United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
TWENTIETH SESSION
Official Records

FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1557th MEETING

Tuesday, 16 November 1965, at 10.55 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Chairman: Mr. Majid RAHNEMA (Iran).

Requests for hearings (continued)

REQUEST CONCERNING FERNANDO POO AND RIO MUNI (AGENDA ITEM 23) (continued) (A/C.4/657)

1. The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to consider the request for a hearing contained in document A/C.4/657.

2. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) pointed out that the United Nations Charter expressly authorized the hearing of petitioners from the Territories coming under Chapter XIII but not from those under Chapter XI. Having made that reservation, he would not object to the petitioners being heard.

3. The CHAIRMAN said that if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to grant the hearing.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 23

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: reports of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: A/5800/Rev.1, chapters VII, IX, X and XIII-XXVI; A/6000/Rev.1, chapters IX-XXV (continued) (A/5959 and Corr.1, A/6084, A/6094, A/C.4/L.802)

HEARING OF PETITIONERS ON FERNANDO POO AND RIO MUNI

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Atanasio Ndong Niyone, Mr. Adolfo Obiang Bike and Mr. Rafael Evita, representatives of the Mouvement national de libération de la Guinée équatoriale (MNLGE), took places at the Committee table.

4. Mr. NDONG (Mouvement national de libération de la Guinée équatoriale) said that the people of Equatorial Guinea had now realized that they could no longer tolerate a régime whose aims seemed to it to be mysterious, to say the least. They had accepted the Basic Law of 20 December 1963 more or less enthusiastically because they had seen in it an essential, though transitory, stage in their attainment of national independence. According to the Spanish Government that law was based on the right of peoples to self-determination and established a system of self-government based on that right. The people of Guinea, however, had soon understood the Spanish Government's game and had resolved to put an end to that régime.

5. The allegedly self-governing institutions established under the Basic Law, namely, the General Assembly, the Governing Council and the local government organs, had no real influence, as was clear from articles 17, 18 and 19 (chapter V), 22, 23 and 29 (chapter VI) and 35, 38, 48, 51, 52, 66 and 67 (chapter VII) of the law published in the Spanish Government's Boletín Oficial Extraordinario of 10 April 1964. All powers were, in fact, in the hands of the Commissioner-General, who exercised complete and absolute jurisdiction in all questions of security, law and order, foreign relations, information media and so forth, could suspend decisions of the Governing Council, appointed the heads of departments of the Administration, all of whom were Spanish, and installed the President and members of the Governing Council, administering to them an oath of allegiance to the fundamental laws of Spain.

6. On 2 and 15 March 1964, elections had been held for councillors representing professional, cultural, economic and co-operative organizations and for councillors representing heads of family. The members of the Governing Council had been appointed on 15 May 1964 and the President of the Council twelve days later. The fact was, however, that neither those elections nor the referendum of 15 December 1963 had been held according to democratic methods. It was known that Mr. Luis Maho, one of the present members of the Governing Council, had sent a cable to the United Nations (A/AC.109/PET.255) informing it that the Spanish authorities had had the people fired on in order to force them to go to the polls and

that he had denounced the results of the referendum of 15 December 1963 and had asked for fresh elections to be held under United Nations supervision. The Secretary-General of the MNLGE had also declared, on the same occasion, that the self-government was only a façade and that the main defect of the Legislative Decree of 1 January 1964 was that it had not fixed any date for the Territory's attainment of independence. Similarly, the people of Guinea denounced Mr. Ondó Edú, the present President of the Governing Council, who had spoken before the Committee at its 1550th meeting, on 8 November 1965. Contrary to what he had implied, he did not represent his fellow-countrymen, any more than did other individuals whose loyalty Spain had purchased.

7. However that might be, he hoped that the Spanish Government would behave honourably and would lead Equatorial Guinea to its destiny as a free and independent nation. Spain, and indeed other friendly nations, could be assured of the co-operation of independent Guinea and its future national institutions in strengthening their mutual well-being in a spirit of understanding, dignity and equality.

8. In conclusion, he emphasized that the Guinean people refused to regard the present system of self-government as the last stage in its evolution. He requested that a date should be set for the Territory's attainment of independence and that all the political forces of the country should be invited to take part in the establishment of democratic institutions calculated to help towards the attainment of that objective. Anything that the United Nations could do to help the people of Guinea to gain their right to self-determination would be welcomed.

