 November 1967. Iraq recalled that as early as 1963, the Special Committee of Twenty-four had attempted to send a sub-committee to Aden, but that the United Kingdom had refused to allow it to enter the territory. Nevertheless, the Special Committee had established the Sub-Committee on Aden and had adopted the Sub-Committee's conclusions and recommendations, which be-

came the basis of the General Assembly's resolution adopted on 11 December 1963.²⁰ This resolution had recommended specific steps that should be taken to enable the territory to attain its independence in peace and harmony. The United Kingdom, however, had refused until 1966 to implement the resolution or accept it as a basis for granting independence. Much suffering and bloodshed could have been avoided if these steps had been taken in 1963.

On 29 November, the representative of the United Kingdom informed the Fourth Committee that the negotiations in Geneva with the NLF had been completed and that transfer of sovereignty and the termination of protection over the territory, which would be incorporated in the People's Republic of Southern Yemen, would take place on 30 November, the date of the new sovereign state's independence.

Replying to questions concerning the future of the off-shore islands, the representative of the United Kingdom informed the Committee that discussions were under way with the people and that, if they so wished, the islands would form part of the new state.

Many Members, including Iraq, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, the USSR, the United Arab Republic, Yemen and Venezuela welcomed the attainment of independence by the former territory. At the same time, they sought assurances that Aden's territorial integrity would not be interfered with through the exclusion of any of the off-shore islands from the new state. The representative of the United Kingdom said that, at that time, he could give no further information on the future status of the off-shore islands, as discussions on the question were still in progress.

The Fourth Committee then approved a consensus which it recommended to the General Assembly for adoption. By this consensus, the General Assembly would, *inter alia*, express its appreciation of the work done by the Special Mission on Aden; reaffirm the unity of the territory and its territorial integrity, including all the islands, and consider any action to disrupt that unity and integrity as a violation of its resolution of 14 December 1960 on the

²⁰ See Y.U.N., 1963, pp. 454-55, text of resolution 1949(XVIII).

granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples²¹ and of its resolution of 12 December 1966.²²

Speaking in a plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 30 November, the representative of the United Kingdom stated that, in view of the negative reaction of the United Nations to the proposal for the internationalization of Perim, the British had consulted the people, who had confirmed their wish to remain with South Arabia; accordingly, Perim would be part of the new Republic. The people of Kamaran had decided to unite with Aden and, accordingly, it too would be part of the new state. However, the people of Kuria Muria had made it clear that they wished to be returned to Muscat and Oman, to which they had previously belonged. Therefore, sovereignty over these islands would be transferred to the Sultan of Muscat and Oman.

Following statements welcoming the independence of Southern Yemen, in the course of which Iraq, Mali, Sudan, Syria and Yemen expressed concern at the separation of Kuria Muria from the new country, the General Assembly adopted the consensus recommended by the Fourth Committee as follows:

"Having considered the chapter of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples relating to Aden, including the report of the United Nations Special Mission on Aden, the General Assembly takes note of the report and expresses its appreciation of the work done by the Special Mission. In wishing peace and prosperity

to the territory on its accession to independence, the General Assembly reaffirms the unity and territorial integrity of the whole territory, including all the islands as prescribed in General Assembly resolution 2183(XXI) of 12 December 1966, and considers any action to disrupt the unity and territorial integrity of the territory as a violation of resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960 and the above-mentioned resolution. The General Assembly also expresses the hope that the territory will consolidate its independence in unity and harmony, overcome the problems confronting it in consequence of colonial rule, and play a constructive role as a member of the international community."

During March 1967, the Special Committee of Twenty-four considered and adopted reports of its Sub-Committee on Petitions which contained recommendations that various communications on Aden not be circulated as petitions. In this connexion, the representative of Saudi Arabia, in a letter of 10 March 1967 addressed to the President of the Security Council, transmitted copies of the texts of the communications referred to in the above-mentioned report of the Sub-Committee on Petitions, which communications, the Saudi Arabian representative said, emanated from petitioners in a region where international peace and security was threatened. He requested their circulation as Security Council documents. On 15 March, the representative of Saudi Arabia transmitted to the President of the Security Council three further communications.

²¹ See Y.U.N., 1960, pp. 49-50, text of resolution 1514(XV).

²² See footnote 19.

DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES

Special Committee on Situation with regard to Implementation of Declaration on Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, meetings 490, 492, 493, 499, 504, 508, 543, 567, 571.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY—22ND SESSION

Fourth Committee, meetings 1706, 1727, 1729-1731. Plenary Meeting 1613.

A/6636. Note by Secretary-General (announcing appointment of Special Mission on Aden).

A/6664. Letter of 18 March 1967 from United Kingdom.

A/6665. Letter of 4 April 1967 from United Arab Republic (transmitting text of decision adopted by Council of League of Arab States at its 47th regular session held in Cairo in March 1967).

A/6700/Rev.1. Report of Special Committee (covering its work during 1967), Chapter VI.

A/6828. Letter of 31 August 1967 from Algeria, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, United Arab Republic and Yemen.

A/6920. Report of Fourth Committee, para. 9.

A/6716. Resolutions adopted by General Assembly during its 22nd session, Vol. I (19 September-19 December 1967), pp. 56-57.

OTHER DOCUMENTS

S/7816, S/7821. Letters of 10 and 15 March 1967 from Saudi Arabia.

A/6702. Report of Security Council to General Assembly, Chapter 31.

Equatorial Guinea

Equatorial Guinea, administered by Spain, consists of Fernando Póo and Rio Muni, the former an island of the same name together with the smaller island of Annobón in the Gulf of Guinea, and the latter on the African mainland bordered by Cameroon on the north and by Gabon on the south and east with several small islands off the coast.

According to the 1960 census, the total population was 245,989; of this number, 62,612 lived in Fernando Poo and 183,377 in Rio Muni. In 1966, the total population was estimated at 260,000 inhabitants.

Following a referendum in December 1963, Rio Muni and Fernando Poo, which had previously had the status of Spanish provinces, were joined together to form one territory called Equatorial Guinea, at the same time being accorded a certain measure of autonomy under a new constitution. In December 1966, the representative of Spain, speaking in the General Assembly's Fourth Committee, announced his Government's intention to convene a Constitutional Conference early in 1967 to enable all sections of the population of the territory to express their aspirations with regard to their future. By its resolution of 20 December 1966, the General Assembly, among other things, requested the administering power, in accordance with the wishes of the people of Equatorial Guinea, to set a date for independence, and, for this purpose, to convene a conference in which the various political parties and all sections of the population would be fully represented.²³

CONSIDERATION BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The situation in Equatorial Guinea was considered in September 1967 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. During its consideration of the situation in the territory, the Special Committee heard as petitioners Saturnino Ibongo and Rafael Evita representing the Movimiento Nacional de Liberación de la Guinea Ecuatorial (MONALIGE).

Mr. Ibongo said that although the representative of Spain had stated on 10 December 1966 that a constitutional conference would be held early in 1967, that conference had still not materialized. The appointment of an inter-ministerial commission to prepare for the constitutional conference had been announced but so far nothing was known about the progress made in that preparatory work. He asked that Spain: set a date for the constitutional conference; declare categorically that the conference would only decide upon the final date for independence, which should be not later than 1968; and announce to the Special Committee of Twenty-four that it would dissolve the present autonomous government and allow the democratic election of a government truly representative of the people. He appealed to members of the Special Committee to exert pressure on the administering power to grant independence to the territory.

The representative of Spain informed the Special Committee of the steps taken by Spain with a view to holding the constitutional conference which was to decide the future of Equatorial Guinea. He said that the Spanish Government had established an inter-ministerial commission to formulate the position of Spain for the purposes of the conference and to hold talks with the elected representatives and opposition leaders of the territory. Meanwhile, the General Assembly of the autonomous régime in Equatorial Guinea had established a special committee to consult the population and the political organizations in the territory and to prepare a report so that the Assembly would be in a position to give instructions to the Guinean delegation to the constitutional conference. The Spanish inter-ministerial commission had completed its work on 20 May 1967. However, the committee of the Guinean General Assembly had not completed its work owing to the large number of people who had to be consulted. Spain would set a date for the constitutional conference as soon as the official delegation of the territory was ready to participate.

²³ See Y.U.N., 1966, pp. 575-76, text of resolution 2230(XXI).

Venezuela considered that the administering power should do everything to set an early date for the convening of the promised constitutional conference and should also take dynamic action in order to arrange for true representation of the people of the territory, without waiting for the report of the General Assembly of Equatorial Guinea.

The representative of the United Republic of Tanzania believed that the autonomous Government did not represent the mass of the people, but rather the interests of Spain; consequently, the contention that the conference could not be convened because the autonomous Government had been slow in responding to the Spanish proposal was unacceptable. It was for the administering power to set a definite date for the constitutional conference and to invite representatives of all political parties, as well as the autonomous Government, to participate.

Chile felt that the constitutional conference should not only set a date for independence, as stated by the petitioners, but should also draw up an adequate constitution for Equatorial Guinea and work out an electoral system in accordance with the recommendations of the United Nations General Assembly.

Similar views with regard to the apparent delay in the convening of the constitutional conference and progress of the territory towards independence were expressed by the representatives of Mali, Uruguay and the USSR, as well as by those of India and Yugoslavia.

On 12 September 1967, acting on a proposal sponsored by Afghanistan, Ethiopia, India, Iran, Ivory Coast, Madagascar, Mali, Sierra Leone, Tunisia, the United Republic of Tanzania and Yugoslavia, the Special Committee adopted a resolution whereby, *inter alia*, it regretted that the constitutional conference, as provided for by the General Assembly's resolution of 20 December 1966, had not been convened and urged the administering power to convene this conference immediately. It requested the administering power to implement without further delay the provisions of the Assembly's resolution of 20 December 1966, in particular those inviting the administering power to establish full democratic freedoms, to hold, before independence, a general election on the basis of universal adult suffrage, and to transfer effective power

to the government resulting from this election. It further requested the administering power to ensure the accession of the territory to independence as a single political and territorial entity not later than July 1968.

The Special Committee adopted this resolution by a roll-call vote of 19 to 0, with 3 abstentions.

Australia and Italy, explaining their votes, expressed reservations in regard to the provision of the resolution setting a target date of July 1968 for independence. They considered that it was for the people themselves to set the date of their independence.

The representative of Spain observed that there had been obstacles which had prevented Spain from opening the constitutional conference as originally scheduled. There were differences of opinion in Equatorial Guinea regarding the territory's future. In the circumstances, to bring those differences into the open might lead the political groups at the constitutional conference to greater inflexibility. His Government had therefore preferred to seek some agreement among Guinean leaders before the conference, in order that positive and constructive results might be achieved at the conference itself.

Subsequently, on 18 September 1967, the Spanish Government informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to convene the constitutional conference on the future of Equatorial Guinea on 30 October 1967. The Constitutional Conference took place in Madrid, Spain, from 30 October till 15 November 1967, when it was adjourned, having completed what was described as its first phase.

CONSIDERATION BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The situation in Equatorial Guinea was considered by the General Assembly during December 1967 at its twenty-second session. The Assembly's Fourth Committee heard as petitioners the following members of the Guinean delegation to the Constitutional Conference held in Madrid: Francisco Macias, Vice-President of the Consejo de Gobierno Autónomo of Equatorial Guinea; Atanasio Ndong, Secretary-General of the Movimiento Nacional de Liberación de la Guinea Ecuatorial (MONALIGE); An-

tonio Eworo, Chairman of the Idea Popular de la Guinea Ecuatorial (IPGE) ; and Francisco Salome, Vice-Chairman of the Movimiento de Unión Nacional de la Guinea Ecuatorial (MUNGE). They were accompanied by four other petitioners: Saturnino Ibongo, Armando Balboa, Tomás Ecoca and José Loeri. The petitioners said that the demands set forth by the majority of the Guinean delegation at the first phase of the Constitutional Conference (30 October-15 November 1967) included complete independence for the territory not later than 15 July 1968, respect for its territorial integrity, the establishment of a provisional government followed by general elections on the basis of universal suffrage, and maintenance of close ties with Spain. They expressed disappointment to find at the end of the first phase of the Conference that the Spanish Government refused to set a date for the attainment of independence, even though that was essential for the continuance of the work of the Conference.

The representative of Spain said that at the opening meeting of the Constitutional Conference, the Spanish Foreign Minister had stated that the principal objective of the Conference was to seek conclusions which, after they had been studied by the Spanish Government, could be submitted to the people of Equatorial Guinea in a referendum. The representatives of the people of Equatorial Guinea at the Constitutional Conference had made known their desires ; the Spanish Government was prepared to conduct a referendum in which the people of the territory would be requested to give their views on the desire expressed in the Constitutional Conference that the territory should become independent before 15 July 1968. If the people of Equatorial Guinea decided to endorse the wishes of their representatives at the Conference, the Spanish Government would grant them independence without delay.

India, while noting with satisfaction that Spain fully recognized the rights of colonial peoples to self-determination and independence and that a Constitutional Conference had been convened in October 1967, regretted that the main purpose of the Conference—namely, to set a date for independence, had not been fulfilled, although when the Sub-Committee on

Equatorial Guinea had visited the territory in 1956 the people of the territory had expressed a desire to become independent not later than July 1968. The representative of Spain had said that the Government would agree to any date set by the people; so far, however, there appeared to be no commitment on the part of the administering power to grant independence before July 1968.

Zambia welcomed Spain's indication that it would respond positively to the views expressed by the people and its recognition that the representatives of the people had expressed their wish for independence and freedom. Zambia hoped soon to see Spain's declarations translated fully into realities.

The representative of Cameroon congratulated the administering power on holding the Constitutional Conference, which conformed with the spirit of the General Assembly's resolutions. He regretted, however, that the administering power had announced its intention of holding a referendum in the following year in order to settle, before 15 July 1968, the question of independence for the territory. He considered this unnecessary; in fact, he said, it would be tantamount to a denial of the representative nature of the leaders of Equatorial Guinea who had participated in the work of the Constitutional Conference and had been duly recognized by the Spanish Government. In the present situation of the territory, it was preferable to convene a second constitutional conference to decide on the procedures for the transfer of powers and to draft an electoral law and a constitution, since, Cameroon felt, there was no need to consult the people in order to confirm their wishes, which were well known.

