

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

EIGHTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**1266th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Thursday, 28 November 1963,  
at 10.30 a.m.

**NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 23:</i>	
<i>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</i>	
<i>General debate. . . . .</i>	1

*President:* Mr. Carlos SOSA RODRIGUEZ  
(Venezuela).

AGENDA ITEM 23

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

GENERAL DEBATE

1. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): The Assembly will begin its consideration 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 [A/5446/Rev.1].

2. As Members will recall, the General Assembly, in connexion with the adoption of the agenda of the eighteenth session, approved a recommendation by the General Committee that "the parts of the report dealing with certain specific territories should be considered by the Fourth Committee on the understanding that no action would be taken in plenary meeting on these territories until the relevant reports of the Fourth Committee have been submitted" [1210th meeting, para. 88]. The territories in question are: territories under Portuguese administration (item 23), question of South West Africa (item 55) and question of Southern Rhodesia (item 75).

3. I have been given to understand that the Fourth Committee's report on territories under Portuguese administration is in preparation and will be available next week. The reports by the Fourth Committee on the other two items, namely, the question of South West Africa and the question of Southern Rhodesia, have been considered in plenary meeting as a matter of urgency. These items nevertheless remain on the agenda of the present session, pending receipt of the reports from the Secretary-General requested in the relevant resolutions adopted at the present session. In resolution 1889 (XVIII) of 6 November 1963 on the question of Southern Rhodesia, the General Assembly, in operative paragraph 8, "requests the Secretary-General to continue to lend his good offices to promote conciliation in the Territory, as stated in paragraph 4 of resolution 1760 (XVII), and to report both to the

General Assembly during the eighteenth session and to the Special Committee on the results of his efforts".

4. In resolution 1899 (XVIII) of 13 November 1963 on the question of South West Africa, the Assembly, in operative paragraph 5, requests the Secretary-General:

"(a) To continue his efforts with a view to achieving the objectives stated in paragraphs 5 and 6 of General Assembly resolution 1805 (XVII);

"(b) To invite the Government of South Africa to inform him of its decision regarding the provisions of those paragraphs not later than 30 November 1963;

"(c) To report to the General Assembly immediately after he has received the reply of the Government of South Africa".

5. In view of the date specified in the resolution from which I have just quoted, I would propose to the Assembly that we proceed in the following manner: the Assembly will defer consideration of the items on Southern Rhodesia and South West Africa until the corresponding two reports by the Secretary-General are received, and will take up item 23 immediately, representatives being at liberty to deal with any problem connected with that item in the course of this general debate.

6. After the general debate, the Assembly will consider the draft resolutions submitted in connexion with item 23. Any representative who wishes to speak and make comments relating solely to specific territories will have the opportunity to make known his opinion before each of the respective draft resolutions is put to the vote.

7. I hope that this proposal will enable us to finish our consideration of the general lines of this item by the middle of next week, after which there will remain only the questions of Southern Rhodesia and South West Africa to be dealt with towards the end of the week. If there are no objections, we will proceed in the manner I have indicated.

*It was so decided.*

8. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I call upon Mr. Natwar Singh of India, the Rapporteur of the Special Committee, to present the Committee's report [A/5446/Rev.1].

9. Mr. NATWAR SINGH (India), Rapporteur of the Special Committee: As Rapporteur 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, I have the honour to present to the General Assembly the report of the Special Committee on its work during the year 1963. This report [A/5446/Rev.1] has already been circulated in five parts [A/5446 and Add.1 to 4]. Addendum 1 relates to territories under Portuguese administration, Addendum 2 deals with South West

Africa and Addenda 3 and 4 cover Southern Rhodesia and Aden respectively. The report in its entirety runs into nearly a thousand pages, and I was constantly and agonizingly conscious of its ever-growing size. On the other hand, it had also to be borne in mind that this document was of great importance, dealing as it did with a large number of colonial territories, and thus touching the lives of millions of people who have not yet attained freedom and independence.

10. All these territories come within the scope of this Committee, and some of these territories were discussed by a United Nations Committee for the first time. It will be recalled that the Special Committee was originally established by the sixteenth session of the General Assembly [resolution 1654 (XVI)] with a membership of seventeen to examine the implementation of the famous Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, which was adopted by the General Assembly at its fifteenth session [resolution 1514 (XV)].

11. At its seventeenth session, the General Assembly adopted resolution 1810 (XVII), which expanded the membership of this Committee to twenty-four and invited it to continue to seek the most suitable ways and means for the speedy and total application of the Declaration to all territories which had not yet attained independence. This expanded Committee of twenty-four members was also called upon to submit to the General Assembly at its eighteenth session a full report on all territories coming within the scope of the 1960 Declaration.

12. The Special Committee began its work on 20 February 1963. Its first meeting was inaugurated by the Secretary-General, and I should like to take this opportunity to express, on behalf of the Committee, its deep appreciation for the interest the Secretary-General has taken in its work and also for the assistance rendered by him to the Committee at all times. The Committee's final meeting was held on 21 October 1963, and during the period between February and October it held 101 plenary meetings. In addition, the Sub-Committee on Petitions, the Working Group and the Sub-Committees on Southern Rhodesia, Aden and British Guiana, which were established by the Special Committee, also held a number of meetings, some of them outside Headquarters.

13. I should like now to turn briefly to the contents of this report. Chapter I of the report deals with the establishment, organization, and activities of the Committee. Chapter II concerns territories under Portuguese administration. Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and Aden are covered in chapters III, IV and V. It will be noted that these four chapters have been circulated as separate documents. Chapter VI deals with Malta, chapter VII with Fiji, chapter VIII with Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, Kenya and Zanzibar, chapter IX with Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland, chapter X with British Guiana, chapter XI with Gambia, chapter XII with Gibraltar, and chapter XIII with Fernando Poo, Ifni, Rio Muni and Spanish Sahara. The final chapter, chapter XIV, covers the action taken by the Committee on General Assembly resolution 1850 (XVII) relating to the report on racial discrimination in non-self-governing territories and lists the petitions relating to the territories which were examined by the Committee in 1963.

14. Most of these chapters are divided into three main sections: section A deals with the information

on the territory concerned; section B contains a summary of the debate in the Committee, and section C contains the decision taken by the Committee.

15. I should like to point out that three of the chapters in the report, those dealing with the territories under Portuguese administration, Southern Rhodesia and South West Africa, have been the subject of consideration by the Fourth Committee during the current session of the General Assembly. The Fourth Committee's reports on South West Africa and Southern Rhodesia have already been considered by the General Assembly, and the report on the territories under Portuguese administration is due to be submitted in a day or two.

16. As explained in the section on future work in chapter I of the report [A/5446/Rev.1], the Special Committee, in spite of its best efforts, was unable to complete its examination of all the territories falling within its mandate. However, as pointed out in paragraph 50 of chapter I of the report, the territories already considered by the Committee covered most of the territories in Africa, where the largest colonies still exist and where some of the most difficult colonial problems are encountered. Subject to any decision that the General Assembly may take at the conclusion of the present debate, the Special Committee hopes to consider the remaining territories in the course of the next year.

17. With regard to the methods of work and procedure, the Committee agreed that it should follow the methods and the procedure adopted by the Committee in 1962, which the General Assembly approved in resolution 1810 (XVII).

18. The Sub-Committee's report, in paragraphs 53 to 59, has drawn the attention of the General Assembly to certain difficulties it encountered in relation to the work of visiting groups and sub-committees established by it to study problems in specific territories. Here I wish to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the introduction to the Secretary-General's annual report on the work of the Organization for the period 16 June 1962 to 15 June 1963. In this, the Secretary-General stated:

"With regard to Portuguese Territories and South West Africa, the Member States responsible for their administration have refused to co-operate with the United Nations or to implement its resolutions. In the case of Southern Rhodesia, the United Kingdom has continued to maintain its constitutional position concerning that Territory, but has co-operated with the Special Committee in its study of this question and has discussed the matter with a Sub-Committee of the Special Committee in London." [A/5501/Add.1, section IX.]

19. It is the Special Committee's hope that all Administering Powers will co-operate fully with the Committee in its work in the future and will enable visiting groups to go to the territories where such visits are considered necessary and useful by the Special Committee.

20. Before concluding, I wish to place on record the deep appreciation of the Committee of Twenty-Four for the magnificent work done by Ambassador Najmudine Rifai of Syria, who was my predecessor as Rapporteur of the Committee. He had been associated with the Committee as Rapporteur since its inception, and continued to hold the post until 9 September of this

year, when he returned to his country for another assignment. A considerable portion of the report which I have just submitted to the General Assembly was prepared by Mr. Rifai. Personally, I am most grateful to him for having accomplished half of my task so diligently and efficiently.