9. Mr. SAO (Cameroon) asked the petitioner whether the MNLGE had had any contacts with the Spanish Government in order to explain its position, which seemed to him to be quite moderate.

10. Mr. NDONG (Mouvement national de libération de la Guinée équatoriale) replied that there had not yet been any official contacts between the MNLGE and the Spanish Government.

11. Mr. SAO (Cameroon) asked whether the MNLGE had responded to the appeal made to all Guineans by the President of the Governing Council of Equatorial Guinea to co-operate in the work of national reconstruction.

12. Mr. NDONG (Mouvement national de libération de la Guinée équatoriale) thought that the appeal had probably been transmitted individually to Guinean nationalists living abroad through the Governments of the host countries.

13. Mr. SAO (Cameroon) said that he would like to know why the meeting of all the political parties held at Bata had been a failure, as the President of the Governing Council had told the Committee in his statement at the 1550th meeting.

14. Mr. NDONG (Mouvement national de libération de la Guinée équatoriale) explained that there were no political parties in Guinea, in accordance with the Spanish political system, but only a national liberation movement which everyone interpreted in his own way. The MNLGE had not taken part in the Bata meeting, since its leaders had been against it, thinking it better for the movement to continue its activities abroad.

15. Mr. SAO (Cameroon) thanked the petitioner and proposed that his statement, which threw light on certain aspects of the question about which the Committee was not sufficiently informed and would be useful for the rest of the discussion, should be issued in full as a Committee document.

It was so decided. 1/

16. Mr. DIAZ GONZALEZ (Venezuela), recalling that the petitioner had mentioned the lack of political parties in the Territory, asked him to explain how it was that in those circumstances the draft Basic Law establishing a new political and administrative structure had received such a large number of votes in the referendum of 15 December 1963.

17. Mr. NDONG (Mouvement national de libération de la Guinée équatoriale) replied that there were indeed no political parties properly so called in Equatorial Guinea but only national liberation movements working to bring about the independence of the Territory. The reason why the Basic Law had gained so many votes was that the MNLGE had been able, by its action both within Guinea itself and outside the Territory, to encourage the Guinean people to accept the proposed status on a provisional basis, for it had felt that that status, despite its inadequacies, constituted a necessary stage on the path to independence.

18. Mr. EVITA (Mouvement national de libération de la Guinée équatoriale) reminded the Venezuelan representative that there were no political parties in Spain.

19. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain), speaking on a point of order, pointed out that the Fourth Committee was discussing Equatorial Guinea, not the political situation in Spain.

20. Mr. EVITA (Mouvement national de libération de la Guinée équatoriale) explained that he had simply wanted to say that the lack of political parties in Equatorial Guinea was due to the same causes as the lack of political parties in the metropolitan country.

21. Mr. NDONG (Mouvement national de libération de la Guinée équatoriale) said that, unlike other colonial Powers, Spain did not prohibit contacts between the Guinean population and the petitioners. The MNLGE, which had offices in Guinea, did not follow any communist or other ideology and was striving only for the achievement of independence by the Territory in an atmosphere of friendly relations with Spain.

22. Mr. BRUCE (Togo) asked the petitioners whether there was any concerted action by the nationalist movements outside the country. He was at a loss to see how the nationalists working outside the Territory could succeed in their demands without a genuine political organization, since nothing was happening

1/ The complete text of Mr. Ndong's statement was subsequently circulated as document A/C.4/659.

in the country, and the people had even approved the Basic Law by a very strong majority.

23. Mr. NDONG (Mouvement national de libération de la Guinée équatoriale) said that besides the MNLGE-FRENAPO (Frente Nacional y Popular de Liberación de la Guinea Ecuatorial)—a movement which brought together all Guineans who were aware of what was really taking place in Africa and wished their country to achieve independence without thereby ceasing to co-operate with Spain, and whose views carried some weight at the international level—there was another political organization that had existed since 1964, namely, the Movimiento de Unión Nacional de la Guinea Ecuatorial (MUNGE), which had shown much less flexibility in its activities.

24. Mr. BRUCE (Togo) said that even the most noble aspirations were doomed to failure if they were not backed by some kind of definite political structure. If there were no political parties in Equatorial Guinea itself, then at least the liberation movements waging the struggle abroad should be organized on a solid basis. They should cease to be mere associations of individuals, all wishing more or less to take command, and should become a well-organized party more representative of the aspirations of the people.