The Constitutional Conference was the first step in the process leading to independence for Equatorial Guinea, Chile said. Another step in the right direction was the organization of a referendum through which the people would ratify the date for independence; Chile hoped that there would be a United Nations presence at that popular consultation. Once the date for independence had been set, it would be for the people themselves and their representatives to draw up an appropriate electoral law and a constitution fully reflecting their wishes. In that way, the Guinean people would have attained

a sufficient degree of self-government to be able to choose in complete freedom the kind of constitution they wanted.

Following the debate, the Fourth Committee approved, and the General Assembly adopted, a resolution whereby, having taken note of the Constitutional Conference which opened in Madrid on 30 October 1967, it approved the report of the Special Committee of Twenty-four in regard to Equatorial Guinea and reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of Equatorial Guinea to self-determination and independence. The General Assembly also: expressed regret that the administering power had not yet set a date for the accession of Equatorial Guinea to independence in accordance with the wishes of the people of the territory; reiterated its request to the administering power to ensure that the territory acceded to independence as a single political and territorial entity not later than July 1968; invited the administering power to ensure full respect for all democratic freedoms, to hold, before independence, a general election for the whole of the territory on the basis of a unified electoral roll, and to transfer effective power to the government resulting from this election; urged the administering power to reconvene the Constitutional Conference in order to work out the modalities of the transfer of power, including the drawing up of an electoral law and of an independence constitution; and requested the Secretary-General to take appropriate action, in consultation

with the administering power and the Special Committee of Twenty-four, to ensure the presence of the United Nations in the territory for the supervision of the preparation for, and the holding of, the general election mentioned above, and to participate in all other measures leading towards the independence of the territory.

The representative of Spain observed that the request addressed to the administering power to reconvene the Constitutional Conference was unnecessary since it had not been dissolved; the Conference had merely been suspended on 15 November, as originally scheduled. Spain had some additional objections to the resolution; however, since they referred to form rather than to substance, Spain had voted in favour of the resolution.

The Assembly's decisions to this effect were embodied in resolution 2355 (XXII) adopted by 111 votes to 0, with 5 abstentions on 19 December 1967. The Fourth Committee had approved the text by 94 votes to 0, with 6 abstentions on 16 December, on the basis of a proposal sponsored by Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Congo (Brazzaville), Ghana, Guinea, Indonesia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Syria, Togo, Uganda, the United Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia and Zambia. (For text of resolution, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES

Special Committee on Situation with regard to Implementation of Declaration on Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, meetings 551-554, 556, 557.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY—22ND SESSION

Fourth Committee, meetings 1706, 1748, 1750, 1752, 1753, 1755, 1756.
Fifth Committee, meeting 1229.
Plenary Meeting 1641.

A/6700/Rev.1. Report of Special Committee (covering its work in 1967), Chapter VIII.
A/6802. Letter of 18 September 1967 from Spain.
A/C.4/695 and Add.1-4. Requests for hearings.
A/C.4/L.894 and Add.1. Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Ghana, Guinea, Indonesia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Syria, Togo, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United

Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zambia: draft resolution adopted by Fourth Committee on 16 December 1967, meeting 1755, by 94 votes to 0, with 6 abstentions.

A/C.4/L.902, A/C.5/1164, A/7025. Administrative and financial implications of draft resolution III recommended by Fourth Committee. Statements by Secretary-General and report of Fifth Committee.
A/7013. Report of Fourth Committee, draft resolution III.

RESOLUTION 2355 (xxii), as recommended by Fourth Committee, A/7013, adopted by Assembly on 19 December 1967, meeting 1641, by 111 votes to 0, with 5 abstentions.

"The General Assembly,
"Having considered the question of Equatorial Guinea,
"Having heard the statements of the petitioners,

"Having also heard the statement of the representative of the administering Power,

"Having considered the chapter of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples relating to Equatorial Guinea,

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

"Recalling further the provisions of its resolutions 2067(XX) of 16 December 1965 and 2230(XXI) of 20 December 1966,

"Having noted the constitutional conference which opened in Madrid on 30 October 1967,

"1. Approves the chapter of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples relating to Equatorial Guinea;

"2. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of Equatorial Guinea to self-determination and independence, in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples contained in General Assembly resolution 1514(XV);

"3. Regrets that the administering Power has not yet set a date for the accession of Equatorial Guinea to independence in accordance with the wishes of the people of the Territory;

"4. Reiterates its request to the administering

Power to ensure that the Territory accedes to independence as a single political and territorial entity not later than July 1968;

"5. Invites the administering Power to implement as soon as possible the following measures:

"(a) To ensure respect for all democratic freedoms;

"(b) To institute an electoral system based on universal adult suffrage and to hold, before independence, a general election for the whole Territory on the basis of a unified electoral roll;

"(c) To transfer effective power to the government resulting from this election;

"6. Urges the administering Power to reconvene the constitutional conference referred to above in order to work out the modalities of the transfer of power, including the drawing up of an electoral law and of an independence constitution;

"7. Requests the Secretary-General to take appropriate action, in consultation with the administering Power and the Special Committee, to ensure the presence of the United Nations in the Territory for the supervision of the preparation for, and the holding of, the election envisaged in paragraph 5 (b) above and to participate in all other measures leading towards the independence of the Territory;

"8. Further requests the Secretary-General to transmit the present resolution to the administering Power and to report to the Special Committee on its implementation;

"9. Decides to maintain the question of Equatorial Guinea on its agenda,"

Falkland Islands (Malvinas)

The Falkland Islands (Malvinas) 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 territory, which is administered by the United Kingdom, is claimed by Argentina as an integral part of Argentina.

During 1967, the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) was considered 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. On the recommendation of its Sub-Committee III, the Special Committee adopted a statement of consensus on the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) on 6 October 1967 in which it recommended that the attention of the parties should again be drawn to the provisions of the

General Assembly's resolution of 16 December 1965²⁴ and its consensus of 20 December 1966,²⁵ both of which urged continued negotiations between Argentina and the United Kingdom, with a view to finding a peaceful solution to the problem as soon as possible, due regard being paid to the recommendation contained in the consensus that the Special Committee and the General Assembly should be kept informed about the development of the negotiations on this colonial situation, the elimination of which was of interest to the United Nations within the context of its resolution of 14 December 1960 containing the Declaration on the Granting

²⁴ See Y.U.N., 1965, pp. 578-79, text of resolution 2065(XX).

²⁵ See Y.U.N., 1966, p. 577, text of the consensus of 20 December 1966.

of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.²⁶

On 19 December 1967, following the discussion of the question in the General Assembly's Fourth Committee, the Assembly adopted a consensus, proposed by Uruguay and approved by the Fourth Committee on 16 December. This consensus read as follows:

"The General Assembly, having regard to its resolution 2065 (XX) of 16 December 1965 and to the consensus approved by the General Assembly on 20 December 1966 concerning the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), takes note of the communications dated 14 December 1967 from the Permanent Representatives of Argentina and the United Kingdom, and, in this connexion and bearing in mind the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, approves a consensus in favour of urging both parties to continue with the negotiations so as to find a peaceful solution to the problem as soon as possible. It likewise urges the parties, bearing particularly in mind resolution 2065 (XX) and the consensus of 20 December 1966, to keep 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 the General Assembly, duly informed during the coming year about the development of the negotiations on this colonial situation, the elimination of which is of interest to the United Nations within the context of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960" (containing text of Declaration on granting of independence).

During the Fourth Committee debates the representative of the United Kingdom said that the talks between the United Kingdom and Argentina on the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) had been conducted in a cordial atmosphere and a constructive spirit, without prejudice to the legal position of the parties. His delegation welcomed the reference in the consensus to the Assembly's resolution of 16 December 1965 (2065 (XX)) which referred not only to the resolution of 14 December 1960 on the granting of independence, but also to the interests of the population of the territory.

The representative of Argentina reiterated the position of his Government regarding the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) and said that Argentina attached great importance to the reunification of its national territory. Negotiations with the United Kingdom with a view to ending the colonial situation had begun in London in 1965 and were continuing. The negotiations had taken place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding, and progress had been made towards narrowing the area of divergence between Argentina and the United Kingdom. The two Governments hoped to report to the Secretary-General on the subject during 1968.

²⁶ See Y.U.N., 1960, pp. 49-50, text of resolution 1514 (XV).

DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES

Special Committee on Situation with regard to Implementation of Declaration on Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, meeting 565.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY—22ND SESSION

Fourth Committee, meetings 1706, 1751, 1752, 1755. Plenary Meeting 1641.

A/6661. Letter of 3 February 1967 from Argentina.
A/6662. Letter of 3 February 1967 from United Kingdom.

A/6700/Rev.I. Report of Special Committee (covering its work during 1967), Chapter XXIII.

A/C.4/703, A/C.4/704. Communications dated 14 December 1967 from Argentina and United Kingdom, respectively.

A/7013. Report of Fourth Committee, paras. 15 and 40.

A/6716. Resolutions adopted by General Assembly during its 22nd session, Vol. I, 19 September-19 December 1967, p. 57.

Fiji

Fiji, situated in the south-west Pacific and administered by the United Kingdom, comprises some 844 islands and islets. At the end of 1966, the population was estimated to be some 480,000,

consisting of about 200,900 Fijians, 240,000 Indians, 10,600 Europeans, 10,200 part-Europeans, 5,600 Chinese, and 13,600 other Pacific races.

The Constitution of Fiji, based on an agreement reached at a constitutional conference held in London, United Kingdom, from 26 July to 9 August 1965, was promulgated on 23 September 1966, and the first general election under this Constitution was held from 26 September to 8 October 1966. Briefly, the Constitution provided for a Governor who exercised authority with the assistance of an Executive Council, and for a Legislative Council composed of not more than 4 official and 36 elected members. The elected members of the Legislative Council consisted of the following: 14 Fijians—9 elected on the Fijian communal roll, 2 elected by the Fijian Council of Chiefs and 3 elected according to a new cross-voting system; 12 Indians—9 elected on the Indian communal roll and 3 elected by the cross-voting system; and 10 Europeans—7 elected on a communal roll and 3 elected by the cross-voting system.

For the election by the cross-voting system, Fiji was divided into three constituencies, each returning one Fijian (or Rotuman or other Pacific Islander), one Indian, and one European (or Chinese or member of another minority group), each member being elected by persons of all communities.

The Executive Council consisted of 4 official members and 6 non-official members, appointed by the Governor from the elected members of the Legislative Council. On 1 September 1967, a ministerial system of government was introduced in Fiji when, as provided for in the Constitution, the Governor appointed the members of the Executive Council as Ministers, thus replacing the Executive Council by a Council of Ministers. The Council of Ministers, whose chairman was the Governor, had the same powers as the former Executive Council. Members of the Council, as Ministers, were given executive powers in the respective departments for which they were responsible. Formerly, as members of the Executive Council, their departmental duties had been limited to assisting in the formulation of policy.

CONSIDERATION BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF TWENTY-FOUR

At meetings held between 28 August and 15 September 1967, the situation in Fiji was con-

sidered 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.

During the debate in the Special Committee, the Chairman recalled that the General Assembly had, by a resolution of 12 December 1966,²⁷ endorsed the decision of the Special Committee to appoint a sub-committee to visit Fiji for the purpose of studying at first hand the situation in the territory and to report to the Special Committee as soon as possible, and it had requested the Chairman of the Special Committee, in consultation with the administering power, to appoint the sub-committee as early as practicable. The Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom had informed the Chairman that the United Kingdom Government did not regard a visit to Fiji by a sub-committee of the Special Committee as necessary. During consultations, many members of the Committee had felt that the sub-committee should nevertheless be appointed. The Chairman reported that he had therefore decided to appoint Bulgaria, Chile, Finland, India and the United Republic of Tanzania as members of the Sub-Committee. He hoped that the administering power would reconsider its position in the matter, and trusted that the Sub-Committee would be able to submit a useful report.

The representative of the United Kingdom said that the constitutional arrangements which had come into effect in September 1966 represented the best available compromise. Although there was still a substantial measure of communal representation and voting, three of the members drawn from each of the three main communities were elected on a cross-voting basis. He wished to assure the Special Committee of Twenty-four that the ultimate objective was a single common roll, regardless of community or race. The problem was to find a framework in which people of different races, proud of their distinct cultural heritages and ways of life, could live together in peace, friendship and co-operation. It would take time to solve such problems; to attempt to do so over-

²⁷ See Y.U.N., 1966, pp. 580-81, text of resolution 2185(XXI).

night would only accentuate them. There was mounting evidence to show that the new Constitution was beginning to pave the way towards that objective. The United Kingdom did not agree that any useful purpose would be served by the visit of a United Nations mission to Fiji, especially in view of the unacceptable nature of recent resolutions concerning the territory. Moreover, in making that decision, the United Kingdom had taken into account, among other things, the declared view of the leader of the majority party in Fiji that the Fiji Government did not agree that a United Nations mission should go to Fiji. The representative of the United Kingdom said that Fiji had embarked on a great experiment in political harmony and racial co-operation and its people had a right to expect the Special Committee to show understanding, patience and forbearance so that the experiment might succeed.

India, Poland and Yugoslavia criticized the United Kingdom for disregarding the provisions of relevant United Nations resolutions, particularly the General Assembly resolution of 12 December 1966, the implementation of which was necessary in order to lead Fiji to independence as a unified and multiracial state. The representative of India said that the present electoral system in Fiji discriminated against the indigenous Fijians and Fijians of Indian origin to the benefit of the small but powerful European community. Under the electoral system, one European vote equalled nine indigenous Fijian votes and 10 so-called Indian votes, he added.