21. It gives me great pleasure to place on record the gratitude of the Committee of Twenty-Four for the able manner in which its Chairman, Ambassador Sori Coulibaly of Mali presided over its deliberations in 1963. His patience, his good nature, his deep understanding of the problems of colonialism and his diplomatic skill have won him the affection and respect of all the members of the Committee. Ambassador Carlos María Velázquez, of Uruguay, and Ambassador Voeunsai Sonn, of Cambodia, the two Vice-Chairmen of the Committee, have also contributed greatly to the successful and smooth working of the Committee. Mr. Velázquez's great learning and experience have been of invaluable assistance. Mr. Sonn has never spared himself in pursuing the task laid down in the Declaration contained in resolution 1514 (XV), and it was on account of the initiative that he took on many occasions that the Committee was able to achieve the results it did. Mr. Sonn presided with great distinction over the Sub-Committee on Aden and presented a valuable report [A/5446/Rev.1, chapter V].

22. To Mr. Mahmoud Mestiri, the deputy permanent representative of Tunisia, the Special Committee is indebted for the effective manner in which he presided over the Sub-Committee on Petitions. In that task he was ably assisted by Mr. Leonardo Díaz González of Venezuela, who was the Vice-Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Petitions.

23. Finally, I wish to recall the valuable and devoted services rendered to the Committee by the members of the Secretariat who were assigned to it by the Secretary-General. Mr. Protitch and, now, Mr. Amachree, the Under-Secretaries in charge, have devoted their time and energy to the work of the Special Committee, and for their hard work, unfailing courtesy and helpful advice the Committee is thankful. To the Secretary of the Committee and his colleagues the Special Committee owes a particular debt of gratitude for the excellent and efficient manner in which he and they have functioned. I now submit this report formally to the General Assembly.

24. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Before giving the floor to the next speaker, I wish to announce that I propose to close the list of speakers for the general debate on Monday, 2 December at 6 p.m.

25. Mr. COULIBALY (Mali) (translated from French): My friend, Mr. Natwar Singh of the Indian delegation, has eloquently introduced 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.

26. As Chairman of the Special Committee, I should like to reiterate my thanks to all the members of the Committee for the work they have accomplished by meeting throughout the period between two sessions of the General Assembly. I should also like to thank Secretary-General U Thant for the facilities placed at the Committee's disposal in the discharge of its duties. May I also once again thank all the members of the Secretariat, including the interpreters, for the substantial contribution they have made to the Com-

mittee's work and to the preparation of the report which has just been presented to the Assembly [A/5446/Rev.1].

27. The fact that the Security Council, the highest organ of the United Nations, has met twice in six months to examine Portugal's colonial policy in Africa proves, if proof were still needed, that colonialism represents not only a very great injustice to the oppressed peoples but also a serious threat to international peace and security.

28. In examining the situation in the colonial territories, in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV), 1654 (XVI) and 1810 (XVII), the Special Committee always endeavoured to obtain the co-operation of the administering Powers, so that the peoples under foreign domination might accede to complete independence, without any conditions or reservations, by peaceful means. Unfortunately, the Special Committee's desire for co-operation did not always meet with a favourable response on the part of the colonial Powers.

29. Thus, despite the repeated efforts of the Special Committee, the Government of Portugal refused to co-operate with it in any way. Indeed, the reactionary and retrograde Salazar Government even carried cynicism to the point of stating that the Committee's activities were illegal, because Portugal had not voted for the Declaration contained in resolution 1514 (XV) or for resolution 1654 (XVI) establishing the Special Committee.

30. As regards South West Africa, the racist Government of South Africa also refused to co-operate with the Special Committee, despite the invitation addressed to it.

31. The United Kingdom, the colonial Power administering the greatest number of territories which are still non-self-governing, is a member of the Special Committee and takes part in its deliberations and decisions. I should like to take this opportunity of stating that my delegation particularly appreciated the willingness to co-operate shown by the United Kingdom Government in taking part in the Special Committee's work. On two occasions the United Kingdom Government received a sub-committee on Southern Rhodesia in London and held detailed conversations with it regarding the situation in this territory.

32. Since the official decolonization policy announced by the United Kingdom is to accelerate the process of self-determination for the populations which it administers, the Special Committee hoped to encounter more active understanding and co-operation on the part of the United Kingdom Government. Unfortunately, such was not always the case. Despite the Sub-Committee's two visits to London, the United Kingdom has not seen fit to adopt the viewpoint of the United Nations on the question of Southern Rhodesia.

33. The Special Committee also regrets that the Government of the United Kingdom refused to allow a Sub-Committee of the Special Committee to visit the territories of Aden and its protectorates. The Special Committee was examining the situation in Aden for the first time and deemed it essential to ascertain the views of the people before submitting recommendations to the General Assembly designed to expedite the accession of these territories to independence, in accordance with the desires of the country's political leaders and in the manner which they found appropriate.

34. Unfortunately, the Special Committee's sincere desire for co-operation was interpreted by the United Kingdom Government as an attempt to interfere in the administration of the territory and, to our great regret, the administering Power acted to prevent the Sub-Committee from entering Aden.

35. At the time when the Special Committee began examining the question of British Guiana, very serious social disturbances occurred in this territory and, at the request of the local political leaders, the Special Committee decided to send a good offices sub-committee to the scene. According to its terms of reference this Sub-Committee was to assist the leaders of the two principal political parties to settle their differences, in order that the country might accede to independence without delay.

36. Acting as it had done in the case of the Sub-Committee on Aden, the United Kingdom refused to allow the Sub-Committee to enter British Guiana. The Sub-Committee was nevertheless able to hold conversations in New York with the political leaders of British Guiana and on this basis formulated the recommendations in the report submitted to the Assembly. While the political leaders of British Guiana were engaged in seeking an agreed solution on the basis of their conversations with the Sub-Committee, in order that the territory might accede to independence without delay, the United Kingdom last month convened a conference on British Guiana in London. When one realizes that the differences between the two principal political parties of British Guiana provide the United Kingdom with a pretext for delaying the country's accession to independence, one can only regret the United Kingdom Government's decision to convene a conference the result of which has been to intensify the opposition between the two political chiefs of British Guiana at the very moment when they were attempting to find an agreed solution.

37. I have stressed the difficulties encountered by the Special Committee in connexion with the dispatch of sub-committees or visiting groups in order that the General Assembly may be fully informed of the conditions in which the Committee carried on its work. The Committee was in fact prevented from employing one of its most effective tools and was therefore obliged to perform its task with the means remaining at its disposal.

38. In the light of the experience acquired in the Special Committee's two years of existence, I believe that the General Assembly should once again invite the colonial Powers to give the Committee greater co-operation. I do not think that the Special Committee's role should be restricted to holding a general debate on the situation in each territory and voting a resolution, as is done in the Fourth Committee and in plenary meetings of the General Assembly. The Special Committee employed this method of work for the large colonial territories of Africa, where the struggle for freedom needed to be known and supported by world opinion, on account of the atrocities committed by colonial Powers such as Portugal. Moreover, the Special Committee's debates on the situation in these territories—particularly at the meetings held in Africa in 1962 at the invitation of the Governments of Morocco, Ethiopia and Tanganyika—helped to show the African peoples under foreign domination that the international community was interested in their fate.

39. It should be emphasized that the African territories under foreign domination, by reason of their

size and their population, do in fact constitute national entities, and that the only problem they face is that of attaining independence. In this connexion, the debates of the Special Committee have helped on the one hand to attack the views of the colonial Powers, and on the other to raise the struggle of the nationalist movements to a higher level.

40. On the basis of my experience in the Committee in its two years of existence, and in view of the fact that the Committee has now almost concluded its consideration of the large territories of Africa and submitted recommendations to the General Assembly on each one of them, I believe that the Committee could now take up the examination of the remaining territories in a suitable manner.

41. Since the Special Committee has been instructed to propose to the General Assembly recommendations and suggestions regarding the application of resolution 1514 (XV) to all Non-Self-Governing Territories, it would be highly desirable for all the colonial Powers to co-operate with the Committee actively and honestly.

42. The Committee could, of course, spare itself lengthy working meetings and vote a resolution on each Non-Self-Governing Territory asking that the Territory should be granted independence, but such a procedure would not be in the spirit of the Committee's mandate. Moreover, it would be pointless, for resolution 1514 (XV) already recognizes that all colonial territories and peoples have the right to independence without any conditions or reservation. It therefore seems to me essential that the colonial Powers should agree to co-operate with the Special Committee in order to define together the best ways and means of enabling all colonial peoples to attain independence. I am convinced that in many cases the United Nations could assist the colonial Powers to resolve some of their difficulties and contradictions, thus hastening the accession of colonial territories to independence in optimum conditions and without any outbursts of violence.