25. Mr. DE CASTRO (Philippines) wished to know MNLGE was satisfied with the Basic Law promulgated in 1963, subject to the Territory's achievement of independence at a later stage.

26. Mr. NDONG (Mouvement national de libération de la Guinée équatoriale) replied that his movement certainly would not passively wait on the good pleasure of Spain. Once its faults were corrected, however, the Basic Law could serve as a basis for the attainment of independence by Equatorial Guinea, under the auspices of the Spanish Government and with the assistance of the United Nations.

27. In reply to a further question put by Mr. DE CASTRO (Philippines), Mr. NDONG (Mouvement national de libération de la Guinée équatoriale) replied that his movement had accepted the Basic Law in all good faith. That was a further reason for it to ask the United Nations to support it in its struggle against the disinterest which had since been shown by the Spanish Administration.

28. Mr. KEDADI (Tunisia) thanked the petitioners for the information they had given the Committee. He expressed satisfaction that the statement of Mr. Ndong was to be circulated as a Committee document, particularly since a similar decision had been taken concerning the statement of Mr. Ondó Edú (A/C.4/656), who had put forward a different point of view.

29. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) said that he was surprised to see petitioners arrogating to themselves the right to speak on behalf of the Guinean people on the pretext that there were no democratic means of expression in Equatorial Guinea. If Mr. Ndong had carefully read the documents circulated by the Secretariat, he would not have considered it necessary to read out the clauses of a law which appeared in those documents. It was also a matter for surprise that the petitioners had denied the existence of any political parties, inasmuch as quite a number of organizations which had played an active part in the campaign preceding the referendum were listed in chapter X of document A/6000/Rev.1. The petitioners in exile should learn to reintegrate themselves into the life of the country, as others had done before them. He himself had had occasion to advise Mr. Ndong to return to Guinea. If the petitioners representing MNLGE wished to play a part in the political life of their country, they had to do so inside the country. They certainly knew that Spain would grant independence to Equatorial Guinea as soon as it desired it.

30. He fully approved of the Committee's decision to issue the full text of the petitioner's statement as a Committee document.

The petitioners withdrew.

GENERAL DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (continued) (A/C.4/L.802)

31. Mr. BORJA (Ecuador), speaking on the question of the Malvinas Islands, said that he wondered whether the problem was really a colonial one in the strict sense or more in the nature of a conflict of sovereignty between two States, one of which had occupied by force a part of the territory of the other. In the latter case, the dispute ought to be settled under the provisions of Chapter VI of the United Nations Charter.

32. The conflict had, in fact, arisen because the United Kingdom had established a colony on territory belonging to another State, or territory over which another State asserted its sovereignty. The first thing to be done was therefore to settle the legal aspect of the problem so as to find out which State had sovereignty the territory in question. Only then could consideration be given, if necessary, to the question of decolonization, which would be settled in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). With that in mind, Ecuador saw no objection to being one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.802, for it was convinced that in that way it would be serving the ideal of American unity and international justice.

33. His delegation believed, moreover, that history provided irrefutable confirmation of Argentina's rights over the Malvinas Islands. If the fact of discovery conferred the right of ownership—and that had certainly been the case in European public law at the time of the great discoveries—then the Malvinas Islands had been part of the Spanish colonial possessions, since they had been discovered by Magellan's expedition in 1520, whereas the English had not landed there until 1592. In addition to the argument of discovery, there was the fact that the islands had been occupied by Spain in 1766, after their restitution by France following the claim put forward by the Spanish Government at the time of the English-French conflict regarding sovereignty over those territories.

34. The facts of history were also supported by a number of legal regulations which had been drawn up in times past by the colonial Powers in order to control navigation in certain waters and thus prevent conflicts. In that connexion, he recalled the provisions of the Treaty of Peace and Friendship between Spain and Great Britain, signed at Madrid in 1670, and the Treaty of Utrecht, signed in 1713, which had settled

the question of the delimitation of the colonial possessions of those two States in America. It thus became quite clear that the Malvinas Islands had been indisputably placed under Spanish authority from the time of the Treaty of Utrecht and that they had still been under that authority at the time when the Argentine nation had obtained its independence from Spain.