Yugoslavia maintained that the present political system in Fiji could not bring independence, communal harmony and national unity to Fiji, but might result in a widening of the gap between the communities, which could then be used by the administering power to justify the perpetuation of the colonial régime.

Bulgaria, Chile, India and Yugoslavia supported the Chairman's decision to appoint the Sub-Committee on Fiji despite the lack of co-operation from the administering power.

On 15 September 1967, the Special Committee adopted a resolution, by a roll-call vote of 17 to 3, with 3 abstentions, by which it affirmed the inalienable right of the people of Fiji to freedom and independence in accordance

with the General Assembly's resolution of 14 December 1960 containing the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.²⁸ It also reaffirmed the view that the administering power must expedite the process of decolonization in Fiji by holding elections on the basis of "one man, one vote" and by fixing an early date for independence. The Special Committee deeply regretted the negative attitude of the administering power in refusing to agree to a visit to the territory by the Sub-Committee on Fiji, and urgently appealed to the administering power to co-operate with the Special Committee and reconsider its decision in order to facilitate the Committee's work. Moreover, it urged the administering power to implement without further delay the provisions of the General Assembly's resolution of 12 December 1966.

The resolution was sponsored by Afghanistan, India, Iran, Iraq, Mali, Syria, the United Republic of Tanzania and Yugoslavia.

Following adoption of the resolution, the representative of Australia expressed his regret that the resolution had merely repeated what had already been said in the General Assembly's resolution of 12 December 1966, without taking any account of the important changes in the territory during the past year.

CONSIDERATION BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The situation in Fiji was also considered later in 1967 at the General Assembly's twenty-second session.

Discussion took place mainly in the Assembly's Fourth Committee, which considered the report on Fiji of the Special Committee of Twenty-four and a 29-power draft resolution on the matter.

By the draft text, the Assembly would, among other things: (1) reaffirm the inalienable right of the people of Fiji to self-determination and independence in accordance with the Declaration on the granting of independence; (2) reaffirm the provisions of its earlier resolution on the question; (3) reaffirm the necessity of sending a visiting mission to Fiji for the purpose

²⁸ See Y.U.N., 1960, pp. 49-50, text of resolution 1514(XV).

of studying at first hand the situation in the territory; (4) regret the refusal of the administering power to receive the visiting mission in Fiji and urgently appeal to it to reconsider its decision; and (5) request the Special Committee to continue its examination of the question of Fiji and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its twenty-third (1968) session.

The Fourth Committee approved the text on 16 December 1967 by a roll-call vote of 80 to 6, with 15 abstentions. On 19 December 1967, the Assembly adopted it as resolution 2350 (XXII) by 91 votes to 6, with 20 abstentions. (For text of resolution, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

The sponsors of the resolution in the Fourth Committee were: Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo (Brazzaville), Cyprus, Ethiopia, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Kenya, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Singapore, Somalia, Syria, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

During the debate in the Fourth Committee, the representative of the United Kingdom said that the usual problems of international power politics and of strategic, economic or financial considerations did not arise in the territory. There was no dispute over sovereignty, nor was there a white minority in the island seeking to perpetuate its political control over the majority. Therefore, he continued, it should be possible to view the problem without prejudice and without seeking to fit it into a predetermined mold.

After the constitutional conference of 1965, the two main communities, despite wide divergencies of view, had accepted that the long-term aim should be a single common roll, regardless of community or race. It was regrettable that past resolutions of the General Assembly and the Special Committee of Twenty-four should have called for the new constitutional system to be replaced by another which would have accentuated racial divisions, as the present Constitution was working well in bridging the division between the communities. Had the United Nations resolutions been implemented, it was unlikely that the very promising development of a non-communal political approach

could have occurred. He further said that the measures called for by the Assembly's resolution of 12 December 1966 would have done irreparable harm. For the same reason, the United Kingdom Government had been unable to agree that any useful purpose would be served by a visit of a United Nations mission to Fiji, particularly when the leader of the majority party in Fiji had publicly stated his opposition to such a visit. In the United Kingdom's view, it would be wrong to force the people of Fiji into a hasty and premature judgement before they were ready to make it.

Although the draft resolution appeared to be more moderate and acceptable than earlier resolutions, the United Kingdom believed it did not in fact differ from them and would therefore vote against it.

The representatives of Bulgaria, India, Nigeria, Venezuela and Yugoslavia, among others, deplored the failure of the United Kingdom to implement the relevant United Nations resolutions concerning Fiji. They maintained that the United Kingdom had exaggerated the differences between the two main groups in order to justify inequities in the political system. They further maintained that the present electoral system, which was based primarily on communal voting, discriminated against indigenous Fijians and Fijians of Indian origin and benefited only the European minority. The disproportionate share of power retained by the European community was obvious. The broad jurisdiction of the Governor was a considerable limitation on the powers of the elected organs to adopt decisions and it hampered the progress of the Fijians towards self-determination. The present system could not guarantee harmony among the different communities in the territory. These Members called for general elections in accordance with the principle of "one man, one vote," and the implementation of United Nations resolutions concerning Fiji.

The proposal to dispatch a visiting mission to Fiji was endorsed by Chile, Ghana, the Philippines, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syria and the United Arab Republic, among others.

The representative of New Zealand said that his country was certainly not opposed to independence, equality and racial harmony. It had voted against the General Assembly's resolution

of 12 December 1966 because of its fundamental objection to the time-table laid down for achieving the resolution's aims. The evidence did not suggest that the majority of the people of Fiji favoured the kind of hasty time-table laid down in that resolution; the evidence was, in fact, that they were opposed to it at the present juncture. In the interests of the Fijian peoples, the Committee should not succumb to the temptation to endorse a time-table which was known in advance to be unacceptable to the Fijians and which might thus give Fijian leaders the impression that the United Nations regarded their views as irrelevant.

Sweden felt that the administering power might well be criticized for having been too slow in encouraging the two principal com-

munities in Fiji to draw closer together, and feared that the existing electoral system and distribution of seats in the Legislative Council were conducive to separatism, although Sweden appreciated that the purpose was to protect the interests of the minority. With regard to the fixing of an early date for independence, it might well be that the political parties would prefer first to gain experience of self-government. The introduction of the ministerial system of government was a step forward in that respect. With regard to the United Nations visiting mission, Sweden believed it would probably be interpreted as proof that the United Nations had taken the side of one of the two main communities to the detriment of the other.

DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES

Special Committee on Situation with regard to Implementation of Declaration on Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, meetings 546, 555, 558, 560, 561.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY—22ND SESSION

Fourth Committee, meetings 1737, 1738, 1740-1742, 1744, 1745, 1753, 1755.

Fifth Committee, meeting 1229.

Plenary Meeting 1641.

A/6700/Rev.1. Report of Special Committee (covering its work in 1967), Chapter VII.

A/C.4/L.895 and Add.1. Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo (Brazzaville), Cyprus, Ethiopia, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Kenya, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Singapore, Somalia, Syria, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia: draft resolution, adopted by Fourth Committee on 16 December 1967, meeting 1755, by roll-call vote of 80 to 6, with 15 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Democratic Republic of Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Libya, Madagascar, Maldives Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Spain, Sudan,

Syria, 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: Australia, Malawi, New Zealand, Portugal, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Gambia, Ireland, Italy, Liberia, Malaysia, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden. A/C.4/L.903, A/C.5/1165, A/7018. Administrative and financial implications of draft resolution adopted by Fourth Committee, A/7011.

A/7011. Report of Fourth Committee.

RESOLUTION 2350(XXII), as proposed by Fourth Committee, A/7011, adopted by Assembly on 19 December 1967, meeting 1641, by recorded vote of 91 to 6, with 20 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cambodia, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Democratic Republic of Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Maldives Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, 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: Australia, New Zealand, Portugal, South Africa, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Gambia, Guyana, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden.

"The General Assembly,

"Having examined the question of Fiji,

"Having considered the chapter of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples relating to Fiji,

"Recalling its resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960,

"Recalling further earlier resolutions of the General Assembly and the Special Committee relating to Fiji,

"1. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of Fiji to self-determination and independence, in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of

Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples:

"2. Approves the chapter of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples relating to Fiji and endorses the conclusions and recommendations contained therein;

"3. Reaffirms the provisions of resolutions 1951 (XVIII) of 11 December 1963, 2068(XX) of 16 December 1965 and 2185(XXI) of 12 December 1966 concerning Fiji;

"4. Reaffirms the necessity of sending a visiting mission to Fiji for the purpose of studying at first hand the situation in the Territory;

"5. Regrets the refusal of the administering Power to receive the visiting mission in Fiji and urgently appeals to it to reconsider its decision;

"6. Requests the Special Committee to continue its examination of the question of Fiji and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its twenty-third session;

"7. Decides to maintain this item on its agenda,"

French Somaliland

French Somaliland,²⁹ administered by France as an overseas territory, lies on the eastern coast of Africa and is bounded by Ethiopia and Somalia. It covers an area of 8,900 square miles (23,000 square kilometres) with a population of 125,000 in 1967.

Following a referendum held on 19 March 1967, in which a majority of the voters of the territory opted in favour of remaining "part of the French Republic with [a] new statute of government and administration," the French National Assembly passed a bill on 13 June 1967 laying down the provisions of the new statute, which, after being approved by the French Senate on 20 June, was promulgated as a law on 3 July 1967. The law was promulgated in the territory on 5 July 1967. The law, which provided for the establishment of an elected Chamber of Deputies, which in turn would elect a Government Council, had as one of its declared purposes to grant a large measure of autonomy in the administration of the territory's affairs.

By this same law, the official name of the territory was changed to the French Territory of the Afars and the Issas.

CONSIDERATION BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF TWENTY-FOUR

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 considered the question of French Somaliland on four separate occasions during 1967: in March, in April, in June and in September.

At meetings held at United Nations Headquarters between 9 and 15 March, shortly before the referendum in French Somaliland, the Special Committee had before it a report submitted by the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of the General Assembly's resolution of 20 December 1966 on the question of French Somaliland.³⁰ By this resolution, the

²⁹ The new name of the territory formerly known as French Somaliland is "French Territory of the Afars and the Issas." This designation was introduced in United Nations terminology as from 15 April 1968 at the request of the administering power.

³⁰ See Y.U.N., 1966, pp. 583-84, text of resolution 2228(XXI).

General Assembly, *Inter alia*, had called upon the administering power to ensure that the right of self-determination should be freely expressed and exercised by the indigenous inhabitants of the territory on the basis of universal adult suffrage and with full respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and it had urged the administering power to create a proper political climate for a referendum to be conducted on an entirely free and democratic basis. It had also requested the administering power, in consultation with the Secretary-General, to make appropriate arrangements for a United Nations presence before, and supervision during, the holding of the referendum. In his report to the Special Committee, the Secretary-General stated that he had not as yet received any response from the French Government regarding the implementation of the resolution.

In statements made before the Special Committee, various members, including Afghanistan, Chile, Iraq, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Tunisia, the United Republic of Tanzania and Uruguay, expressed regret that there had been no response from the French Government with regard to the implementation of the General Assembly's resolution of 20 December 1966, particularly with respect to arrangements for a United Nations presence before, and supervision during, the holding of the referendum.

These members stressed the urgency and importance of establishing a United Nations presence in the territory to ensure a climate of confidence. The representative of Somalia proposed that a sub-committee should go immediately to the territory to obtain impartial information about the situation there before, during and immediately after the referendum. He said that, should this not be possible, he was authorized by his Government to invite a sub-committee to obtain pertinent information in Somalia, in a place or places to be determined by it as appropriate.

The representatives of Ethiopia, the Ivory Coast and Mali expressed confidence in the French Government's intentions and claimed that the process of decolonization had already begun in French Somaliland. Although Mali and Ethiopia regretted the lack of response of the French Government to the Secretary-General's communication and its attitude of non-

co-operation with the Special Committee, they nevertheless did not believe that a United Nations presence was a useful initiative in the case of French Somaliland. The Ivory Coast shared this view, and maintained, further, that the adoption of a resolution on the question of French Somaliland a few days before the referendum would be untimely.

On 15 March 1967, the Special Committee adopted a resolution by a roll-call vote of 16 to 1, with 7 abstentions, by which, among other things, it expressed its regret that the administering power had not as yet complied with all the provisions of the General Assembly's resolution of 20 December 1966 on French Somaliland, and urged the administering power to ensure that the forthcoming referendum was conducted in a just and democratic manner. It also appealed to the people of the territory to continue their united efforts to achieve their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

On 6 April 1967, the Special Committee of Twenty-four heard the following petitioners: Abdillahi Wabery, Vice-President of the Parti du mouvement populaire (PMP) and Secretary-General of the Central Committee for Deportees from French Somaliland; Abdulrahman Ahmed Hassan Gabot, Vice-President of the Front de Liberation de la Côte des Somalis (FLCS) and former member of the Territorial Assembly of French Somaliland, and Abdillahi Youssouf, Member of the Central Committee of PMP and former Secretary of the Co-ordinating Bureau of PMP and the Union démocratique Afar. After drawing attention to what they considered to be the unsatisfactory conditions under which the March 1967 referendum had been held and the inflexible designs of the French Government, the petitioners appealed to the United Nations to establish an investigating commission to study the conduct of the referendum and to report on the situation in the territory, and they called upon France to set a date for the independence of the territory. The petitioners also claimed that France had created a new refugee problem by deporting a large number of inhabitants from the territory.

The representative of Somalia said that his Government considered it essential that the Committee should obtain impartial evidence on

the situation in French Somaliland and on the refugee problem in Somalia and in this connexion called for the appointment of a sub-committee to conduct an inquiry in the territory. He considered that the Committee should also express its concern over recent developments in French Somaliland and call on the administering power to discontinue its current policies towards the territory.