43. The territories to be examined by the Special Committee at its next session are for the most part small territories with a small population. Consequently, they possess special characteristics that cannot be overlooked. In considering the situation of these territories, it is essential for the Committee to enjoy the sincere and loyal co-operation of the Administering Power. One of the most important aspects of this co-operation should be allowing the Committee to enter into direct contact with the representatives of the people of these territories in order to obtain objective information regarding their opinions and desires. The Committee would then be able to submit to the General Assembly proposals and suggestions regarding the steps to be taken to enable these territories to accede to independence. The Committee might also draw the Assembly's attention to the assistance which the international community will have to provide to some of these territories in order to facilitate the exercise of their right to independence.

44. I am deeply convinced that the destinies of millions of human beings who are still subjected to shameful foreign domination must not be left solely in the hands of the colonial Powers. Those Powers must re-appraise their positions and not regard the activities of the Special Committee as an interference in the administration of the territories under their control. I therefore firmly believe that the administering Powers should not only allow the Special Commit-

tee's sub-committees or visiting groups to enter the territories under their control but should also publicize throughout these territories resolution 1514 (XV) and the efforts of the United Nations to promote decolonization. I have been informed that the populations of some colonial territories are completely unaware of the existence of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. Some Non-Self-Governing Territories are also theoretically endowed with a status which provides no positive opportunities for self-determination but permits the administering Power to insist that resolution 1514 (XV) is not applicable to them.

45. I have deliberately gone into details so that the General Assembly may be fully informed of the conditions in which the Special Committee has carried out its work, and may take the necessary steps to ensure the rapid and effective implementation of the Declaration.

46. It is regrettable that owing to the Security Council's hesitation to take steps to force the colonial Powers to comply with its decisions and those of the General Assembly, it has not yet been possible to fix a target date for the accession of all territories to independence. In this connexion, the results of the recent Security Council debate on the territories administered by Portugal and on the question of Southern Rhodesia are quite significant. Nevertheless, it is to be hoped that all territories still under foreign domination will have been liberated by the Assembly's twentieth session, so that all peoples may, without hate or racial prejudice, celebrate together the twentieth anniversary of our Organization, which represents for all mankind the most reliable guarantee of the maintenance of international peace and security.

47. The accession of Kenya and Zanzibar to independence next month and the probable accession to independence of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland in 1964 are encouraging signs. Enjoying as it does the confidence of the General Assembly and conscious of the hope placed in it by millions of human beings who are still denied their inalienable rights, the Special Committee must, in our opinion, pursue its task and attack colonialism in its last strongholds.

48. Mr. ALAINI (Yemen) (translated from French): As my delegation is speaking for the first time since the tragic death of President John F. Kennedy, allow me, Mr. President, to offer, through you, to Mrs. Kennedy, to the Kennedy family, to President Johnson, and to the Government and people of this great American nation our most sincere condolences. These condolences are also addressed to the United States delegation to the United Nations and to its eminent head, Mr. Stevenson.

49. The Committee on decolonization, whose official title is the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, has presented a report on its activities [A/5446/Rev.1]. My delegation is particularly interested in commenting on this report.

50. The delegation of the Yemen Arab Republic considers this report one of the most serious and conscientious ever prepared by a body set up by our Organization. This valuable document is comprehensive and accurate and merits the careful consideration of the General Assembly. The Committee which has

compiled and drawn it up has earned our appreciation and our gratitude.

51. This report, which has been submitted for consideration by the General Assembly at its eighteenth session, consists of several chapters and deals with many countries and territories which are still under colonial rule.

52. My delegation, which has a heartfelt concern for the interests of all the colonial countries referred to in the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, today finds itself obliged, through lack of time, to concentrate in the general debate on expounding the problem of its own national territory, which has been seized from the mother country by the colonialists and reduced to the rank of a foreign possession or protectorate.

53. The territory which was seized from Yemen is, as the Members of the Assembly know, Aden and the surrounding territories, that is to say the part of Yemen which is referred to in our documents as "Aden and the Aden Protectorates". It is natural that my delegation should in its present statement devote special attention to this part of our homeland which is under foreign occupation. Moreover, the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples has noted the importance of the special colonial problem which exists in this territory and its disturbing character, by dealing with this question in a separate document independent of the general report. The General Assembly will understand that our attitude is justifiable and will forgive my delegation for feeling obliged to devote its statement specifically to this colonial problem, which concerns a purely Yemeni territory.

54. The report on Aden presented by the Special Committee [A/5446/Rev.1, chapter VI]<sup>1</sup> is one of the most interesting documents ever published by our Organization. This excellent work has been carefully conceived and clearly drawn up and reports conscientiously the facts and the situation in the port of Aden and in the other southern regions of Yemen occupied by the United Kingdom.

55. All through history, even during the thousand years preceding the Christian era, the inhabitants of Yemen—or of Yumnat, as it was formerly called, or the country of Sheba, as historians call it now—were, for 3,000 years, experts in navigation and international trade, so much so that they had a monopoly of trade. From that distant date in history until our own day, southern Yemen's foreign trade has been continually carried on through the only natural outlet on the Indian Ocean.

56. This outlet, the country's only natural gateway to the Ocean, consists of an ideal harbour, well sheltered and protected by nature. I mean the Port of Aden. Clear proof of the links between this port and the interior of the country is furnished by the following: the Yemenites, who were the builders of the first dams in the world, at that time erected in the rocky cliffs of Aden engineering works to conserve rain-water, which is so scarce and precious in this region. These great hydraulic installations could only be the achievement of a whole nation, for they are the most extraordinary works of this kind which—thirty centuries ago—human genius gave to the world.

<sup>1</sup> Circulated earlier under symbol number A/5446/Add.4 and Corr.1.

57. Any tourist passing through Aden can admire this great achievement. It is clear and irrefutable evidence that the whole Yemeni people has concerned itself with this natural harbour on the Indian Ocean from time immemorial. The fact is that the inhabitants of Yemen, who can only be one entity, in the thousand years before Christ, built dams in the mountainous region and in the interior of the country. The Maareb Dam is eloquent testimony of the engineering genius characteristic of our nation alone at this ancient date in history. So the Yemenites, who were masters of the sea and builders of great hydraulic installations, made use of their natural harbour, Aden, for the international trade of which they had a monopoly, and there built dams on the model of those they had built in the interior of the country.

58. I apologize for going so far back in history to prove that Aden and Yemen are one, but it is my duty to nip in the bud any claim that might be made. Is there any need to explain further that Aden was and remains the only natural port for the whole southwest region of Yemen, being its only outlet on the Indian Ocean? It is therefore natural that it has always been and still is inseparably joined to the interior of the country, and that the whole forms a geographic, economic and ethnic entity.

59. How could this natural harbour, which is so dependent on the mother country, have been seized by the colonialists, and how was it possible for the British Empire to despoil a nation of this natural gateway to the sea, in the face of all historical, ethnic and economic reason? The answer to this question is simple. British colonial power has never been able to separate effectively this Yemeni port from the interior of the country, and we can affirm that Aden has always been, and still is, our leading commercial port. This remains true, even though this port is under British domination, since, as all the statistics prove and as I can state without fear of contradiction, 75 per cent of Yemeni trade still goes on through the port of Aden.

60. The situation has thus been shaped by history as well as by geography and economics and is such as to make Aden an integral and inseparable part of Yemen from every point of view. The great majority of the population remains essentially Yemeni, despite considerable efforts on the part of Great Britain for more than a century to encourage foreigners to settle in Aden.

61. The history of the colonization of Aden, which shows how the British Empire has been able to sever this port administratively from its mother country, is extremely interesting and sometimes amusing, although often it is tragic.

62. During the great expansion of the British Empire at the beginning of the last century, England, then mistress of the seas, had to seek out along the famous route to India a natural harbour, well-sheltered and easy to defend, to serve as a supply base for His Majesty's fleet.

63. Aden, whose exceptional qualities as a port and as a stronghold had been discovered by earlier inhabitants, had been used in this way from time immemorial. This exceptional port aroused the interest of the British Admiralty early in the last century. However, it was not until 1839 that England had occasion to occupy Aden and turn it into a British posses-

sion. At that time the East India Company, aware that Yemen was engaged in a struggle against another major aggressor, the Ottoman Empire, judged the moment propitious to seize this bastion by force. This amputation was performed, as I have just said, when the central Yemeni Government had already been for some time overstrained by a struggle in the interior of the country.

64. I should perhaps recall that Yemen's heroic and glorious struggle against the Ottoman Empire, which was then being waged in the interior, had left the country's southern regions unprotected, and this made matters easier for the British expedition which had been sent from Bombay, India to accomplish a mission of colonization at the very moment when Yemen, which had been fighting bravely, was exhausted by its struggle against the Ottoman Turks.

65. It was thus in these unfortunate and inglorious circumstances that Aden was detached from the mother country by force of arms, and made dependent on the East India Company, whose headquarters were then in Bombay.