35. In that connexion, the Argentine delegation, in support of its argument, had many times cited the Papal Bulls Inter coetera and Dudum si quidem of the late fifteenth century, which had defined the zones of influence of Spain and of Portugal and had placed the Malvinas Islands in the geographical region attributed to Spain. The Ecuadorian delegation did not believe that that argument could be adduced in a conflict of sovereignty over a territory, because in its opinion a religious authority could not legally settle questions concerning the civil government of nations. The rights of Argentina had been sufficiently established without there being any need to rely on Papal Bulls, which, quite apart from the limitations referred to, could in no way be binding upon the United Kingdom.

36. The rights of Argentina over the Malvinas Islands derived from the principle uti possidetis, which had governed the territorial apportionment of America at the end of the colonial era, when each State, on its accession to independence, had adopted as its territorial limits the limits of the administrative divisions which had been fixed by Spain. The Malvinas Islands had come within the Viceroyalty of Río de la Plata and had therefore become part of the Argentine Republic when that Spanish colony had obtained its political emancipation. Once independence had been proclaimed and the internal situation had been consolidated, the Argentine Republic, as the inheritor of the rights of Spain, had taken possession of the Malvinas Islands. It had set up administrative authorities there, had authorized the settlement of the islands by family groups and had incorporated the islands into its territorial domain.

37. In 1833 the Malvinas Islands had been occupied by a United Kingdom naval detachment, whose captain had made known to the Argentine Commandant that he intended to exercise United Kingdom sovereignty over the islands. Despite the immediate protests of the Argentine Government, the United Kingdom had continued its occupation, displacing the Argentine authorities and creating an abnormal situation which had never been recognized by the Argentine Government and which the United Nations now had a duty to correct.

38. The Argentine Republic had never relinquished its rights to the Malvinas Islands, and it refused to recognize the de facto situation there. It had been supported in that matter by the countries of Latin America, which had made their position known either individually or by means of resolutions adopted by the regional organizations to which they belonged. Thus, at Bogotá, in 1948, the Ninth International Conference of American States had affirmed, in its resolution XXXIII, that the process of American emancipation would not be completed so long as there remained on the American continent any regions that were subject to the colonial system or any territories occupied by States not belonging to that continent. At Caracas, in 1954, the Tenth Inter-American Conference had reaffirmed, in resolution XCVI, the desire of the people of America for the final abolition of the colonial system, which was being maintained against the will of the peoples concerned, and for an end also to the occupation of American territories. The attitude of the Latin American countries in that regard was dictated by their acceptance of the principle that victory created no rights and that any acquisition of territory by force or by any other form of coercion must not be recognized. That principle was, moreover, enshrined in the Charter of the Organization of American States and in the United Nations Charter, and the States that were members of those organizations were therefore morally and legally bound to apply it. His country most certainly abided by that principle.

39. The United Nations must take up the question of the occupation of the Malvinas Islands and seek a peaceful settlement of the problem. Draft resolution A/C.4/L.802 specifically recommended that the Governments of the United Kingdom and Argentina should proceed with negotiations with a view to finding a solution compatible with the principles of the United Nations Charter and the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). Ecuador was convinced that such negotiations would take place and would lead to a peaceful solution not only because of the demands of international justice but also for clear and compelling reasons of geography and geo-politics.

40. Mr. AKA (Ivory Coast) said, with reference to the United States Virgin Islands, that according to the information in the Special Committee's reports (A/5800/Rev.1, chap. XXV; A/6000/Rev.1, chap. XXIV), steady progress was being made by those islands towards the achievement of the objectives of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), the implementation of which was not being hampered by the administering Power. His delegation hoped that that trend would become more pronounced along the lines of greater democratization of the legislative and executive organs, so that the people might be able, with complete freedom, to decide on their political status and the kind of relationship they wished to have with the United States.

41. The British Virgin Islands were similar to the United States Virgin Islands with regard to geography, economy, language and ethnic composition. Politically, however, they constituted a "colony", which should be given the opportunity of choosing between self-government and some form of association with other Territories, and more particularly the West Indies. The bonds existing between all those islands were favourable for the establishment of a viable State. His delegation therefore endorsed the idea of a merger of the Virgin Islands among themselves or with other Territories, on condition that such an association corresponded to the wishes of the people as freely expressed under the conditions of political advancement which it was the duty of the administering Power to ensure. It must, however, be said that there was no clear evidence of any steps having been taken to facilitate such a change of course, and that,

for example, the British Virgin Islands were suffering from administrative and cultural under-development and were economically dependent on tourism to an excessive degree. As to the political situation in the British Virgin Islands, it was imperative for the legislative and executive organs, and particularly the Executive Council, to become more independent and more representative.