During the meetings, held in Dar es Salaam, United Republic of Tanzania, on 16 and 19 June 1967, the Special Committee of Twenty-four heard Abdillahi Wabery, Abdillahi Yousouf and Osmen Abubaker, Vice-President, Secretary for External Relations and Under-Secretary respectively of the Front de Libération de la Côte des Somalis (FLCS). These petitioners claimed that the referendum of 19 March had been rigged. They stressed the need to find a solution to the refugee problem and asked that the earliest possible date be fixed for the accession of French Somaliland to independence, after a referendum on the basis of universal suffrage, under the supervision of international organizations. They also urged the Special Committee to condemn the recent change of name of the territory by the French National Assembly to "French Territory of the Afars and Issas" as a stratagem designed to prolong French domination and repression.

The representative of Somalia repeated his previous suggestion concerning a fact-finding sub-committee. He called on the Special Committee to reject the March 1967 referendum which he claimed had been a mockery and a farce. The Committee, in his view, should call on the administering power to normalize all aspects of life in the territory, terminate all special police, emergency and military measures and martial law and release all detainees in the so-called transit camps and all other political prisoners, as well as to arrange for the orderly return of the deportees from Somalia to the territory. The Special Committee should also strongly censure France for the brutality and loss of life inflicted on the indigenous people by its military forces.

During the Special Committee's meetings held at United Nations Headquarters on 12 and 13 September 1967, the representative of Somalia described what he regarded as the continued

deterioration of the situation in the territory, particularly in relation to the provisions of the new Statute approved by the French National Assembly, which in his view gave the colonial power unlimited authority in all matters of importance and was a scarcely disguised effort to turn back the clock, precluding any possibility of the territory's evolution towards self-determination.

The Special Committee decided to transmit to the General Assembly the information contained in the relevant working papers prepared by the United Nations Secretariat, together with the statements made on the item by representatives and by petitioners. It also decided that, subject to any decision that the General Assembly might take at its twenty-second session, (later in 1967), the Committee would consider French Somaliland again in 1968.

CONSIDERATION BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY

At the General Assembly's twenty-second session in 1967, the question of French Somaliland was discussed in the Assembly's Fourth Committee. Among the Members who expressed regret at the policies being pursued by the administering power in French Somaliland were Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen and Zambia. They expressed concern at the French Government's refusal to co-operate with the United Nations in the decolonization of the territory and urged that Government to grant independence to the people without delay.

The representative of Somalia, emphasizing many of the points made in the Special Committee's earlier debates on the question, urged the General Assembly to seek the release of political prisoners and permission for persons who had been exiled or expelled for political reasons to return to the territory, and to try to promote respect for the fundamental human rights of the population—such as the right of freedom of expression and of association. He condemned the administering power for pursuing a policy of "divide and rule" and claimed that the change of the territory's name to "French Territory of the Afars and Issas" was evidence of such a policy.

The representative of Madagascar, however, considered that the conditions necessary for the exercise of the right of the people to self-determination and independence already existed. His view was that the territory was autonomous and the territorial legislature could request a change in the territory's status or in its relations with other States at any time.

On 16 December, the Fourth Committee approved a draft resolution by roll-call vote of 71 to 1, with 27 abstentions, and at a plenary meeting on 19 December the Assembly adopted the text as its resolution 2356(XXII) by a roll-call vote of 86 to 1, with 29 abstentions. The Assembly thereby: (1) reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of French Somaliland to self-determination and independence; (2) expressed regret that the administering power had not co-operated with the United Nations in the application of the General Assembly's resolution of 14 December 1960 on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples³¹ and had not implemented the General Assembly's resolution of 20 December 1966;³² (3) called upon the administering power to

create the political conditions necessary for accelerating the implementation of the right of the people to self-determination and independence, including the full exercise of political freedoms, and to allow the return of all refugees to the territory; (4) urged the administering power to co-operate fully with the Special Committee of Twenty-four and with the United Nations in accelerating the process of decolonization in the territory and to grant independence to the inhabitants at an early date; (5) asked the Special Committee of Twenty-four to report again on this situation; and (6) decided to keep the question on its agenda. (For text of resolution, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

The sponsors of the draft resolution in the Fourth Committee were: Ghana, Guinea, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen and Zambia.

³¹ See Y.U.N., 1960, pp. 49-50, text of resolution 1514(XV).

³² See footnote 30.

DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES

Special Committee on Situation with regard to Implementation of Declaration on Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, meetings 499, 500, 502, 503, 508, 537, 538, 557, 559.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY—22ND SESSION

Fourth Committee, meetings 1706, 1746, 1751-1753, 1755, 1756.

Plenary Meeting 1641.

A/6700/Rev.1. Report of Special Committee (covering its work in 1967), chapter XII.

A/C.4/L.898 and Add.1. Ghana, Guinea, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia: draft resolution, adopted by Fourth Committee on 16 December 1967, meeting 1755, by roll-call vote of 71 to 1, with 27 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Barbados, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chile, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Democratic Republic of Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Malaysia, Maldive Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mon-

golia, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Portugal.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, India, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Madagascar, Malawi, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Senegal, South Africa, Sweden, Togo, United Kingdom, United States.

A/7013. Report of Fourth Committee, draft resolution IV.

RESOLUTION 2356(XXII), as recommended by Fourth Committee, A/7013, adopted by Assembly on 19 December 1967, meeting 1641, by roll-call vote of 86 to 1, with 29 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Democratic Republic of Congo, Costa Rica,

Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Portugal.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Dahomey, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Senegal, Sweden, Togo, United Kingdom, United States.

"The General Assembly,

"Having considered the question of French Somaliland (Djibouti),

"Recalling its resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960, containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and its resolution 2228(XXI) of 20 December 1966,

"Having considered the chapter of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Grant-

ing of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples relating to French Somaliland (Djibouti),

"Considering the circumstances in which the referendum organized by the administering Power took place on 19 March 1967,

"1. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of French Somaliland (Djibouti) to self-determination and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514(XV) ;

"2. Regrets that the administering Power has not co-operated with the United Nations in the application of resolution 1514(XV) and did not implement General Assembly resolution 2228(XXI);

"3. Calls upon the administering Power to create the political conditions necessary for accelerating the implementation of the right of the people to self-determination and independence, including the full exercise of political freedoms, and to allow the return of all refugees to the Territory;

"4. Urges the administering Power to co-operate fully with 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 with the United Nations in accelerating the process of decolonization in the Territory and to grant independence to the inhabitants at an early date;

"5. Requests the Special Committee to continue its consideration of the situation in French Somaliland (Djibouti) and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its twenty-third session;

"6. Decides to keep the question of French Somaliland (Djibouti) on its agenda."

Gibraltar

Gibraltar, covering an area of 2¼ square miles and administered by the United Kingdom, had a population in 1966 estimated at 25,184 of whom 19,164 were Gibraltarians, 4,593 other British and 1,427 aliens.

CONSIDERATION BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF TWENTY-FOUR

The situation in Gibraltar was considered in August-September 1967 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 of Twenty-four had before it a report by the Secretary-General transmitting communications from Spain and the United Kingdom concerning the implementation of a General Assembly resolution of 20 December

1966 calling upon the two parties to continue their negotiations on the question of Gibraltar, and asking the administering power to expedite the decolonization of Gibraltar and to report to the Special Committee of Twenty-four.³³

During the meetings, the representative of the United Kingdom said that, to his delegation's regret, the continued negotiations between the United Kingdom and Spain called for by the General Assembly had not taken place. The United Kingdom favoured negotiations and regretted the imposition by the Spanish Government of unacceptable pre-conditions for the holding of further talks. The United Kingdom Government, by its decision to hold a referendum in Gibraltar on 10 September 1967,

³³ See Y.U.N., 1966, p. 588, text of resolution 2231 (XXI).

had made an important contribution towards the implementation of the Assembly's resolution of 20 December 1966.

Two alternatives would be offered to the people of Gibraltar in this referendum, the United Kingdom representative explained—namely, to pass under Spanish sovereignty in accordance with the terms proposed by the Government of Spain in 1966³⁴ or to retain their link with Britain, with democratic local institutions and with Britain retaining its present responsibilities. The United Kingdom Government regarded the referendum as an important, though not necessarily a final, stage in the process of decolonization. It did not represent an irrevocable option on the part of the people of Gibraltar, for even if a majority elected to retain the link with Britain, the people of Gibraltar would still retain the right to express by free and democratic choice their desire to join Spain. The United Kingdom representative said that his Government would welcome the presence of any observer whom the Secretary-General might wish to send to Gibraltar for the referendum, as well as the presence of an observer nominated by the Government of Spain. Certain Commonwealth countries had already agreed to nominate observers. The United Kingdom representative reiterated his Government's position that integration of Gibraltar with Spain would constitute decolonization only if it took place in accordance with the wishes of the population.

The representative of Spain said that the General Assembly's resolution of 20 December 1966—taken in conjunction with the Special Committee's consensus of 16 October 1964³⁵ and with an Assembly resolution of 16 December 1965³⁶ not only indicated that Gibraltar should be decolonized but also specified the manner in which the process should be conducted. (In its consensus of 16 October 1964, the Special Committee reaffirmed that the provisions of the General Assembly's Declaration of 14 December 1960³⁷ on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples were fully applicable to Gibraltar and invited Spain and the United Kingdom to begin talks without delay to reach a negotiated solution, in conformity with the provisions of the Declaration, bearing in mind the interests of

the people of Gibraltar. By its resolution of 16 December 1965, the Assembly invited Spain and the United Kingdom to begin without delay the talks envisaged under the terms of the Special Committee's consensus.)

The representative of Spain maintained that the provisions of the Assembly's resolution of 14 December 1960 containing the Declaration on the granting of independence were applicable to Gibraltar. That resolution had set forth the principles of self-determination and had embodied the principles of national unity and territorial integrity of all countries. Neither the Special Committee nor the General Assembly, the Spanish representative said, had specified that the principle of self-determination should apply to the civilian population of Gibraltar. The condition laid down by the United Nations for the return of Gibraltar to Spain was that the interests of the inhabitants should be respected; the Spanish Government had offered to respect those interests and had made a number of suggestions to the United Kingdom as to how they might be safeguarded.

Spain considered that the continued British presence on a portion of Spanish soil was tantamount to the dismemberment of the national unity and the territorial integrity of Spain; as long as such dismemberment persisted the colonial situation in Gibraltar would also persist. By its resolution of 20 December 1966, the General Assembly had requested the United Kingdom to expedite, without any hindrance and in consultation with the Government of Spain, the decolonization of Gibraltar. The United Kingdom had interrupted the negotiations for the decolonization of Gibraltar and had decided to hold a referendum in the territory without previous consultations with Spain. This decision not only violated the Treaty of Utrecht of 1713 but also the United Nations resolutions.

Venezuela maintained that the General Assembly's resolution of 14 December 1960 containing the Declaration on the Granting of

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 585.

³⁵ See Y.U.N., 1964, p. 424.

³⁶ See Y.U.N., 1965, p. 583, text of resolution 2070(XX).

³⁷ See Y.U.N., 1960, pp. 49-50, text of resolution 1514(XV).

Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and particularly paragraph 6 of the Declaration (which stated that any attempt aimed at partial or total disruption of the national unity and territorial integrity of a country was incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter), was applicable to Gibraltar. Because the problem affected the territorial integrity of a Member State, the Assembly had asked the parties to negotiate.

Iraq agreed with Spain's challenge of the validity of the referendum, which violated the provisions of the General Assembly's resolutions and was based on a unilateral decision by the administering power. Similar opinions were expressed by Chile and Syria.

The United Kingdom submitted a draft resolution to the Special Committee of Twenty-four by the preamble of which the Special Committee would: (a) recall the General Assembly's request of 20 December 1966 to take into account the interests of the people of the territory; (b) note the declared intention of the administering power to consult the people of the territory about their views as to where their interests lay by means of a referendum to be held on 10 September 1967; and (c) note the statement by the administering power that, in accordance with the requirements of the General Assembly's resolution of 20 December 1966 on the question of Gibraltar,³⁸ it intended to make a full report to the Special Committee following the referendum. The operative part of the draft text would have the Special Committee decide to resume discussion of the question of Gibraltar as soon as the full report of the administering power was received.

By the preamble to another draft resolution, sponsored by Chile, Iraq, Syria and Uruguay, the Special Committee would, among other things, recall previous decisions of the General Assembly and of the Special Committee on Gibraltar and consider that any colonial situation which partially or totally disrupted the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country was incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and specifically with the provision to this effect contained in paragraph 6 of the Assembly's Declaration of 14 December 1960

on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

By its operative paragraphs, the draft resolution would: (1) regret the interruption of the negotiations which were recommended by General Assembly resolutions; (2) declare that the holding by the administering power of the envisaged referendum would contradict the provisions of the Assembly's resolution of 20 December 1966 on the Gibraltar question; (3) invite the United Kingdom and Spain to resume without delay the negotiations provided for by the General Assembly's resolutions with a view to putting an end to the colonial situation in Gibraltar and to safeguarding the interests of the population upon the termination of that colonial situation; and (4) request the Secretary-General to assist the two Governments in the implementation of the present resolution and to report to the General Assembly at its twenty-second session in 1967.

The representative of Uruguay said that the referendum decided upon by the United Kingdom represented a departure from the system of bilateral negotiations called for by the Assembly's resolution of 20 December 1966 on the Gibraltar question. Another reason for objecting to the referendum was that, according to the Treaty of Utrecht, Spain was to have preferential option to recover the territory should a change of status be contemplated. Any referendum organized by the British who inhabited the territory was devoid of legal value. Mali and Tunisia expressed support for the Spanish position, in particular with regard to the proposed referendum.

The United Republic of Tanzania said that the General Assembly had called upon the administering power to enter into consultations with Spain to ensure not only decolonization, but also the type of decolonization and the process followed. The proposed referendum would defeat the purposes of the Assembly's resolution of 20 December 1966 on the Gibraltar question. His delegation, however, had certain reservations with regard to the interpretation given by the sponsors of the four-power draft resolution to that paragraph of the Assembly's

³⁸ See footnote 33.

Declaration of 14 December 1960 on the grant of independence which dealt with disruption of the national unity or territorial integrity of a country. In the view of the United Republic of Tanzania that paragraph only applied to colonial territories and could not be linked with the question of sovereignty of independent States.