66. The British authorities became aware, as time went by, of the increasing strategic and economic value of Aden and began to concern themselves with the protection of this latest pearl in the imperial crown. Great Britain well knew that the newly conquered territory formed part of a glorious country and, taking a practical view, realized that the people in this occupied territory knew that as soon as their brothers in free Yemen were in a position to recapture the port and to recover their property, they would do so thanks to the unity which is natural among citizens of the same country. So the colonialists had to take advantage of the chaos which existed in southern Yemen, while the great battle for independence was being waged in the interior, to establish a ring of defences around Aden, so that they could hold Aden permanently by separating it from the rest of the country by a belt of conquered and protected regions. The Colonial Office took advantage of this vacuum, as we now call it, and acted with its usual skill.

67. That was the beginning of the history of the British protectorate in Yemen and it was thus that treaties were signed with local chiefs—strange and indeed fantastic treaties of protection and friendship. These notorious treaties and documents multiplied and at the present time there are no less than ninety of them. I will speak of these fantastic documents later. I leave to Lt. Colonel Sir Bernard Reilly, Governor of Aden, the task of explaining the aim of these treaties to us.

*[The speaker continued in English.]*

"The treaties which specifically accord the British protection to the individual States are all cast in much the same form. It is a very simple one, for the provisions are limited to a few short clauses stating that the gracious favour and protection of the British sovereign shall be extended to the ruler concerned, who, for his part, undertakes to have no relations with any other foreign Power. There are thirty-one such treaties of protection, and between them they cover both the western and eastern parts of the Aden Protectorate. Collectively they lay on Her Majesty's Government the obligation to defend the States concerned, which in effect means the whole Protectorate, against external attack, and to protect them from outside aggression or interference. They are thus,

in a sense, the cornerstone of the Protectorate structure, and both to the rulers and people of the States and to the protecting Power they are the most important of all the Treaties governing the relationship between the British Government and their Arab associates in Southern Arabia."<sup>2/</sup>

" ...

"The object of these Treaties was to create an area of the mainland behind and near Aden free from interference and bound by mutual friendship and interest to the British."<sup>3/</sup>

*[The speaker resumed in French.]*

68. Here we have the purpose of these treaties clearly explained by the Governor. But how were the local chieftains—the emirs and the sultans—in the area behind and near Aden to be convinced of the necessity for signing these treaties? Several stratagems were employed to achieve this end. First of all, use was made of the most traditional method, that of "divide and rule". The agents of the Colonial Office were to set the local chieftains against each other, flatter their personal and tribal pride, and stir them up to quarrel among themselves. Once they were well launched on this fratricidal struggle, they were supplied with arms and money, and then presented with protection treaties which, it was claimed, would protect them. The second method used was that of direct force or intimidation. This was employed mainly in the coastal regions and in the islands and anywhere else where the British Navy could intervene. The third method was bribery and intrigue.

69. Now let us see who these protégés of His Britannic Majesty were. They were decent people, good citizens, honourable chieftains who had always been local leaders, chiefs of tribes or regions, who found themselves without the support of the central Yemeni Government, which was itself engaged, as we have explained, in a struggle against the Ottoman occupation, and who were induced one after the other to sign treaties which left them the privileges of chieftain, flattered their pride and provided them, it must be admitted, with a little money. Sometimes the fact of having put his fingerprints on a paper which he could not even read and which was called "a treaty" gave or confirmed to a chieftain the title of emir or sultan and the right to be received in Aden with up to an eleven-gun salute.

70. Thanks to these treaties, in 1959 twenty-five States were under the protection of the United Kingdom behind and around Aden, thus producing the desired situation which, as explained by the Governor, Sir Bernard Reilly, was to isolate this strategic base. Only one continent—or perhaps two—contains as many States as occupied Yemen. Of the twenty-five States in this territory, twenty form what is known as the Western Aden Protectorate and five the Eastern Aden Protectorate.

71. What is the nature of these treaties and what are these States which are under the friendly protection of the United Kingdom? Lieutenant Colonel Reilly, later Sir Bernard Reilly, Governor and Commander-in-Chief of Aden from 1932 to 1940, explains this in the passages from his book which I have just quoted (see para. 67). It was natural that in the absence of

the traditional authority, each tribal chief should conduct his own affairs. There is a great difference between that and being independent.

72. The fact remains that, taking advantage of this chaos, the British forces were able to land at Aden on 10 January 1839, two years after Sa'na had fallen to the Ottoman Empire. So, while the North was giving way under pressure from the Turkish armies, Aden surrendered to the British Empire, after a bombardment carried out in the best tradition in January 1839.

73. We must recall that, well before the British, the Portuguese had tried without success to seize this Yemeni gateway and citadel. At that time the country was not yet involved in its war of independence against the Ottoman aggression and so was easily able to repel the Portuguese attack. Such an explanation would not have been necessary if the British authorities had not claimed that, on their arrival in 1839, the princes of the region had been independent for a century. This view of past history will also answer the argument, put forward by a responsible person and mentioned in the report, that the central authority had ceased to exist in 1728. In this connexion I shall quote the following passage from the report:

"After that date [1728] there had been no evidence that any Yemeni ruler had exercised the slightest authority over the region, and when the United Kingdom had occupied Aden in 1839, Yemen had neither protested nor come to the assistance of the Sultan of Lahej. Yet Yemen had at that time been fully independent, and it would certainly not have permitted the United Kingdom to occupy Aden if it had regarded that territory as its own."  
[A/5446/Rev.1, chapter V, para. 85.]

74. Can the originators of this argument explain to us how a country which had just lost its capital, after centuries of desperate fighting, could at the same time oppose another, yet more powerful aggressor, especially in the coastal areas which could be controlled by the British Navy, then mistress of the seas? We must ask that a sense of proportion be maintained and history respected.

75. Let us now examine the situation in this part of Yemen after the occupation of Aden. From that time on the port was under the control of the British Government. Administratively it depended on Bombay and served as a supply port for the coaling of British ships, particularly those of the famous East India Company. To enable Aden to continue to be the principal port on the Indian Ocean, the East India Company declared it a free port in 1853, so that the traditional Yemeni trade continued to be carried on in the town and port of Aden. Later, the opening of the Suez Canal gave Aden an even greater importance. Then, at all costs, British control had to be extended over the adjoining territories. Sir Bernard Reilly does not conceal this when he states:

*[The speaker continued in English.]*

"The British interest in establishing this relationship with the Arab tribes concerned was the security of Aden and of the sea route to India and the East."<sup>4/</sup>

*[The speaker resumed in French.]*

Now Sir Bernard Reilly reduces these States to a lower level and speaks of Arab tribes.

<sup>2/</sup> Sir Bernard Reilly, *Aden and the Yemen*, London, Stationery Office, 1960, p. 16.

<sup>3/</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 15.

<sup>4/</sup> *Ibid.*

76. Let us see also how British colonialism set about extending its domination over the area surrounding Aden. It was simply the accident of occupation which determined the limits of British domination, a domination which was admittedly confirmed by the famous treaties, more amusing than realistic, which we have already mentioned. And here is the representative of the Colonial Office admitting in his book quoted above, that "These documents form the nucleus from which the Aden Protectorate has gradually grown."<sup>5/</sup>

77. Therefore it is crystal clear that what is called Aden and the Protectorates was formed through a nibbling away of Yemeni territory over a long period. In this sense, Aden was like a drop of oil which makes a stain that spreads in all directions. It was entirely due to the accident of occupation that this southern region of Yemen became a colony, separated from the mother country. This, of course, was achieved without any consideration for the will of the people, or for historical, geographical, economic, racial and other factors.

78. In every country there are regions which have special characteristics and a name of their own. In the United Kingdom, for example, there is Wales and Scotland; in France, Normandy and Languedoc; in Italy, Lombardy and Sicily; in Spain, Andalusia and Catalonia. The world over, there are many other natural regions of one and the same country which have their own peculiar features and distinguishing name. But these natural regions of occupied Yemen do not even have a name in common or names of their own. Their name derives from their relationship to Aden—"Aden and the Aden Protectorates", and it means precisely what it says.

79. I must add that at the beginning of the British occupation of Aden and of the expansion of this occupation, the region was called: "Aden and the Nine Districts". When the Nine Districts or protectorates multiplied and became not nine but twenty-five, this name no longer fitted the facts. So two names were invented: "States of the Western Aden Protectorate" and "States of the Eastern Aden Protectorate".