42. The same observations were equally valid for the other islands mentioned in chapter XXIV of document A/6000/Rev.1. In all those cases, the administering Powers concerned should be asked to give an undertaking that they would apply the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) in the very near future, and they should also be asked to ensure, for that purpose, that in all cases an administration composed mainly of indigenous inhabitants and legislative organs elected on a democratic basis and having as wide a jurisdiction as possible, at least in internal affairs, would be set up.

43. Turning next to the Malvinas Islands, he said that they had been regarded by the United Kingdom as a colony ever since it had established its sovereignty there. In fact, however, that colony was no bigger than a commune and was administered as a municipality. According to the United Kingdom representative, the inhabitants of the islands would reject any idea of independence. That gave evidence of their common sense, for it would be unrealistic to attempt to apply the provisions of resolution 1514 (XV) in a strict way to Territories such as those, which had virtually no permanent inhabitants. The institutional history of States had always swung back and forth between opposite extremes, and it had almost never been possible to find the golden mean. It was therefore particularly important for the United Nations, in its task of decolonization, to distinguish between the spirit of the law and its applicability in a particular case. His delegation was fully aware of the historical considerations impelling Argentina to claim those islands, but it felt that account must also be taken of the character of the inhabitants and of the fact that America had always been a continent in which immigration and occupation had been a dominant feature. There could be no transfer of sovereignty to Argentina without previous safeguards for the inhabitants of British stock. As the Malvinas Islands constituted a colony, the United Nations must keep the question under close review, while leaving it to the United Kingdom and Argentine Governments to settle their dispute through negotiation.

44. Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania) said that, in its consideration of the chapters of the Special Committee's reports now before it, the Committee must take a decision on the question of colonialism as a whole. The fact, moreover, that the Territories under consideration were being dealt with as a group did not in any way lessen their individual importance.

45. As a member of the Special Committee, his delegation had consistently affirmed that the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) fully applied to all Territories and all peoples who were still under the colonial yoke, and it was pleased that the conclusions and recommendation in the Special Committee's reports reflected and supported its own point of view. It therefore hoped that those conclusions and recommendations would receive the widest possible support from the members of the Fourth Committee. That would be a tangible way of helping all the peoples in the world who were still fighting for their national emancipation against the forces of backwardness and colonial exploitation, and that action would give the coup de grâce to colonialism.

46. Experience had shown that certain colonial Powers gave their own interpretation to the principles of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and that the so-called constitutional reforms introduced in some Territories were in direct opposition to the principles on which decolonization was based. That was true, for example, of Papua and New Guinea, where the House of Assembly established by the administering Power had no real law-making powers since its decisions had to be approved by the colonial authorities. In view of the fact that freedom was indivisible, and must be unconditional, the constitutional reforms in Papua and New Guinea were actually nothing more than readjustments decided upon by Australia for reasons of convenience.

47. The situation was similar in the United States Virgin Islands, where, under a United States law, the natural rights of the population had been reduced to association with the United States. The representative of the colonial Power had said that his Government had sought to endow the Territory with a future which would, in particular, provide for the possibility of sending a representative to the United States Congress. It was obvious, in the circumstances, that the administering Power had already decided what the Territory's future would be.

48. It was extremely important for the Committee to keep a close watch on the situation of the small Territories in view of their strategic and military importance for the execution of the world policy of the colonial Powers. Thus the island of Guam, which was under colonial occupation of the United States, had become a large and dangerous military base, which the colonial Power was now using to conduct a war that was of benefit only to itself. The Press had announced on various occasions that United States military aircraft had taken off from aerodromes on the Non-Self-Governing Territory of Guam to carry out military missions in a war being waged by the United States. If those aerodromes were bombed for reasons of self-defence, the population of the colonial Territory of Guam would be involved in a war simply because it happened to be under colonial domination. One could only be thankful that the country which was being subjected to United States bombing raids was not an aggressive nation and had not decided to bomb the oppressed population of the Territory of Guam in return.