The representative of Afghanistan considered that the interests of the inhabitants of Gibraltar demanded that the Special Committee should base its decision on the General Assembly's view that under the prevailing circumstances the continuation of negotiations between the administering power and Spain was the most effective means of achieving a workable solution to the problem of Gibraltar. Afghanistan proposed that the Committee should avoid a negative approach to the holding of the referendum and might instead declare that the proposed referendum had not been envisaged by the General Assembly.

The question of Gibraltar could not be a simple matter for negotiation between the United Kingdom and Spain, in the opinion of Sierra Leone. The interests of the people of the territory should be taken into account and they would certainly be ascertained by consultation in the form of a referendum. Sierra Leone, further, believed that the paragraph dealing with disruption of the national unity and territorial integrity of a country contained in the Assembly's Declaration of 14 December 1960 on the granting of independence, like the resolution as a whole, was directed specifically to non-self-governing territories; Spain's claim of disruption of its territorial integrity was not relevant.

The USSR representative stressed the military aspects of the question of Gibraltar and said that during their negotiations concerning the future of the territory, the parties had never raised the question of eliminating the Gibraltar military base. In the view of the USSR, the problem of decolonizing Gibraltar could not be separated from that of dismantling the military base and demilitarizing the area.

Australia's spokesman said he understood the Spanish case to be that Spain was the legitimate sovereign power with respect to Gibraltar and

responsible for its inhabitants. The United Kingdom, for its part, maintained that it was the sovereign power, and that it had primary responsibility for the future of the people of Gibraltar, although Spain had an interest in the situation by virtue of the Treaty of Utrecht. Australia did not consider that the Special Committee was competent to take decisions on questions of sovereignty; the United Nations body competent to consider such disputes was the International Court of Justice. The Australian representative noted that the United Kingdom was prepared to submit the question of sovereignty to the International Court and that the Spanish Government had declined to accept that procedure. With regard to the General Assembly's resolution of 20 December 1966 on the Gibraltar question, Australia felt that the debate which took place in 1966 in the General Assembly's Fourth Committee had demonstrated the importance which the Assembly as a whole attached to the right of the Gibraltarians to decide their own future. Also, in Australia's view, the paragraph in the Declaration on granting independence which dealt with the disruption of the national unity and territorial integrity of a country could hardly be taken to apply to Gibraltar. It was a very sound idea to hold a referendum in order to ascertain the wishes of the people of Gibraltar at the present stage.

The immediate objective of the United Kingdom draft resolution, the spokesman of the United Kingdom observed, was that no decision should be taken until the voice of the people of Gibraltar had been heard. It would be contrary to the most elementary principles of justice and to the fundamental principles of the Charter to deny the people concerned the right to speak in their own cause. And no one could dispute the United Kingdom's right to consult the people of a territory under its administration on a matter of fundamental importance to their future. When the people had made their choice and the facts were thus before the United Nations, then whatever the result of the referendum there would be a wide range of matters for negotiation between Spain and the United Kingdom.

Italy believed that the best way to solve

the dispute was through negotiations between the administering power and Spain, taking into account the interests of the people of the territory. Italy's vote in favour of the four-power draft resolution should not be taken as an unqualified endorsement of a certain interpretation of the General Assembly's resolution of 14 December 1960 on the granting of independence which, although worthy of further consideration, was not universally accepted either in the Special Committee or in the General Assembly.

The representative of Tunisia said that his delegation was opposed, not to the holding of a referendum as a means of determining the views of the population, but rather to the manner in which it was being organized by the administering power.

On 1 September 1967, the draft resolution sponsored by the United Kingdom was rejected by the Special Committee by 10 votes against to 3 in favour, with 11 abstentions. The revised draft resolution sponsored by Chile, Iraq, Syria and Uruguay was adopted by a roll-call vote of 16 in favour to 2 against, with 6 abstentions.

CONSIDERATION BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY

In December 1967, at the twenty-second session of the General Assembly, the situation in Gibraltar was considered mostly in the Assembly's Fourth Committee.

The Fourth Committee had before it a communication from the United Kingdom which stated, among other things, that in the referendum held on 10 September 1967, the number of valid votes cast was 12,182 (out of an electorate of 12,757) of which 12,138 were for the alternative of "voluntarily to retain their link with Britain, with democratic local institutions and with Britain retaining its present responsibilities." The United Kingdom had proposed to Spain that talks on Anglo-Spanish relations, including the question of Gibraltar, should begin in Madrid in the latter part of November, the communication added.

The Fourth Committee also had before it a communication from Spain which said, among other things, that the Spanish Government believed that talks between Britain and Spain regarding the state of relations between the

two countries must always be desirable and useful. However, talks such as those proposed by the United Kingdom had nothing in common with negotiations designed to put an end to the colonial situation in Gibraltar as recommended by the United Nations.

Sir Joshua Hassan and Peter Isola, respectively Chief Minister and Deputy Chief Minister of Gibraltar, addressed the Fourth Committee as petitioners. They supported the United Kingdom position on Gibraltar and stressed that the people of Gibraltar had an identity and that their interests, according to the United Nations Charter, should be paramount. The referendum had established the wishes of the people.

Pedro Hidalgo and Fernando Fugarado (Trade Union of Spanish Workers in Gibraltar) also addressed the Fourth Committee as petitioners. They supported the position of Spain on Gibraltar and said that if the future of Gibraltar was to be decided by those affected by the colonial situation, the inhabitants of the Campo of Gibraltar had a right to participate in that decision since they were affected more than anyone else. The five cities of the Campo of Gibraltar had been founded and settled by descendants of Gibraltarians who had been expelled as a result of the British occupation of Gibraltar. Among the inhabitants of the Campo of Gibraltar there were some 5,000 Spanish workers in Gibraltar who were not allowed to live where they worked.

Three draft resolutions were before the Fourth Committee.

By the preamble to one text, sponsored by 25 Members, the Assembly would, among other things, recall the Special Committee's resolution of 1 September 1967 and its own resolutions on the question of Gibraltar, and would consider that any colonial situation which partially or completely destroyed the national unity and territorial integrity of a country was incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, and specifically with the provisions of the paragraph to that effect in the General Assembly's resolution of 14 December 1960 on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. By the operative paragraphs of the 25-power proposal, the Assembly would: (1) regret the interruption of the negotiations which it had recom-

mended; (2) declare the holding of the referendum of 10 September 1967 by the administering power to be a contravention of the provisions of the Assembly's resolution of 20 December 1966 and of the Special Committee's resolution of 1 September 1967; (3) invite Spain and the United Kingdom to resume without delay the negotiations provided for by General Assembly resolutions with a view to putting an end to the colonial situation in Gibraltar and to safeguarding the interests of the population upon the termination of that situation; and (4) request the Secretary-General to assist the Governments of Spain and the United Kingdom in the implementation of the present resolution and to report to the twenty-third (1968) session of the Assembly.

The following were the sponsors of the 25-power proposal: Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Cambodia., Cameroon, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Gabon, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iraq, Mauritania, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Southern Yemen, Syria, the United Arab Republic, Uruguay and Yemen.

A second draft resolution was submitted by the United Kingdom. By this text, the General Assembly, expressing concern at the restrictions imposed by Spain in the area, would: (1) call for the termination of the restrictions imposed on free access to Gibraltar and of other measures designed to damage the interests of the population of Gibraltar; (2) take note of the United Kingdom report submitted in accordance with the Assembly's resolution of 20 December 1966 on the Gibraltar question; (3) take note of the results of the referendum in which the overwhelming majority of the people voted in favour of retaining their links with the United Kingdom, rather than passing under Spanish sovereignty; (4) draw the attention of the parties concerned to Article 73 of the Charter, according to which the interests of the people were paramount and under which the United Kingdom had accepted the obligation to develop self-government and to take due account of the political aspirations of the people; (5) urge the necessity of avoiding any act which might impede the holding of negotiations; (6) call upon the two parties to continue their negotiations, taking into account the freely

expressed aspirations and interests of the people of the territory; and (7) ask the Secretary-General to assist in implementing the present resolution.

A third draft resolution was submitted by the following eight Members: Ceylon, Denmark, the Gambia, Iceland, Jamaica, Malta, Norway and Singapore. By the operative terms of this eight-power draft resolution, the General Assembly would call upon the two parties to continue their negotiations, in accordance with the provisions of previous resolutions, and ask the administering power to expedite the decolonization of Gibraltar without any hindrance and in consultation with the Government of Spain, and taking into account the interests of the people of the territory.

The United Kingdom said that its draft resolution recognized that one of the essential factors in the situation was the wishes of the inhabitants of the territory. By its reference to the restrictions imposed by Spain in Gibraltar it pointed to the factor which, more than any other, had impeded the peaceful negotiation of differences; and by calling for the removal of those restrictions it sought to remove that principal impediment.

Supporting the 25-power text, the representative of Ecuador observed that international disputes should be settled by peaceful means and that attempts to disrupt the territorial integrity of a country were incompatible with the United Nations Charter and specifically with the paragraph to that effect in the Assembly's resolution of 14 December 1960. The Special Committee's consensus of 1964 had recommended a negotiated solution of the question of Gibraltar, and the General Assembly in 1966 had asked the United Kingdom to expedite the decolonization of Gibraltar in consultation with Spain. Also, the Special Committee had declared on 1 September 1967 that the holding of the proposed referendum would contradict the provisions of the Assembly's resolution of 20 December 1966 on the Gibraltar question.

Norway, supporting the eight-power resolution, said that earlier debates on the question of Gibraltar had always led to almost unanimous decisions, urging the parties to undertake negotiations with a view to reaching

an understanding. This year, conflicting draft resolutions had been introduced and Norway felt that many Members would be reluctant to support one or the other of the parties. Therefore, the aim of the eight-power draft resolution, which offered a third alternative, was to reaffirm that Gibraltar should be decolonized through negotiations between the administering power and Spain, which historically and legally had a close interest in the matter. Jamaica said that the eight-power draft resolution offered a compromise solution, while at the same time respecting the basic principle that the interests of the inhabitants of the territory were paramount.

Although the 25-power draft resolution was not in his view fully satisfactory since the question of the military base in Gibraltar should have been mentioned, the Spanish representative said he would nevertheless vote for it because it reflected the point of view of the Special Committee. The draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom seemed to him to contain nothing which was conducive to further negotiations between the United Kingdom and Spain. He thought the eight-power draft resolution was not a constructive proposal.

The representatives of Malaysia, New Zealand, Sierra Leone, and Trinidad and Tobago were among those who expressed the view that the principle of self-determination was fully applicable in the case of Gibraltar and that a solution to this problem should be found through negotiations between the administering power and Spain, taking into account the wishes of the population.

Iran, Ireland, Jordan and Venezuela, among others, stressed that the principle of territorial integrity, embodied in paragraph 6 of the Assembly's Declaration of 14 December 1960 on the granting of independence, was relevant in the case of Gibraltar. The purport of that principle was that self-determination should in no way affect the territorial integrity of any State. The General Assembly, in recommending negotiations as a basis for decolonization in the case of Gibraltar, had acted in conformity with that provision of the Declaration.

The representative of Finland had no doubt

that the people of Gibraltar had the right to self-determination. His delegation also supported the principle of territorial integrity, as the term was used in the Declaration on decolonization, but considered that that principle could not alone determine the future of a territory. In his view, the most constructive approach to the problem would be to adopt a resolution based on wide agreement among Member States, including the two most directly concerned.

On 16 December, Norway proposed that the eight-power draft resolution should be voted on first. This proposal on priority in voting was rejected by a roll-call vote of 62 to 30, with 24 abstentions.

On the same day, the Fourth Committee approved the 25-power draft resolution by a roll-call vote of 70 to 21, with 25 abstentions. The draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom and that submitted by eight Member States were withdrawn.

Speaking in explanation of vote, the United Kingdom said that by singling out the principle of territorial integrity and by referring to the disruption of national unity, the approved text would be interpreted by some as an endorsement of the Spanish claim to Gibraltar. It was for the International Court of Justice to settle that question, not the Fourth Committee, whose task was to deal with the political problems of decolonization. The draft resolution was dangerously defective in asserting that the Gibraltar referendum contravened the General Assembly's resolution of 20 December 1966. The referendum had provided an opportunity for the people of Gibraltar to indicate their views on their own interests, which that resolution itself required to be taken into account. Under Article 73 of the Charter, Members of the United Nations which assumed responsibilities for the administration of non-self-governing territories should recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of those territories were paramount. The United Kingdom Government had recognized its obligations to dependent territories as a solemn trust and it would not be deterred, nor would it be deflected from carrying out its obligations.

On 19 December 1967, the text recommended by the Fourth Committee was approved at a plenary meeting of the Assembly by a roll-call

vote of 73 to 19, with 27 abstentions, as resolution 2353(XXII). (For text of resolution, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES **below**.)

DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES

Special Committee on Situation with regard to Implementation of Declaration on Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, meetings 543-550, 570.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY—22ND SESSION

Fourth Committee, meetings 1706, 1719, 1737, 1741-1743, 1745-1755.

Plenary Meeting 1641.

A/6700/Rev.1. Report of Special Committee, (covering its work in 1967), Chapter X.

A/6876. Letter of 25 October 1967 from United Kingdom.

A/6882. Letter of 30 October 1967 from Spain.

A/C.4/702 and Add.1. Requests for hearings.

A/C.4/L.876 and Add.1-7. Argentina, Bolivia, Cameroon, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mauritania, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Southern Yemen, Syria, Yemen: draft resolution.

A/C.4/L.876/Rev.1. Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Cambodia, Cameroon, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Gabon, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iraq, Mauritania, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Southern Yemen, Syria, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Yemen: revised draft resolution, adopted by Fourth Committee on 16 December 1967, meeting 1754, by roll-call vote of 70 to 21, with 25 abstentions as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cambodia, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Barbados, Botswana, Canada, Ceylon, Denmark, Gambia, Guyana, Jamaica, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldive Islands, Malta, New Zealand, Norway, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom.