80. Lately, perhaps to avoid the absurdity of maintaining twenty-five States, the United Kingdom authorities tried to turn them into one or two States, still, of course, as one entity, in order to isolate them from Yemen. I know that we have North Korea and South Korea. But, for this partition, agreement was reached on the 38th parallel and the name of Korea was retained. Here, however, the word Yemen is not even used. All citizens of that region know with certainty that they are above all Yemenites; consequently, any union under the true name of Yemen would be simple. Must I add that any Yemenite, whether he lives in the north, the south, the east or the west, is proud of belonging to this country with its ancient civilization, the country of Yumnat, the country of the Queen of Sheba? The sultans, the emirs, the sheikhs and local chieftains all know that they are Yemenites first and last, that they belong to a nation which, twenty or thirty centuries ago, built dams and twenty-storey skyscrapers, produced works of art, and constructed roads and tunnels, a nation which was mistress of the seas and had a monopoly of the international incense trade for almost fifteen centuries, and that this country was called Arabia Felix, that is to say Happy Arabia: Yemen.

81. Inventing names for a region which is by nature part of a glorious and united country is not enough to sanction an artificial separation between that country and the region which a foreign overlord seeks to tear away from it.

82. Having described the general circumstances which led up to the artificial separation of southern Yemen from the mother country, through the colonization of Aden and the surrounding area; having stressed the oneness in the past of this glorious country; having related the manoeuvres and stratagems which were used to induce the local chieftains to sign the illegal and often ridiculous treaties which bound them to remain under British domination until the end of the world; having demonstrated the interdependence of Aden and the surrounding area with the interior of the country, I shall now proceed to demonstrate that Aden and the Aden Protectorates are ethnically one with free Yemen.

83. There are Yemeni emigrants all over the world: in Indonesia, in Malaysia, in neighbouring Arab countries, and also in Europe (France, Italy and elsewhere). Even in the United Kingdom there are colonies of Yemeni emigrants in London, in South Shields, and more especially in Cardiff. Anyone who visits these colonies of emigrants scattered throughout the world realizes that they come from the same stock, that they are natives of the same country, that they profess the same religion, and that they have the same customs, eat the same food, and sing the same songs. When you ask them their nationality, they all proudly reply: "Yemenite". Now, some come from Aden, others from the neighbouring area, Sa'ana, Taiz, or elsewhere. Although the majority are from the occupied region, it would not occur to any of them to say that he is not a Yemenite but comes from the occupied region. Besides, they are all too proud to recall willingly that they come from a part of Yemen occupied by foreigners.

84. And yet, in spite of this, the colonial authorities have gone so far in their efforts to divide and mutilate Yemen as to try to establish a separate nationality for Aden, an "Adenese" nationality.

85. It is like trying to create a "Cardiff" nationality in relation to the port of Cardiff. All this chicanery was invented by the colonial Power in an attempt to delay as long as possible the restitution of this region of Yemen and to prolong the colonial rule, or to perpetuate what is now called neo-colonialism, in other words the disguised colonialism that they are attempting to impose on the country.

86. Today, the knell of colonialism has sounded. How can British domination of Aden and the protective network around that base be maintained? The sword of decolonization has been given into the hands of the United Nations. A Special Committee has been established for this purpose, and it wields the sword firmly and resolutely.

87. The Colonial Office must therefore act quickly to save Aden from decolonization and subject it to neo-colonialism. Aden is no longer merely a supply base on the route to India. It is now something much more important: a bastion and a shield. It is the only United Kingdom military base in the whole region and the general headquarters of the United Kingdom naval forces in the Middle East. It is also a very important air base. We are told that more than 10,000 men are stationed there. Arab oil, indispensable to the economy

<sup>5/</sup> Ibid.

and the imperial war machine, is close by. The Aden oil refinery is one of the most important in the Middle East. Since the evacuation of Suez and Kenya, Aden has become the United Kingdom bastion of the whole Middle East. The protective zone around this imperial—or imperialistic—base must therefore be maintained, notwithstanding the local Yemeni population, the country of Yemen, the Arab world and even the Special Committee.

88. To ensure the continued presence of the British, the total isolation of this region must be achieved, and not only a physical isolation but also an intellectual and emotional isolation. Even more than this, a spirit of hostility should be aroused towards the Arab countries, and especially towards the Yemen Arab Republic in order to set it apart once and for all and sanction an artificial division. But the Yemeni people in both the North and the South are no longer asleep. More and more citizens of this great people are now awake to the situation and are beginning to organize. They are forming political parties, social organizations and trade unions. They are sending delegations wherever needed to defend their cause and explain what they want. The representatives of the Yemeni people have come here to the United Nations to pursue their just and obvious claims. They are seeking to hasten the decolonization of their country. Petitioners have gained a hearing, and they have had memoranda circulated. Several of these have been addressed to you in particular, Mr. President. Thus, the peoples and Governments throughout the world that care about the right of self-determination, and the Powers concerned with or anxious about questions of security and stability in that part of the world, are now becoming alarmed. The representatives of those Powers in this great Organization are discussing this burning question with obvious anxiety and make no effort to hide their impatience.

89. In addition to all this, the Special Committee, also called the Committee on Decolonization or the Committee of Twenty-Four, now presents us with a report containing no less than 219 mimeographed pages dealing solely with the question of Aden. This report tells us that, in view of the importance of this question, which comes within the purview of the problems of decolonization, the Special Committee considered it essential, in turn, to establish, by a resolution adopted on 3 May 1963, a Sub-Committee which was given specific and clear-cut terms of reference in the said resolution, paragraph 4 of which reads as follows:

"Decides to send to these territories a sub-committee to be nominated by the Chairman."  
[See A/5446/Rev.1, chap. V, appendix, para. 6.]

90. However, the colonizing Power—on this occasion the Government of the United Kingdom—which denounces what are called "walls" or "curtains", is erecting around these territories a barrier to block the beneficent influence of the United Nations. As a result, the members of this Sub-Committee—that is to say, of a body established by the United Nations—were not allowed to set foot on these territories and were unable to find any way of breaking through this colonial barrier. By virtue of this act of defiance on the part of the United Kingdom authorities, the members of the Sub-Committee who are representatives of our Organization, were forbidden access to Aden and were treated as undesirables by the Colonial Office and its administration. Thus, the Immigration Department

at Aden had a letter circulated with reference to them. [Ibid., appendix, annex II]. Allow me to read it to you:

Immigration and Passports  
Department  
P.O. Box 1178  
Maalla, Aden

"Confidential

"All airlines and shipping

Circular

"(1) H.E. Mr. Sonn Voeunsai (Cambodia);

"(2) H.E. Dr. Adnan M. Pachachi (Iraq);

"(3) Dr. Leonardo Díaz González (Venezuela);

"(4) H.E. Mišo Pavičević (Yugoslavia);

"(5) H.E. Louis Rakotomalala, or Mr. Remi Andriamaharo (Madagascar).

"This is to inform you that should any of the five persons named above arrive in Aden State by any of your Agency Aircraft or Ships, they will not be permitted to land.

"It is therefore suggested that you should advise owners of airlines and shipping under your Agency not to accept any booking from these persons for journey to Aden or any journey that would necessitate their stay in Aden in transit.

"Please acknowledge receipt of this circular.

"(Signature illegible)  
"Controller of Immigration."

91. These honourable representatives, ambassadors and high officials of several Powers who were representing the authority of the United Nations with all its prestige were thus treated simply as undesirables by the authorities occupying the South of our country. I leave it to the Chairman and the members of the Sub-Committee to tell us in their own words how they were treated by the United Kingdom authorities. I should nevertheless like to call attention to the following passages in the Sub-Committee's report:

"Finally, the Sub-Committee notes with regret that the United Kingdom considers the presence of a visiting mission in the Territories of Aden as an interference in the internal affairs of these Territories. This entirely distorts the spirit behind the proposed visit which was aimed at ascertaining the views of the population so as to implement the Declaration on the granting of independence.

"The Sub-Committee cannot stress too strongly its deep regret and disappointment at the position taken by the United Kingdom Government. This decision not only prevented the Sub-Committee from performing one of the specific tasks given it by the Special Committee, but also, through refusing the Sub-Committee access to the very Territory with which it was concerned, denied it one of the most effective means of carrying out the main tasks assigned to it." [Ibid., appendix, paras. 31 and 32.]

92. After this description of the accomplishment of its mission, the Sub-Committee came to the following conclusions:

"Petitioners pointed out that the British had originally occupied Aden in pursuit of their own interests and that today the policy of the United Kingdom in the Territory was still directed by

motives of self-interest. They drew particular attention to the military base that was being maintained in Aden which they objected to on the grounds that it was an instrument of colonial domination." [Ibid., para. 60.]

93. The report further clarifies matters for us as follows:

"Petitioners were unanimous in rejecting the various Governments in Aden and Aden Protectorates, namely the Government of the State of Aden, the Governments in the various protected states and the Government of the Federation of South Arabia. Petitioners stated that they were controlled by the British either directly or through people who allowed themselves to be used as tools of the British. They were therefore false or sham governments, unrepresentative of the people and all legislation passed by them was unlawful.