49. An analogous situation was threatening Mauritius and the Seychelles, and it was surprising to learn in that regard that five years after the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), certain colonial Powers were still thinking of establishing new colonies. Thus The Times of London, in its issue of 11 November 1965, and The New York Times of the same date, had announced that the United Kingdom

Government had decided to establish a new colony, which would consist of the Chagos archipelago, thus far attached to Mauritius, and of the Aldabra, Farquhar and Desroches islands, thus far attached to the Seychelles. Those islands were inhabited by 1,384 persons, and the establishment of the new colony was intended to permit the installation of military and naval bases by the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States.

50. The joint United Kingdom-United States project was aimed at reversing the course of history. It was contrary not only to resolution 1514 (XV), but also to other resolutions adopted by different United Nations organs concerning specific colonial problems and the application of the principle of self-determination, which must be regarded as a general principle of international law. That principle would be meaningless if it could be circumvented and if, by the payment of compensation to the majority of the inhabitants of a colony, a colonial Power could retain in perpetuity a part of the territory of that colony inhabited by a minority. The right of colonial peoples to self-determination could never be subject to financial dealings, which were particularly reprehensible when their purpose was the establishment of foreign bases in a colonial Territory. It would be recalled that the Second Conference of the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries had stated in its Cairo Declaration of 10 October 1964 that the maintenance or establishment of military bases, or the stationing of troops, in the territory of other countries against the express wishes of those countries, constituted a flagrant violation of the sovereignty of States and a threat to freedom and international peace. The Conference had also declared that it considered particularly unacceptable the existence or maintenance, in dependent Territories, of bases which might serve to perpetuate colonialism or to achieve some other objective.

51. It must not be forgotten that the nature of colonialism and imperialism remained constant and that only the tactics changed. The colonialists resorted to every strategem in order to hold on to the positions and privileges they had acquired in the past and to prevent the people still under their sway from enjoying freedom and independence. One of those strategems was the policy of "divide and rule". Thus, in British Guiana, the United Kingdom was employing all kinds of tactics to delay the colony's accession to independence; it was really most unfortunate that racial tensions should have developed and had lent themselves to being used to justify delays in the emancipation of the Territory. The people of British Guiana had shown that they did not want to remain under foreign domination, and his delegation hoped that the international community would help them to attain freedom and independence more speedily.

52. On the other hand, the differences between the various colonial Territories must be taken into account. Sometimes the real problem was to reach agreement by negotiations among two or more States. His delegation therefore welcomed the suggestion of the Latin American delegations to invite two Member States to open negotiations on the subject of the Falkland or Malvinas Islands.

53. Sometimes, too, the administering Power held fast to a colony on the pretext that the colony would not be economically viable as an independent nation. The purpose of that pretext was to deny the indigenous population the enjoyment of the natural rights which were recognized to be theirs by the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. His delegation believed that the rights of those peoples and Territories to self-determination and independence must not be infringed by the action of the forces which prevented them from being exercised. The fact was that the economy of the colonies strengthened the economy of the metropolitan country, for economic exploitation was the essence of colonialism. His delegation wished to repeat that freedom was indivisible. The colonial Powers must first provide the peoples of the Territories in question with all that they needed to exercise their rights to self-determination and independence. When a Territory's economy was not strong enough, the free members of the international community should do everything in their power to give the people of that Territory the material assistance that would enable them to follow the path which they had chosen.

54. His delegation considered itself morally bound to reaffirm the inalienable right of all peoples and all Territories, large or small, to self-determination, freedom and independence. It believed that the Territories which the Committee was now considering should be given the means to exercise their natural rights. The establishment of institutions which provoked or encouraged racial conflict or ethnic division was an obstacle to national self-awareness; it should therefore be avoided in order that the people still under the colonial yoke might be able to accede to democratic freedom. Furthermore, the use of colonial Territories for military or strategic purposes was harmful to their interests and those of their inhabitants and delayed their independence. That was why military bases should be dismantled.

55. The Tanzanian delegation was prepared to join with all other delegations which had advocated a solution based on the principles which he had enunciated. Those who were waging an honourable struggle for emancipation must be given moral and material support by all those who cherished freedom and detested the colonial system and man's exploitation by man.

Organization of work

56. The CHAIRMAN read out a revised time-table[2/] for the Committee's consideration of the items remaining on its agenda. He suggested that if there were no objections, the revised time-table should be adopted.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.

2/ Subsequently issued as document A/C.4/L.805.

Litho in U.N.

77401—April 1966—2,250