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Central African Republic, Chad, Democratic Republic of Congo, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Iceland, India, Israel, Kenya, Madagascar, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Senegal, Singapore, Thailand, Togo, Uganda, United States.

A/C.4/L.877. United Kingdom: draft resolution.

A/C.4/L.884. Ceylon, Denmark, Gambia, Iceland, Jamaica, Malta, Norway, Singapore: draft resolution.

A/C.4/L.887 and Add.1. Algeria, Cambodia, Gabon, Iraq, United Arab Republic, Uruguay: amendments to 19-power draft resolution, A/C.4/L.876.

A/C.4/L.888. Yemen: amendments to 8-power draft resolution, A/C.4/L.884.

A/C.4/L.889. Guyana: amendment to 8-power draft resolution, A/C.4/L.884.

A/C.4/L.890. Guyana: sub-amendment to amendment by Yemen, A/C.4/L.888.

A/7013. Report of Fourth Committee, draft resolution I.

RESOLUTION 2353 (XXII), as proposed by Fourth Committee. A/7013, adopted by Assembly on 19 December 1967, meeting 1641, by roll-call vote of 73 to 19, with 27 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Barbados, Botswana, Canada, Ceylon, Denmark, Gambia, Guyana, Jamaica, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldive Islands, Malta, New Zealand, Norway, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom.

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Iceland, India, Israel, Kenya, Laos, Luxembourg, Madagascar,

Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Singapore, Thailand, Togo, Uganda, United States.

"The General Assembly,

"Having considered the question of Gibraltar,

"Having heard the statements of the administering Power and the representative of Spain,

"Recalling its resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960,

"Recalling further the resolution adopted on 1 September 1967 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, General Assembly resolutions 2070(XX) of 16 December 1965 and 2231 (XXI) of 20 December 1966 and the consensus adopted on 16 October 1964 by the Special Committee,

"Considering that any colonial situation which partially or completely destroys the national unity and territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and specifically with paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 1514(XV),

"1. Regrets the interruption of the negotiations recommended in General Assembly resolutions 2070 (XX) and 2231 (XXI);

"2. Declares the holding of the referendum of 10 September 1967 by the administering Power to be a contravention of the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2231 (XXI) and of those of the resolution adopted on 1 September 1967 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;

"3. Invites the Governments of Spain and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to resume without delay the negotiations provided for in General Assembly resolutions 2070 (XX) and 2231(XXI) with a view to putting an end to the colonial situation in Gibraltar and to safeguarding the interests of the population upon the termination of that situation;

"4. Requests the Secretary-General to assist the Governments of Spain and the United Kingdom in the implementation of the present resolution and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its twenty-third session."

Ifni and Spanish Sahara

Ifni, an enclave on the Atlantic coast of Africa surrounded on the north, east and south by Morocco, covers an area of approximately 1,500 square kilometers and has a population of about 50,000 inhabitants. Spanish Sahara covers an area of 280,000 square kilometres on the Atlantic coast of Africa; it is bounded on the north by Morocco and on the east and south by Mauritania (except for a few kilometres in the east, where it is bounded by Algeria). Its population in 1966 was reported to be 33,512. The two territories are administered by Spain. Ifni is the subject of territorial claims by Morocco, and Spanish Sahara by Morocco and Mauritania.

By the terms of a resolution adopted on 20 December 1966,³⁹ the General Assembly reaffirmed the inalienable right of the peoples of Ifni and Spanish Sahara to self-determination and requested the administering power to accelerate the decolonization of Ifni and to determine with the Government of Morocco, bearing in mind the aspirations of the indigenous population, procedures for the transfer of powers in accordance with the provisions of its resolution of 14 December 1960 on the

granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.⁴⁰

With regard to Spanish Sahara, the Assembly, by the same resolution, asked the administering power to determine at the earliest possible date, in conformity with the aspirations of the indigenous people of Spanish Sahara and in consultation with the Governments of Mauritania and Morocco and any other interested party, the procedures for the holding of a referendum under United Nations auspices with a view to enabling the indigenous population of the territory to exercise freely its right to self-determination. The Assembly also asked the Secretary-General, in consultation with the administering power and 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, to send a special mission immediately to Spanish Sahara to recommend practical steps for the full im-

³⁹ See Y.U.N., 1966, pp. 591-92, text of resolution 2229(XXI).

⁴⁰ See Y.U.N., 1960, pp. 49-50, text of resolution 1514(XV).

plementation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, and to determine the extent of United Nations participation in the preparation and supervision of the referendum.

CONSIDERATION BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF TWENTY-FOUR

In a report submitted to the Committee of Twenty-four on 31 May 1967, the Secretary-General informed the Special Committee of the steps he had taken in connexion with the appointment of the special mission called for by the Assembly. In reply to his request for the views of the Spanish Government concerning the proposed mission, the Permanent Representative of Spain had recalled the exact wording of the Spanish proposal made in the Fourth Committee on 7 December 1966 concerning a possible visit. At that time, the Spanish representative had stated that his delegation was willing to hold conversations with the Secretary-General with a view to considering the appointment of a mission. The Spanish Government considered the points made at that time concerning the scope and purpose of any such visit to be essential. These included, *inter alia*, that the commission should consist of a group of impartial and disinterested persons, not representing any country which had shown a direct interest in Spanish Sahara or which harboured any territorial ambitions concerning it, which would assess actual conditions in the territory, providing an opportunity to see what Spain had accomplished up to that time, to become acquainted with future plans and to ascertain the wishes of the inhabitants regarding their future destiny.

The Spanish Government considered that its offer must be dealt with as it stood, the Permanent Representative's letter continued. Spain was resolved to let the indigenous inhabitants exercise freely their right to self-determination. To that end, steps were already being taken to apply the necessary practical measures.

With regard to Ifni, the Secretary-General's report set out a communication of 18 April 1967 from the Permanent Representative of Spain indicating that the Spanish Government was prepared to enter into negotiations with the Government of Morocco in order to reach an

agreement which would satisfy all the interests involved.

When the Special Committee of Twenty-four took up the question in September 1967, the representative of Spain said that the difficulties concerning the decolonization of Ifni could be solved through an open and sincere dialogue which had already begun between Spain and Morocco. He also referred to Spain's offer regarding the visit of a special mission to Spanish Sahara and declared that the difference was purely procedural between the terms of the Spanish offer and those of the request on this subject contained in the General Assembly resolution of 20 December 1966.

The representative of Venezuela regretted that it had not so far been possible to send a visiting mission to Spanish Sahara and pointed out that Spain had once again stated its intention of accepting a visiting mission provided that its mandate was merely to study conditions in the territory and its political, economic and social development. This would provide first-hand information on the basis of which practical measures could be recommended. Every effort should be made to ensure that such a mission was appointed and sent to the territory as soon as possible.

Claims that Spanish Sahara formed an integral part of Morocco, on the one hand, and of Mauritania on the other hand, were restated by the representatives of these two countries. While maintaining their respective positions of principle, both representatives also said that the wishes of the people of Spanish Sahara should be ascertained on the question.

The representative of Spain added that his Government attached importance to the fact that the General Assembly had accepted the principle of self-determination for Spanish Sahara.

Algeria believed that the statements of the representatives of Spain, Morocco and Mauritania encouraged the hope that a solution could be reached. In the light of Spain's statement, Algeria felt it should be possible to ensure the dispatch of a mission to the Sahara.

On 14 September 1967, the Special Committee adopted a consensus by which it expressed hope that Spain and Morocco would

continue the dialogue on the decolonization of Ifni in accordance with the General Assembly's resolution of 20 December 1966.⁴¹ With regard to Spanish Sahara, the Committee noted with regret that the provisions of that resolution had not so far been implemented by the administering power. In view of the limited time available, it was not possible for the Committee to have a full debate on this question. Therefore, the Committee's consensus statement concluded, it had been decided to refer the question of Ifni and Spanish Sahara to the General Assembly for consideration.

CONSIDERATION BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY

In December 1967, the question of Ifni and Spanish Sahara was considered at the twenty-second session of the General Assembly.

During the discussions held in the Assembly's Fourth Committee, the representative of Mauritania stated that his Government had no doubt about the fact that Spanish Sahara formed a natural part of Mauritania. Mauritania's position was that there should be no confusion between two clearly different questions, namely: (a) Ifni was of concern to Spain and Morocco; and (b) Spanish Sahara should be the subject of negotiations between Spain and Mauritania. Mauritania considered that the unity of Spanish Sahara with Mauritania was not in contradiction with the faithful application of the principle of self-determination to the inhabitants of that region. Moreover, Mauritania well understood that it was in the interests of all the countries bordering on that region that a final solution should be found that would safeguard the peace and security of each.

The representative of Morocco, referring to a statement of the Moroccan Foreign Minister, observed that Morocco and Spain had opened negotiations on the problem of Ifni and Spanish Sahara and that an agreement in principle had been reached on the practical implementation of the General Assembly's resolution of 20 December 1966 regarding Ifni. He noted that the procedure which the administering power was considering for the decolonization of Spanish Sahara was different from that applied to Ifni, but that did not mean that the juridical nature of the two territories was dissimilar, nor could

it challenge Moroccan territorial integrity. It was unfortunate that the administering power did not feel that bilateral discussion, which had proved successful with regard to the northern zone and the province of Tarfaza and promised to be so for Ifni, could also be pursued in the case of Spanish Sahara. Morocco still considered that recognition of the right of self-determination of the people of Spanish Sahara would speed up the decolonization of the territory. A consultation of the people, held under United Nations auspices, would be the best way of ascertaining the wishes of the people, since talks with Spain had not yet been successful.

Spain informed the Fourth Committee that high-level discussions between Spain and Morocco regarding the decolonization of Ifni were continuing. In Spanish Sahara, the Spanish Government's aim was to support the people's right to self-determination. To help them, exercise that right, Spain had set up a General Assembly, a representative body, which would enable the people to face the future with maximum assurance of stability and representative status. The fact that Spain had taken special steps to speed up the decolonization of Equatorial Guinea and Ifni did not mean that it considered the decolonization of Sahara through the self-determination of its people any less important. Spain's invitation to the United Nations to send a mission to observe the situation in the Sahara was still open. The Spanish proposal for a mission, and that of the General Assembly set out in its resolution of 20 December 1966, differed only in formal details; any difficulties could be easily overcome, in the view of Spain.

At a plenary meeting on 19 December 1967, the General Assembly adopted a resolution (2354(XXII)) on this question by 113 votes to 0, with 4 abstentions. By this, the Assembly reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of Ifni and Spanish Sahara to self-determination in accordance with its resolution of 14 December 1960 (containing the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples) and approved the report of the Special Committee with respect to the two territories.

⁴¹ See footnote 39.

With regard to Ifni, the General Assembly, among other things: (1) requested the administering power to take immediately the necessary steps to accelerate the decolonization of Ifni and to determine with the Government of Morocco, bearing in mind the aspirations of the indigenous population, the procedures for the transfer of powers in accordance with the provisions of the General Assembly's resolution of 14 December 1960; and (2) invited the administering power to continue the dialogue which had begun with the Government of Morocco with a view to implementing the above-mentioned provision.

With regard to Spanish Sahara, the Assembly, among other things, invited the administering power to determine at the earliest possible date, in conformity with the aspirations of the indigenous people of Spanish Sahara and in consultation with the Governments of Mauritania and Morocco and any other interested party, the procedures for the holding of a referendum under United Nations auspices to enable the indigenous population to exercise freely its right

to self-determination. The Assembly outlined specific measures to be taken in this respect. Further, it requested the Secretary-General, in consultation with the administering power and the Special Committee, to appoint immediately the special mission provided for by its resolution of 20 December 1966 and to expedite its dispatch to Spanish Sahara for the purpose of recommending practical steps for the full implementation of the relevant General Assembly resolutions, and in particular for determining the extent of United Nations participation in the preparation and supervision of the referendum. (For text of resolution, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

The text of this resolution was approved by the Assembly's Fourth Committee on 16 December 1987 by 97 votes to 0, with 3 abstentions on the basis of a proposal by Afghanistan, Cameroon, Congo (Brazzaville), Guinea, Indonesia, Iraq, the Ivory Coast, Mali, Niger, Senegal, Syria, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES

Special Committee on Situation with regard to Implementation of Declaration on Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, meetings 508, 552, 553, 559, 560.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY—22ND SESSION

Fourth Committee, meetings 1746, 1752, 1753, 1755, 1756.

Fifth Committee, meeting 1229.

Plenary Meeting 1641.

A/6700/Rev.1. Report of Special Committee (covering its work in 1967), Chapter IX.

A/C.4/L.893 and Add.1. Afghanistan, Cameroon, Congo (Brazzaville), Guinea, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Mali, Niger, Senegal, Syria, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia: draft resolution, adopted by Fourth Committee on 16 December 1967, meeting 1755, by 97 votes to 0, with 3 abstentions.

A/C.4/L.901, A/C.5/1163, A/7019. Administrative and financial implications of draft resolution, A/C.4/L.893. Statements by Secretary-General and report of Fifth Committee.

A/7013. Report of Fourth Committee, draft resolution II.

RESOLUTION 2354(XXII), as recommended by Fourth Committee, A/7013, adopted by Assembly on 19

December 1967, meeting 1641, by 113 votes to 0, with 4 abstentions.

"The General Assembly,

"Having examined the chapter of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples relating to the Territories of Ifni and Spanish Sahara,

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

"Recalling also the resolution adopted on 16 October 1964 by the Special Committee.