"The views presented by petitioners on the constitutional status of Aden itself are best illustrated by reference to a memorandum submitted by the People's Socialist Party." [Ibid., paras. 65 and 66.]

94. It must be explained that the People's Socialist Party groups together all the active and enlightened forces of occupied Yemen. It is supported by the Aden Trades Union Congress—a remarkable, powerful and disciplined organization—by the Arab Women's Association, the Arab Youth Organization, the Graduates' Congress and the Sports Union. This party therefore represents the great majority of organized forces and is a powerful and representative organization. A memorandum sent by this powerful political party to the Chairman of the Sub-Committee is referred to in the Sub-Committee's report; I shall now quote from the report:

"In this memorandum it was pointed out that although, under the new constitution, Aden is now called the State of Aden its status had not been changed. It still remained a colony, despite its misleading name. The memorandum also drew attention to the wide powers exercised by the United Kingdom and the Governor, now called the High Commissioner. The Governor was appointed by the United Kingdom Government and every Ordinance to have effect had to be consented to by him; if he refused consent to any Ordinance, then it became of no effect. He also had the power to stop or 'block' any Bill while it was being discussed in the Legislative Council. The Governor also had the power to make legislation himself, without reference to the Legislative Council, for the 'peace, order and good government of the Colony'. The memorandum pointed out that the flexibility of this last phrase enabled the Governor to legislate on any subject he wished. In addition, the United Kingdom Government might disallow any Ordinance passed by the Legislature in Aden, such Ordinance having no effect from the date it was disallowed. The United Kingdom Government also reserved the same power as the Governor to legislate for the 'peace, order and good government of the Colony'.

"The memorandum also drew attention to regulations or subsidiary legislation which could be enacted by the Governor, the Governor-in-Council, a Minister or an official such as the Commissioner of Police. This subsidiary legislation could have very wide effects and could essentially change the law of the Country. The powers of making subsidiary

legislation were in many cases discretionary and were not subject to review by courts of law or by any representative institution. Furthermore, subsidiary legislation was never laid before the Legislative Council.

"Petitioners also condemned the present Legislative Council. It was characterized as a completely unrepresentative body which had been elected in 1958 under a narrowly restricted franchise. It was pointed out that at that time the population of the Colony was about 200,000 but that the property qualifications and in particular the provision that those not born in Aden had to be British subjects in order to vote, had resulted in the right to vote being given to only 5,000 male persons. Many thousands of potential Arab voters had thus been excluded, while on the other hand, foreigners who happened to be British subjects, including temporary expatriates and British officers, were given the right to vote. Because of this a boycott was organized as a result of which, according to official figures published by the Government, 73 per cent of the 5,000 who had the right to vote had boycotted the elections.

"Petitioners also pointed out that although the term of this Legislative Council was due to expire at the end of 1962, no elections had been held and the life of the Council had been extended by one year. They felt that elections should have been held at this time as important changes affecting the status of the country were being introduced by the United Kingdom Government. First, there were the proposals for the accession of Aden to the Federation of South Arabia, to which, to the knowledge of the Government, there had been great public opposition. There were also the proposals for so-called 'constitutional development' which included the introduction of a semi-Cabinet system of government. There was, therefore, in the words of the Peoples Socialist Party memorandum, 'a strong case for holding a general election to test the opinion of the people on these gravely important issues before they are introduced'.

"It was also pointed out in this memorandum that in 1958 the twelve elected members had stood for election as individuals and not as representatives of political parties with plans and programmes. A number of political parties had been formed since then and it was 'proper and in accordance with established constitutional practice' that before the introduction of a semi-Cabinet system of government there should have been an opportunity for the newly formed parties to contest a general election. The party that won a majority of seats would then form the Government and could 'truly and democratically claim to represent the people in any negotiations for merger in any Federation' or in any negotiations affecting the status and future of the whole country.

"Petitioners also drew attention to the method used to elect the four new members of the Legislative Council in 1962. Instead of being elected by the people they were elected by the Legislative Council itself sitting as an electoral college. This procedure had been opposed as undemocratic and unconstitutional. Mr. Adhal, in a written submission to the Sub-Committee, stated that by this means the Government had been able to see that its own candidates were elected. All the members elected in this manner were now Ministers. One, the present

Minister for Education, had been defeated previously in the last elections to the Legislative Council held in 1959. Another, the present Minister of State, had been defeated a few weeks previously in the municipal elections.

"The Peoples Socialist Party memorandum concludes its discussion of the question of elections as follows:

"Since 1958 the Government has been very scared to face the country in a general election. Every possible means and device was invented to avoid facing the country in a general election at a time when there is every reason (constitutional and legal) for the Government to hold a general election."

"Petitioners also drew attention to the amount of corruption associated with the Government in Aden. They stated that two Ministers, the Minister of Works and the Minister of State, had been found guilty of corruption as a result of public inquiry into municipal affairs instituted by the Governor in 1962. In this connexion they handed to the Sub-Committee a copy of the Report of the Municipality Inquiry Commission, dated 16 July 1962 ..."  
[*Ibid.*, paras. 66-73].

95. Let us now see how the Sub-Committee's report describes the attitude of these petitioners towards what has been called the "Federation of South Arabia".

"Petitioners devoted particular attention to the Federation of South Arabia which had been created in 1959 and to which Aden had acceded in January 1963. They condemned it as a 'false' and 'fictitious' federation created by the British in order to further their own colonial interests and maintain their colonial domination in the area. One petitioner, Mr. Adhal, described it as a 'disguise to enable the British to preserve their authority there, to maintain their military base and thus control neighbouring countries'. Another, Mr. Mohamed Aidaroos, deposed Sultan of Lower Yafei, said: 'Great Britain has followed the policy of divide and rule, a policy of arrests and murders, threats and tyranny for more than 100 years, and now that it sees the people cannot endure any more, they are instituting a Federation in the hope that they will thus prevent the people from demanding their rights'.

"In support, petitioners stated that the Federation had been created by the British and that the people had not been consulted. On this point Mr. Mohamed Aidaroos said: 'The population of the South have never refused and will never refuse a true federation for themselves which would be in their own interests and in the interest of their present and future, because they believe in the unity of all the Arab people, but they refuse this Federation because it is done by the British'.

"Petitioners also held that the Federation was also completely controlled by the British. The Constitution of the Federation stated clearly that nothing in it affected the terms of the treaties which had been imposed on the rulers of the individual states and by which they had been subjected to British control. The rulers were still under the orders of the British advisers. Also, by the provisions of the Constitution of the Federation, all the important powers had been reserved for the High Commissioner or the United Kingdom Government."  
[*Ibid.*, paras. 76-78.]

96. Further on, the report speaks of the legislation restricting political activities and human rights, in the following terms:

"Petitioners had much to say concerning legislation in the Territory which restricted political activities and human rights. While the following paragraphs are based to a large extent on the detailed examination of this legislation contained in the memorandum submitted by the Peoples Socialist Party, many petitioners stressed the effect of these laws on the political life of the Territory. Specifically, attention was drawn to legislation affecting the Press, the labour movement, societies and organizations, personal rights (including imprisonment without trial and summary deportation), public gatherings, and the law of sedition." [*Ibid.*, para. 88.]

97. The report explains how section 334 of the Aden Criminal Procedure Ordinance permits imprisonment without trial. We read the following:

"Attention was drawn to section 334 of the Aden Criminal Procedure Ordinance which provided that 'when any person accused of any non-bailable offence and detained without warrant by an officer in charge of a police station, appears or is brought before a court he may be released on bail by him or it, but he shall not be so released if there appears reasonable grounds for believing that he has been guilty of an offence punishable with death or that it is expedient in the public interest that he be not released on bail'.

"It was pointed out that the phrase 'or that it is expedient in the public interest that he be not released on bail' was designed to enable the Aden Government to imprison without trial its political opponents and had in fact been used and was still being used for this purpose. Among those who had been arrested and remanded to prison before any trial were the following leaders of the political and labour movements:

- (1) "Abdulla Ali Murshed, a Trade Union leader;
- (2) "Idris Hambala, a Trade Union leader and a member of the Peoples Socialist Party;
- (3) "Abdulla Al-Asnag, General Secretary of the Aden Trades Union Congress and President of the Peoples Socialist Party;
- (4) "Abdulla Ali Obaid Wahti, distributor of newspaper of the Aden Trades Union Congress.

"All had applied for bail at their trials but the Crown had objected that it was not expedient in the public interest that they be released on bail and bail had been refused to them all." [*Ibid.*, paras. 100 and 101.]

98. The report also explains how and on what basis summary deportation takes place and speaks of the ban on public meetings and on the displaying of bills and posters on buildings. Here is what it says:

"Attention was drawn to the wide discretionary power given to the Governor under section IV of the Vagrants and Undesirables Ordinance. Under this section the Governor may make an order for the departure of any person not being a British subject born in Aden who is, *inter alia*, 'a person who for political or any other reason is not in his opinion a suitable person to reside in the Colony'.

"It was stated that this power had been widely exercised to deport political leaders, labour move-

ment leaders and workers. Even a one-day strike rendered a labourer liable to deportation without any trial, and in fact mass deportations of hundreds of workers had been effected. This legislation puts 'workers, ordinary citizens, political and labour movement leaders under a constant threat and menace. A person whose political views are not very much liked by the authorities finds himself deported by the authorities if it just happens that he was born over the border'. Attention was also drawn to the hardship and human suffering caused by these mass deportations not only to the individuals concerned but also to their wives and families who were often left penniless." [Ibid., paras. 102 and 103.]

99. The report also describes the repression, in the following terms:

"Events relating to peace and security in the area were emphasized by nearly all the petitioners. They described, sometimes at great length, what they called the reign of terror and the repression existing in the Protectorates. The world, it was stated, knew nothing or very little about the attacks constantly carried out by the British forces, particularly the Royal Air Force, against the people of the Protectorates; little was known about the people killed or wounded, the villages destroyed, the crops burnt, the cattle lost, the hundreds imprisoned and the refugees scattered in the hills or in neighbouring countries. Nor did the world know about the stout resistance which the people had been displaying against British domination and in defence of their freedom. No news agencies had been in these areas to report on these military actions, the destruction left behind and the damage done to the local inhabitants. Each area had carried out its resistance alone, without being able to get any help from outside. The Sub-Committee received a great number of photographs taken in various localities in the Protectorates showing homes destroyed by bombs, burnt plantations, refugees living in caves and armed fighters.

"The following paragraphs contain descriptions given by petitioners which seem best to illustrate the events referred to in those areas.

"Mr. Mohamed Adubaker ben Farid, who was in exile in Cairo, said that it was only in 1951-1952 that British forces had occupied his region, Upper Aulaqi. Until 1959 the people had struggled politically against the British and refused to co-operate with them. Then suddenly in May 1959, without any warning, British aircraft and tanks carried out their first attack against their villages and homes. From the hills, the tribesmen organized their resistance, but in May 1960 the British sent 4,000 soldiers into the area and hundreds of people were forced to take refuge in Yemen and Saudi Arabia. About 12,000 sorties had been effected by the Royal Air Force against the Aulaqis and surrounding areas. The petitioner presented to the Sub-Committee a partial list of forty destroyed homes and the names of nine women who had been killed in the bombings and nine men who had been imprisoned, all of whom he had known personally." [Ibid., paras. 114-116.]

100. The report reproduces the text of warnings of air-raids and gives a list of merciless raids carried out against the population:

"Despite our repeated warnings, Al-Musli and the other trouble-makers are continuing their hostile

activities and breaches of the peace. It has been decided to take action from the air against Al-Musli's house and the cultivated land adjoining it.

"We accordingly warn you to move your women and children immediately to a distance of about one mile from Al-Musli's house. If you fail to do so, you will be responsible for the consequences." [Ibid., para. 119.]

101. It also presents the demands of the population as set forth by the petitioners. We see that the first of these demands—one with which, needless to say, the delegation of the Yemen Arab Republic associates itself wholeheartedly—is for "the immediate ending of colonial rule". I am convinced that almost all the delegations here present are equally warm, I would even say fervent, in their support of this just and equitable demand, which is in accordance with the United Nations declaration on decolonization. Included in the list of demands is the dissolution of the Federation and the holding of elections or a plebiscite under United Nations supervision.

102. At the end of the report the Sub-Committee sums up the conclusions it finally reached. The Sub-Committee makes the following statement:

"In visiting neighbouring countries, the Sub-Committee was merely carrying out one of the provisions of the Special Committee's resolution of 3 May 1963. Since it was unable to visit the territories concerned, it went where individuals from Aden and Aden Protectorates could appear before it to present their views on conditions in their country and on its future.

"The Sub-Committee was in fact able to hear a great many people belonging to many different sections of the population: representatives and leaders of political parties, trade union delegates, elected representatives, former Sultans or tribal chiefs, civilians and soldiers, civil servants, business men, farmers, students, and men and women belonging to various organizations.

"The Sub-Committee's visit to countries neighbouring Aden and Aden Protectorates made it possible for these people to present their views and demands with regard to their country's future. This is a positive aspect of the work of the Special Committee in its efforts to seek the most suitable ways and means for the speedy implementation of the Declaration on the granting of Independence to colonial countries and peoples.

"One of the most heartening results of these hearings was the many testimonials they provided of the earnest faith and hope placed in the United Nations as an instrument for the peaceful liberation of the peoples under colonial rule.

"The Sub-Committee found a general desire to put an end to colonial domination. The few differences of opinion encountered did not concern the objective sought but rather the means and the conditions for the achievement of that objective." [Ibid., paras. 158 to 162.]

103. At this stage of the general debate on the report of the Special Committee, my delegation, which has today confined itself to the question of Aden, reserves the right to speak later, with the President's permission, about the other territories mentioned in the general report.

104. My delegation wishes, however, to stress its support of the principal demand of the petitioners, namely, the immediate ending of colonial rule, a demand as just as it is natural and one for which the Special Committee was set up.

105. Mr. ALEKSEEV (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (translated from Russian): The clock of history is inexorably ticking away the last moments of colonialism. We are not only witnesses of its inevitable downfall, but participants in the struggle against this detestable anachronism, a struggle which is being waged on an international scale. I say "struggle" because colonialism will not surrender without a fight. Colonialism is doomed, but will not of its own accord leave the arena of history. We see this clearly. We see that colonialism—a shameful phenomenon, little better than slavery, which adds no lustre to the age of civilization—is putting up a desperate resistance. As in any struggle, in the international fight against colonialism the latter has its defenders, who under one pretext or another seek political palliatives to prolong the life of this accursed monster.

106. We live and fight at a time when peoples still languishing under the colonial yoke are refusing to go on bearing the burden of exploitation and humiliation. They are making a powerful appeal to the conscience of the world. How long shall colonialism continue to exist and foster inequality among peoples—colonialism, which results in the political, economic and social subjugation of weak countries by strong and domineering States?

107. The peoples of colonial and dependent countries have raised high the banner of national liberation—the banner of the struggle for full equality with other nations, for freedom and independence. At the same time, they have placed their hopes in the United Nations and appealed to it fervently for help. The General Assembly heeded this appeal and at its fifteenth session in 1960 adopted the historic Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)]. The draft of this Declaration,<sup>6/</sup> as is known, was proposed by the Government of the Soviet Union and was submitted for consideration at the fifteenth session of the General Assembly by Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

108. In his statement at that session in September 1960, Mr. Khrushchev stressed particularly that

"... the time has come to pose the question of the full and final abolition of the colonial system of government in all its forms and varieties in order to make an end of this infamy, this barbarism, this savagery" [869th meeting, para. 181].

109. Three years have passed since the Declaration became a directive for action by the United Nations and its organs. These three years have convincingly confirmed the incontrovertible truth that on the manner in which the provisions of the Declaration are observed and implemented depends the fate of colonialism and the timing of its departure once for all from the arena of history, in Southern Rhodesia as well as in South West Africa, in the territories under Portuguese administration and in other countries which have not yet attained their independence.

110. That is why such insistent demands are being made, both within the walls of the United Nations and outside this international Organization, for unconditional compliance with and immediate implementation of the Declaration, and why the colonial system is being roundly condemned. Colonialism is condemned not only by the black races who are living under colonial oppression or who have recently thrown off its yoke. It is also condemned and held up to shame by yellow men and white men, by people of every race who hold dear the concepts of liberty, equality and independence.

111. The Ukrainian delegation has studied very carefully 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 [A/5446/Rev.1]. This has brought home to us the important work the Committee has done and the great efforts all its members have had to make in preparing the report submitted for consideration by the Assembly. Our task would not have been easy without the assistance given to all of us by the Special Committee, which collected, systematized and set forth in comprehensible and cogent form an enormous amount of factual material on the item under discussion.

112. I should like to express to the Committee and to its Chairman, Mr. Coulibaly, the sincere gratitude of the Ukrainian delegation for their great work.

113. The report of the Special Committee has confirmed yet again that although each of the colonial and dependent countries has its own particular conditions and characteristics of development, in approaching the problem of the abolition of colonialism there are common principles which must underlie the policy of those who are fighting for the final abolition of the colonial system.

114. These principles are based on the need to grant independence to all colonial and dependent countries and peoples without exception.