"Reaffirming its resolutions 2072(XX) of 16 December 1965 and 2229(XXI) of 20 December 1966,

"Noting that the Spanish Government, as the administering Power, has not yet applied the provisions of resolution 1514 (XV),

"Recalling the decision concerning the Territories under Spanish administration taken by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its third ordinary session, held at Addis Ababa from 5 to 9 November 1966,

"Noting the statement of the administering Power that a high-level dialogue had already begun between the Governments of Morocco and Spain concerning Ifni,

"Noting further the statement made by the administering Power on 7 December 1966 relating to Spanish Sahara, in particular with regard to the sending of a special United Nations mission to the Territory, the return of exiles and the free exercise by the indigenous population of its right to self-determination,

"Considering the consensus adopted by the Special Committee at its meeting of 14 September 1967,

"1. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of Ifni to self-determination in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514(XV) ;

"2. Approves the chapter of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples relating to the Territory of Ifni and endorses the consensus adopted by the Special Committee on 14 September 1967;

"3. Requests the administering Power to take immediately the necessary steps to accelerate the decolonization of Ifni and to determine with the Government of Morocco, bearing in mind the aspirations of the indigenous population, the procedures for the transfer of powers in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1514(XV) ;

"4. Invites the administering Power to continue the dialogue which has begun with the Government of Morocco, with a view to implementing the provisions of paragraph 3 above;

"5. Requests the Special Committee to continue its consideration of the situation in the Territory of Ifni and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its twenty-third session;

II

"1. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of Spanish Sahara to self-determination in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514(XV) ;

"2. Approves the chapter of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting

of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples relating to the Territory of Spanish Sahara and endorses the consensus adopted by the Special Committee on 14 September 1967;

"3. Invites the administering Power to determine at the earliest possible date, in conformity with the aspirations of the indigenous people of Spanish Sahara and in consultation with the Governments of Mauritania and Morocco and any other interested party, the procedures for the holding of a referendum under United Nations auspices with a view to enabling the indigenous population of the Territory to exercise freely its right to self-determination, and, to this end:

"(a) To create a favourable climate for the referendum to be conducted on an entirely free, democratic and impartial basis by permitting, inter alia, the return of exiles to the Territory;

"(6) To take all the necessary steps to ensure that only the indigenous people of the Territory participate in the referendum;

"(0) To refrain from any action likely to delay the process of the decolonization of Spanish Sahara;

"(d) To provide all the necessary facilities to a United Nations mission so that it may be able to participate actively in the organization and holding of the referendum;

"4. Requests the Secretary-General, in consultation with the administering Power and the Special Committee, to appoint immediately the special mission provided for in paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 2229(XXI) and to expedite its dispatch to Spanish Sahara for the purpose of recommending practical steps for the full implementation of the relevant General Assembly resolutions, and in particular for determining the extent of United Nations participation in the preparation and supervision of the referendum and submitting a report to him as soon as possible for transmission to the Special Committee;

"5. Requests the Special Committee to continue its consideration of the situation in the Territory of Spanish Sahara and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its twenty-third session."

Other Territories

In 1967, in addition to the territories covered in the preceding sections, the General 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 considered the situation in the following territories: American Samoa, Antigua, Bahamas, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Cocos (Keeling) Islands, Dominica, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Grenada, Guam, Mauritius, Montserrat, New Hebrides, Niue, Pitcairn, St. Helena,

St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Swaziland, Tokelau Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands and the United States Virgin Islands. In addition, the Special Committee and the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly heard petitioners regarding British Honduras, but consideration of this territory was deferred owing to lack of time.

The General Assembly and the Special Committee also considered the situation in the Trust Territory of Nauru, and in Papua and the Trust

Territory of New Guinea. In addition, the Special Committee considered the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. (For further details of the consideration of the situation in these Trust Territories and in Papua, see pp. 598-618.)

The Assembly's Fourth Committee heard five petitioners: P. S. W. Goldson and C. L. Rogers made statements concerning British Honduras; J. Gumbs and R. Fisher made statements concerning St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla; and D. A. Halstead made a statement concerning Antigua. The Special Committee heard M. A. Caesar and E. M. Gairy concerning Grenada and P. S. W. Goldson concerning British Honduras.

CONSIDERATION BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Twenty-five of the above 26 territories were considered in 1967 by the Special Committee's Sub-Committees I, II and III. The Special Committee's conclusions and recommendations concerning them were based on the reports of those Sub-Committees. The remaining territory, Swaziland, was considered by the Special Committee in its plenary meetings.

On 23 October 1967, the Special Committee adopted a consensus on Swaziland by which it called upon the administering power to grant independence to the territory without delay and in accordance with the freely expressed wishes of the people; requested the administering power to take immediate steps for the return to the indigenous inhabitants of all the land taken from them; requested the administering power to take all appropriate action to protect the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Swaziland in the face of the interventionist policy of the racist régime in South Africa and to enable the territory to enjoy genuine and complete independence; and urged the administering power to take the necessary steps to bring about the economic independence of the territory vis-à-vis South Africa. Finally, noting from a report of the Secretary-General that the total amount of contributions to the Fund for the Economic Development of Basutoland (Lesotho), Bechuanaland (Botswana) and Swaziland—established by the General Assembly on 16 December 1965⁴²—had been insufficient to enable the Fund to become operative,

the Special Committee recommended that, subject to the consent of the donor Governments, the General Assembly should decide to transfer those contributions to the General Fund of the United Nations Development Programme in the light of the latter's expectation and desire to provide increased assistance to Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland.

The representative of the United Kingdom dissociated his delegation from the consensus, while the representatives of Australia and the United States reserved the position of their delegations.

Before referring the question of the territories of Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla and St. Vincent to Sub-Committee III, the Special Committee considered the situation in those territories in the light of the constitutional changes that were about to be brought into force.

Speaking in the Special Committee, the representative of the United Kingdom said that, during the week beginning 27 February 1967, Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, and St. Lucia would assume a new status as States in association with the United Kingdom. St. Vincent, where there had been certain special problems, would assume that status not later than 1 June 1967. With the introduction of the new constitution in each of those territories, the islands would be known as "the West Indies Associated States."

The representative of the United Kingdom pointed out that under the new arrangements the six territories would enjoy a full measure of self-government, while the United Kingdom would remain responsible for external affairs and defence. They would be completely autonomous in their internal affairs and the United Kingdom's obligations under Chapter XI of the United Nations Charter would thus be fully discharged.⁴³ He also emphasized that the territories would enter into a strictly voluntary association with the United Kingdom, an association under which each territory would be entirely free to declare itself independent at any time it might wish to do so, in accordance

⁴² See Y.U.N., 1965, pp. 566-67, text of resolution 2063(XX).

⁴³ For text of Chapter XI of Charter, see APPENDIX II.

with the agreed constitutional processes, namely, approval by a two-thirds majority in a referendum. Similarly, each island would be entirely free to sever its association with the United Kingdom and enter into an association with any other State. Finally, he stated that the new arrangements had been worked out in full consultation with the people of the particular territory concerned and had been freely and willingly accepted by the people. He recalled that these arrangements had been agreed upon at constitutional conferences held in 1966 with the Governments of the territories and members of all parties represented in the elected legislatures and that, subsequently, they had been approved by all the legislatures. Moreover, in four of the territories there had been an additional form of consultation concerning the arrangements in the form of general elections which were held after the United Kingdom had announced the proposals.

The representative of Australia said that the requirements which should govern association between an administering power and a non-self-governing territory were set out in Principle VII of the Annex to the General Assembly's resolution 1541(XV) of 15 December 1960.⁴⁴ He had no doubt that the first requirement—namely, that free association should be the result of a free and voluntary choice by the people of the territory concerned expressed through informed and democratic processes, had been fulfilled. Principle VII also required that territories in association should be free to modify the status of the territory through the expression of their will by democratic means and through constitutional processes. That requirement was fulfilled by the constitutional provisions enabling each of the territories to have its independence, subject to a two-thirds majority. The other requirements expressed in Principle VII, namely that the associated territory should have the right to determine its internal constitution without outside interference, in accordance with due constitutional processes and the freely expressed wishes of the people, had also been met by the administering power. Australia was therefore convinced that the association arrangements for the six territories constituted a genuine act of self-determination.

In the view of the United States the new arrangements had been devised through amicable consultation between the Governments involved and appeared to be a workable and appropriate solution to the special problems facing the small territories. The arrangements had been worked out in consultation with the elected representatives of the people and were therefore in accordance with the desires of the people. The formation of the West Indies Associated States represented a new and constructive approach to the problem of the small territories.

The USSR representative said that the United Kingdom had worked out its plans for the future status of the territories without consulting the people. It was claimed that the approval of the people had been secured through the legislative organs of the six territories, but those organs had been elected under the colonial system and were controlled by the United Kingdom administration. The long-standing refusal of the United Kingdom to allow a mission of the Special Committee of Twenty-four to visit the territories had made it impossible for the United Nations to ascertain the views of the peoples and ensure that they would be given an opportunity to exercise their sovereign will in conditions of relative freedom.

An examination of the new arrangements showed that the contention that the territories would enjoy full internal self-government and that the United Kingdom Government had accordingly discharged its obligations under the

⁴⁴ Principle VII states :

"(a) Free association should be the result of a free and voluntary choice by the peoples of the territory concerned expressed through informed and democratic processes. It should be one which respects the individuality and the cultural characteristics of the territory and its peoples, and retains for the peoples of the territory which is associated with an independent state the freedom to modify the status of that territory through the expression of their will by democratic means and through constitutional processes.

"(b) The associated territory should have the right to determine its internal constitution without outside interference, in accordance with due constitutional processes and the freely expressed wishes of the people. This does not preclude consultations as appropriate or necessary under the terms of the free association agreed upon."

For full text of resolution, see Y.U.N., 1960, pp. 509-10.

United Nations Charter was meaningless. In view of its far-reaching implications, the situation in the Caribbean territories confronted the Special Committee with a most important task of recommending to the General Assembly that colonial powers carry out a series of preparatory measures to ensure that the people had an opportunity to express their wishes concerning their future freely and without hindrance. The measures must be such as effectively to frustrate all attempts by colonial powers to use various forms of association and integration as a means either of annexation of small territories completely or of maintaining their former rule under a new label. There could be no guarantee that other colonial powers would not follow suit and apply their own versions of decolonization having nothing to do with the true interests of the peoples under their rule. It was no accident that the United States representative had praised the measures taken by the United Kingdom in the Caribbean territories as a model for the solution of similar problems for the future.

Other Committee members, including Bulgaria, Poland, Tunisia and Sierra Leone also believed that the United Kingdom had not fulfilled its obligations to the territories. The representative of Poland said that the method of consultation used by the United Kingdom was inadequate and stated that the people of the territories should take a decision directly through a referendum conducted in an atmosphere of complete freedom and with full knowledge of the various possibilities open to them. The representatives of Chile, the United Republic of Tanzania and Yugoslavia, among others, believed that such a referendum should be supervised by the United Nations. Uruguay and Yugoslavia believed there was a need for a positive decision by the people and that the mere absence of opposition to a proposal should not be regarded as a sufficient expression of the wishes of the people.

A number of other members, including Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria and the United Republic of Tanzania, emphasized the need for the United Nations to ensure that the provisions of the General Assembly's resolution of 14 December 1960 on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples⁴⁵ were carefully applied.

Mali and Uruguay were among those who

drew attention to the fact that under the new arrangements the territories could not move to independence by means of a simple majority vote at a referendum, but that a two-thirds majority was required. The representative of Uruguay observed that this provision protected the status quo and limited the possibilities of self-determination.

The representative of Uruguay, and others, maintained that there was no incompatibility between the Assembly resolution which contained the Declaration on the granting of independence (1514(XV)), and that which set out principles determining whether or not an obligation existed to transmit information under Article 73 e of the Charter (1541 (XV)).⁴⁶ In the small territories which could not be viable as independent states, independence would have no real meaning. The latter resolution provided ways which allowed small territories to emerge from colonial status.

At the conclusion of the debate on 23 March 1967, the Special Committee adopted a resolution by which it reaffirmed that the General Assembly's resolution of 14 December 1960 on the granting of independence and other relevant resolutions continued to apply to the territories. The Special Committee also requested its Sub-Committee III to examine, in the light of the recent constitutional developments, the situation in these territories in all its aspects including the possibility of sending a visiting mission, and to report to the Special Committee at an early date. This resolution was adopted by a roll-call vote of 18 to 3, with 3 abstentions.

Before the vote, the representative of the United Kingdom said, *inter alia*, that while asking Sub-Committee III to examine the situation, the draft resolution seemed to prejudge many of the main points the Sub-Committee would have to consider. He proposed simply to refer the matter to Sub-Committee III; this proposal was defeated by 16 votes to 6, with 2 abstentions.

The representative of the United Kingdom also stated before the vote that should the Committee adopt the draft resolution, further par-

⁴⁵ See Y.U.N., 1960, pp. 49-50, text of resolution 1514(XV).

⁴⁶ See footnotes 44 and 45.

ticipation or co-operation by his delegation on the matters under discussion either in the Sub-Committee or the Special Committee would not be possible.

Subsequently, Sub-Committee III recommended draft conclusions and recommendations for adoption by the Special Committee of Twenty-four. By these, which were adopted by the Special Committee on 6 October 1967, that body noted with regret that the administering power had refused to co-operate with the Sub-Committee. The Special Committee noted the constitutional developments in these territories, which it considered constituted a certain degree of advancement in the political field; it also noted the recent political developments that had taken place on the island of Anguilla. The Special Committee reaffirmed that the General Assembly's resolution of 14 December 1960 on the granting of independence and other relevant resolutions continued to apply fully to these territories and it requested the administering power to ensure that the peoples of the territories were informed of the possibilities available to them in their achievement of the objectives of the resolution on the granting of independence. The Special Committee also reiterated its belief that a United Nations presence during the procedures connected with the process of self-determination would be essential in order to ensure that the peoples of the territories were enabled to exercise their right in complete freedom, without any restriction and in full knowledge of the options available to them. The Special Committee also requested the administering power to allow the dispatch of a United Nations visiting mission to the territories.

Reservations concerning these conclusions and recommendations, in general, were expressed by the representatives of the United Kingdom and Australia.

Reservations on the paragraph relating to the necessity of a United Nations presence were expressed by the representatives of Bulgaria and the USSR. These members felt that what was required at the present stage was a visiting mission to report on the situation. They were not opposed to a United Nations presence but they feared that in the present circumstances a United Nations presence might be

exploited by the colonial power. A United Nations presence would not contribute anything of value until conditions existed in which the United Nations could play an active role.

The Special Committee's decisions on the other territories considered by its Sub-Committees were also based on proposals made by the Sub-Committees.

On 19 June 1967, the Special Committee adopted a resolution concerning Mauritius, Seychelles and St. Helena by a roll-call vote of 17 to 2, with 3 abstentions, by which it: endorsed the conclusions and recommendations of its Sub-Committee I; urged the administering power to hold, without delay, free elections in the territories on the basis of universal adult suffrage and to transfer all powers to the representative organs elected by the people; further urged the administering power to grant the territories the political status their peoples freely chose; deplored the dismemberment of Mauritius and Seychelles by the administering power, which violated their territorial integrity, in contravention of decisions of the General Assembly, and called upon the administering power to return to the territories the islands detached therefrom; declared that the establishment of military installations and any other military activities in the territories was a violation of the General Assembly's resolution of 20 December 1966,⁴⁷ which violation constituted a source of tension in Africa, Asia and the Middle East, and called upon the administering power to desist from establishing such military installations.

Italy and the Ivory Coast expressed reservations about the inclusion of the paragraph dealing with military installations. The representative of the United States, pointing out that it was possible that Mauritius would become independent in 1968, said that he had voted against the draft resolution as it did not constitute a realistic and balanced appraisal of the situation in the territories. Australia was also opposed to the paragraph dealing with military installations and commented that the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom had stated that neither of their Gov-

⁴⁷ See Y.U.N., 1966, pp. 594-95, text of resolution 2232 (XXI).

ernments had any intention of establishing military installations on the islands in question.

On 22 and 27 September 1967, the Special Committee adopted conclusions and recommendations concerning the territories in the Pacific on the basis of proposals by its Sub-Committee II. In its conclusions and recommendations concerning the Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Pitcairn and the Solomon Islands, the Special Committee concluded, *inter alia*, that although some progress had been made in the territories towards the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence, it had not been very significant and should be speeded up. The Special Committee considered that its previous decisions and those of the General Assembly had not been adequately implemented and that the economic base of the territories needed to be strengthened. Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States expressed reservations on the conclusions and recommendations in general. The representative of the USSR also expressed reservations, stating that instead of saying that the decisions of the Special Committee and the General Assembly "had not been adequately implemented," the Special Committee should state that they "had not been implemented."

In its conclusions and recommendations concerning Niue and Tokelau, administered by New Zealand, the Special Committee reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people to self-determination and independence. It stated its opinion that the slow progress in the territories towards self-determination and independence was due, in part, to inadequate training and education of the indigenous people. It recommended that the administering power further increase such training and invited it to work with the United Nations specialized agencies in order to improve the economic structure of the territories so as to lessen their economic dependence on the administering power.

Reservations concerning these conclusions and recommendations were expressed by the representatives of Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States as well as the representative of New Zealand who participated in the Special Committee's consideration of the territories.

With regard to the New Hebrides, a con-

dominium administered by the United Kingdom and France, the Special Committee noted that no constitutional changes or proposals for changes had been made by the administering powers, and it reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people to self-determination and independence. It recommended that urgent steps be taken for the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence with respect to the territory. Reservations were expressed by the representatives of Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States.

Concerning American Samoa and Guam the Special Committee reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people to self-determination and independence. It recommended that the administering power should accelerate the further political development of the territories by expanding the functions and powers of the legislature and by vesting greater executive authority in the indigenous population. It urged the administering power to expedite further the economic growth of the territories and, particularly in Guam, to implement as speedily as possible, its plans for the diversification of the economy. It also requested the administering power to intensify the educational and training programme for the people of the territories so as to enable them to occupy more responsible positions. Finally, as in the case of all the other territories in the Pacific area, the Special Committee expressed its view that visits to the territories by the Special Committee itself or by the Sub-Committee were necessary and would be useful as a means of gathering information about the territories and also to increase the people's awareness of their rights. Reservations concerning these conclusions and recommendations were expressed by the representatives of Australia, Bulgaria, Poland, the USSR, the United Kingdom, the United Republic of Tanzania and the United States.

On 27 September and 6 October, the Special Committee, on the basis of proposals made by its Sub-Committee III, adopted conclusions and recommendations concerning the remaining territories in the Caribbean reaffirming the inalienable right of the people of these territories to self-determination and independence. In the case of the United States Virgin Islands and the British Virgin Islands the Special Com-

mittee regretted that, despite political and constitutional advancement, the administering powers had failed further to implement the provisions of the Declaration on the granting of independence and other relevant decisions of the General Assembly. It invited the administering powers to encourage open, free and public discussion of the various alternatives open to the people in their achievement of the objectives of the Declaration on the granting of independence. It also reiterated its belief that a United Nations presence during the procedures connected with the exercise of the right of self-determination would be essential to be sure that the right was exercised in complete freedom.

In the case of all the territories, including also Bermuda, the Bahamas, Montserrat, the Turks and Caicos Islands, and the Cayman Islands, the Special Committee urged the administering power to enable the United Nations to send a visiting mission to the territories. Reservations concerning the conclusions and recommendations, in general, on all the territories were expressed by the representatives of Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States. The representatives of Bulgaria and the USSR expressed reservations concerning the paragraphs calling for a United Nations presence during the procedures connected with the process of self-determination.

CONSIDERATION BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Later in 1967, at the twenty-second session of the General Assembly, the Assembly's Fourth Committee took up the Special Committee's reports on the 26 territories considered in 1967.

During the discussions in the Fourth Committee a number of Members criticized administering powers for refusing the right of self-determination to small territories, and considered that the General Assembly should reaffirm their rights in this respect in accordance with its resolution of 14 December 1960 on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. The representative of the USSR stated that in the political sphere, the small territories had no truly representative organs; their legislatures were controlled and all important decisions were taken by administrators and foreign officials. The administering power

did virtually nothing to remedy the situation, which, he said, might well continue indefinitely.

India considered that, in general, the rate of progress to self-government or independence in a large number of the non-self-governing territories had been slow, and economic and social conditions in them left much to be desired. Bulgaria maintained that no substantial progress had been achieved in the process of decolonization during the period under review, owing to the opposition of the administering powers. Poland commented that, despite repeated resolutions of the General Assembly, the administering powers were still seeking to perpetuate their colonial domination.

The representative of the United Kingdom stated that Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla and St. Lucia, having achieved the status of associated states, had achieved "a full measure of self-government." The United Kingdom had fully and finally discharged its obligations under Chapter XI of the United Nations Charter and information concerning those territories would not be transmitted in future. The Netherlands considered that the constitutional progress achieved in the form of complete self-government by the West Indies Associated States was in conformity with the General Assembly's resolution of 15 December 1960 (1541(XV))⁴⁸ and that the United Kingdom had fully complied with its obligations under Chapter XI of the Charter.

A number of Members, including Bulgaria, India, Poland and the USSR, called attention to the establishment or continued existence of military bases maintained by administering powers in small territories, which, they said, contravened the spirit of the United Nations Charter and the provisions of various General Assembly resolutions.

The representative of India said he could not understand the persistent refusal of some administering powers to receive visiting missions in territories under their administration; he hoped that the continued call for United Nations visiting missions would convince them that it was in their own interests to allow such visits. Bulgaria, Poland and the USSR also criticized the administering powers for refusing

⁴⁸ See Y.U.N., 1960, pp. 509-10, for text.

to co-operate with the United Nations regarding the question of visiting missions.

On 19 December 1967, the General Assembly adopted a resolution by the preamble to which it, among other things, noted the constitutional changes that had been introduced in February and March 1967 in the territories of Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla and St. Lucia, and that were envisaged for the territory of St. Vincent, and noted further the decision taken by the Special Committee that the General Assembly's resolution of 14 December 1960 (containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples) and other relevant resolutions continued to apply to these territories.

By the operative part of the resolution, the Assembly: (1) approved the report of the Special Committee of Twenty-four relating to these territories; (2) reaffirmed the inalienable right of the peoples of these territories to self-determination and independence; (3) called upon the administering powers to implement without delay the relevant General Assembly resolutions; (4) reiterated its declaration that any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and territorial integrity of colonial territories and the establishment of military bases and installations in these territories was incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of the General Assembly's resolution of 14 December 1960 on the granting of independence; (5) urged the administering powers to allow United Nations visiting missions to visit the territories, and to extend to them full co-operation and assistance; (6) de-

clared that the United Nations should render all help to the peoples of these territories in their efforts freely to decide their future status; (7) requested the Special Committee of Twenty-four to continue to pay special attention to these territories; and (8) requested the Secretary-General to assist in implementing the present resolution. (For text, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

The Assembly's decision to this effect was embodied in resolution 2357 (XXII), adopted by a recorded vote of 86 to 0, with 27 abstentions. The text was approved in the Fourth Committee on 16 December 1967, by 72 votes to 0, with 26 abstentions, on the basis of a proposal sponsored by Indonesia, Libya, Niger, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, the United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

At the plenary meeting, the Assembly by a separate roll-call vote of 78 to 16, with 16 abstentions, approved the operative paragraph by which it reiterated its declaration that any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of colonial territories and the establishment of military bases and installations in these territories was incompatible with the United Nations Charter and the Assembly's resolution of 14 December 1960 on the granting of independence.

Before the voting on this resolution, the President of the General Assembly pointed out that by adopting it, the Assembly would be adopting the recommendations of the Special Committee of Twenty-four (see p. 681 above) concerning the disposition of the contributions to the Fund for the Economic Development of Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland.

DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES

Special Committee on Situation with regard to Implementation of Declaration on Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, meetings 489-497, 500, 501, 504-506, 535-539, 548, 563-565, 569.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY—22ND SESSION

Fourth Committee, meetings 1719, 1737, 1741, 1743, 1746, 1748-1753, 1755.
Plenary Meetings 1566, 1641.

A/6700/Rev.1. Report of Special Committee (covering its work in 1967). Chapter XIV: Mauritius,

Seychelles and St. Helena; Chapter XV: Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Pitcairn and Solomon Islands; Chapter XVI: Niue and Tokelau Islands; Chapter XVII: New Hebrides; Chapter XVIII: Guam and American Samoa; Chapter XIX: Trust Territory of Pacific Islands; Chapter XX: Cocos (Keeling) Islands, Trust Territory of Nauru, Papua and Trust Territory of New Guinea; Chapter XXI: Brunei; Chapter XXII: Hong Kong; Chapter XXIII: United States Virgin Islands, British Virgin Islands, Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, Montserrat, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Bermuda, Bahamas, Turks and Caicos Islands, Cayman Islands,

Falkland Islands (Malvinas) and British Honduras. A/6845. Letter of 28 September 1967 from United Kingdom.

A/C.4/694 and Add.1. Request for hearings: British Honduras.

A/C.4/694/Add.2. Request for hearings: Anguilla.

A/C.4/694/Add.3. Request for hearings: Antigua.

A/C.4/L.899. Indonesia, Libya, Niger, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, Zambia: draft resolution, adopted by Fourth Committee on 16 December 1967, meeting 1755, by 72 votes to 0, with 26 abstentions.

A/7013. Report of Fourth Committee, draft resolution V.

RESOLUTION 2357(XXII), at recommended by Fourth Committee, A/7013, adopted by Assembly on 19 December 1967, meeting 1641, by recorded votes of 86 to 0, with 27 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Democratic Republic of Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Guyana, Iceland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives Islands, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom, United States.

"The General Assembly,

"Having considered the question of American Samoa, Antigua, Bahamas, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Cocos (Keeling) Islands, Dominica, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Grenada, Guam, Mauritius, Montserrat, New Hebrides, Niue, Pitcairn, St. Helena, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Swaziland, Tokelau Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands and the United States Virgin Islands,

"Having examined the chapters of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to

the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples relating to these Territories,

"Recalling its resolutions 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960, 1654(XVI) of 27 November 1961, 1810(XVII) of 17 December 1962, 1956(XVIII) of 11 December 1963, 2066(XX) of 16 December 1965, 2069(XX) of 16 December 1965, 2189(XXI) of 13 December 1966, 2232(XXI) of 20 December 1966 and 2288(XXII) of 7 December 1967,

"Noting the constitutional changes that were introduced in February and March 1967 in the Territories of Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla and St. Lucia and that are envisaged for the Territory of St. Vincent,

"Noting further the decision taken by the Special Committee that General Assembly resolution 1514(XV) containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and other relevant resolutions continue to apply to these Territories,

"Deeply concerned at the information contained in the report of the Special Committee on the continuation of policies which aim, among other things, at the disruption of the territorial integrity of some of these Territories and at the creation by the administering Powers of military bases and installations in contravention of the relevant General Assembly resolutions,

"Deploring the attitude of some administering Powers which continue to refuse to allow United Nations visiting missions to visit these Territories,

"Conscious that these situations require the continued attention and assistance of the United Nations in the achievement by the peoples of these Territories of their objectives, as embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

"Aware of the special circumstances of geographical location and economic conditions of some of these Territories,

"1. Approves the chapters of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples relating to these Territories;

"2. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the peoples of these Territories to self-determination and independence;

"3. Calls upon the administering Powers to implement without delay the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly;

"4. Reiterates its declaration that any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of colonial Territories and the establishment of military bases and installations in these Territories is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of General Assembly resolution 1514(XV);

"5. Urges the administering Powers to allow

SOUTH WEST AFRICA

689

United Nations visiting missions to visit the Territories and to extend to them full co-operation and assistance;

"6. Decides that the United Nations should render all help to the peoples of these Territories in their efforts freely to decide their future status;

"7. Requests the Special Committee to continue to

pay special attention to these Territories and to report to the General Assembly at its twenty-third session on the implementation of the present resolution;

"8. Requests the Secretary-General to continue to provide all possible assistance in the implementation of the present resolution."