115. Guided by these principles, the General Assembly should reject and dismiss any pretext for delaying the attainment of independence by any Non-Self-Governing Territory and call on all States Members of the United Nations strictly to comply, insofar as concerns the colonial and dependent countries and peoples, with the provisions of the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights [resolution 217 (III) A] and the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

116. From the report of the Special Committee and from the discussions on colonial problems at the present session, especially in the Fourth Committee, two positions emerge.

117. One position is that of States which, as the Declaration demands, speak out unconditionally for the immediate abolition of colonialism. This is the position of the overwhelming majority of countries.

118. The other position is that of the minority of States, first and foremost the colonial States; but it is primarily on these States that the implementation of the provisions of the Declaration and of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly depends. Essentially this position consists in delaying the final abolition of colonialism under one pretext or another and putting off the day when this shameful system will disappear forever.

<sup>6/</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 87, document A/4502.

119. The two opposing positions which I have mentioned did not arise today or yesterday. The problems of colonialism have been on the agenda of the General Assembly literally since the earliest days of the United Nations. As early as 1946, at the first session of the Assembly, the situation in the Portuguese colonial possessions was discussed.

120. The General Assembly has also dealt with other questions relating to colonialism. In the intervening period, the heroic struggle of many peoples has been crowned with victory. On the African continent alone, dozens of States have attained their independence, and in this, of course, the United Nations has been of great service. However, for many colonial and dependent countries and peoples it is as if time had stood still.

121. About seventy territories, with 50 million inhabitants, are still in the chains of colonialism, and the problem of their liberation has indeed become almost a constant one for the United Nations.

122. In Southern Rhodesia and in the Portuguese colonies, new generations have grown up since the question of granting independence to these territories was first placed on the agenda of the General Assembly.

123. The General Assembly has already adopted more than sixty-five resolutions on South West Africa and for seventeen years now a petitioner, the Reverend Scott, has been coming to the United Nations with complaints. But nothing has changed. South West Africa is still under the heel of the colonialists, as it was then. That is a paradox and a living reproach to the United Nations.

124. The fact is that a paltry minority of colonial Powers, pursuing a policy of delay and procrastination with regard to the abolition of the colonial system, have succeeded for all these years in ignoring the will of the overwhelming majority of countries which, guided by the decisions of the General Assembly and the requirements of the United Nations Charter, favour the immediate and unconditional abolition of the remnants of colonialism.

125. We have already had occasion in the Fourth Committee to point out to representatives, for instance, how protracted has become the solution of the question of Southern Rhodesia. It was discussed on several occasions at meetings of the General Assembly and was considered twice 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. Twice this question was discussed by a specially created Sub-Committee on Southern Rhodesia, whose members travelled to London for talks with the United Kingdom Government. Quite recently, the question of Southern Rhodesia was discussed by the Security Council. And every time, resolutions and recommendations have stressed the exceptional importance of the time factor for a successful solution of the question of Southern Rhodesia.

126. I must emphasize that many decisions of the United Nations General Assembly on problems of colonialism, as well as resolutions of well-known African conferences, have insisted on the immediate satisfaction of the legitimate aspirations of colonial peoples.

127. Whereas the first All-African Peoples' Conference<sup>7/</sup> in Accra in December 1958 took as its

slogan "Independence in our time", the cry a year later, at the Second All-African Conference<sup>8/</sup> in Tunis, was "Independence—Now!" These same demands were heard at the conference of the heads of thirty-two African States<sup>9/</sup> in Addis Ababa.

128. Taking into account the interest of the colonial peoples in immediately obtaining their freedom and the right to self-government, the Declaration solemnly proclaimed "the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations".

129. Having regard precisely to the real state of affairs, the General Assembly has stressed on every occasion the necessity of granting immediate and effective independence to colonial peoples, since the timing of the granting of independence will decide the ways and means—peaceful or other—which will be used to achieve this goal.

130. To adopt the position of a minority of colonial States, a position of delaying tactics and procrastination, is in fact to embark on a course fraught with dangerous consequences for international peace and security.

131. Nevertheless, the colonial Powers are unwilling to abandon this path. They are resorting to all kinds of tactical manoeuvres and subterfuges. Their whole propaganda machine is being employed to justify their predatory colonialist intentions to international public opinion.

132. From the report of the Special Committee on Southern Rhodesia and from the discussion of the item in the Fourth Committee, we know that in that country all political parties are banned which march in step with the people and which, in the opinion of the racists of Southern Rhodesia, are "subversive".

133. The representative of the Republic of the Congo (Brazzaville) rightly stressed in his statement of 15 November 1963 in the Fourth Committee [meeting 1482], that the statement: "Nationalists are Communists" was the one most frequently used by the colonialists. That statement is used by the colonialists to justify their blood-letting and their suppression of the struggle for national liberation.

134. But it is not only under the cloak of anti-Communism that the colonialists conceal their shameful activities. Without a twinge of conscience, they venture to assert that they are almost the benefactors of the colonial peoples. At the same time, they attribute to colonialism features which are supposedly alien to its exploitative nature. To listen to these so-called "friends" of the colonial peoples, all they are concerned about is to bring modern civilization within the reach of the oppressed peoples. But they omit to say that civilization is incompatible with oppression, and that the chains of slavery have never been the symbol of freedom and independence.

135. However, this does not exhaust the colonialists' tactical arsenal. The United Kingdom, for instance, contrary to all good sense and the decisions of the General Assembly, still maintains that Southern Rhodesia is not a territory covered by Article 73 of the United Nations Charter. For Southern Rhodesia a special concept has even been devised: that of a "self-governing colony".

<sup>8/</sup> Second All-African Peoples' Conference, 25-31 January 1960.

<sup>9/</sup> Summit Conference of Independent African States, 22-25 May 1963.

136. The Portuguese Government for its part, to justify its policy of colonial usurpation, tries—unsuccessfully, it must be admitted—to hide behind another screen: the Portuguese colonies, it seems, are not colonies, but "overseas provinces" which form an integral part of the mother country. It even attempts to find a scientific and theoretical basis for its colonial policy. We know about these attempts on the part of the Portuguese Government from the report of the Secretary-General<sup>10/</sup> presented in pursuance of the resolution adopted by the Security Council at its 1049th meeting on 31 July 1963.<sup>11/</sup> Making the best of a bad job, the Portuguese Government has evolved its own conception of self-determination and, hiding behind this, is trying to reduce a controversy of principle concerning the Portuguese colonies to a dispute about the meaning of "self-determination".

137. As the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Portugal recently stated, on behalf of his Government, it is not so much a matter of self-determination as of how "self-determination" should be defined. He asserts that just as there are different forms of government, so there are different forms of self-determination.

138. In Portugal's view, if the indigenous population participates in the administration of the colony, then it also participates in the taking of decisions concerning the affairs and the life of the colony.

139. What semantic quibbling and obvious chicanery there is in all this! Self-determination means, above all, political and national independence; it means the administration of the country without foreign intervention or domination. Do Angola, Mozambique, Portuguese Guinea and the other territories really enjoy self-determination, when they are administered from abroad, when the indigenous population merely participates in that administration and does not itself determine its forms and methods—when the indigenous population has only a share of sorts in the administration of its own country, and a dubious share at that?

140. Even if it is true that, as the Portuguese Government asserts, the population of the colonies participates in elections to municipal councils, legislative councils and so on, even then the part that the indigenous population plays in the life of its own country is an unequal one. Foreigners play the part of dictators, and the indigenous population that of subject people, whose lot it is to carry out the will of the foreign dictators who occupy all the controlling positions in the colonies.

141. The very enactment of the new fundamental law, which, as conceived by the Portuguese authorities, is to allow the promulgation of new political and administrative statutes for the so-called "overseas territories", indicates that the population of these territories has been and still is in the position of people unfairly treated, deprived of political and other rights.

142. The new fundamental law, the introduction of certain changes into the constitution and the carrying out of individual reforms are all calculated to quench the fire of the national-liberation struggle in the Portuguese colonies and to create an illusion of self-government in those territories.

143. It is no coincidence that these and all the other reforms were correctly evaluated by the Special Committee on Territories under Portuguese Administration, in the following terms:

"In the Committee's view, the reforms which Portugal claimed to have introduced not only do not meet the basic aspirations of the peoples of the Territories but have not even brought about, as yet, any significant changes in political, economic, social and educational conditions."<sup>12/</sup>

144. In short, no quibbling about the notion of "self-determination" and no partial reforms can conceal the true colonial status of the peoples of the territories under Portuguese administration. This is not a controversy about the notion of "self-determination"; it is a question of the people of the Portuguese colonies receiving and exercising their right to separation from Portugal and to the attainment of their freedom and independence.

145. The humiliations and insults to which the colonial peoples are constantly subjected by their oppressors and the widespread assertion that the colonial peoples of Africa are not yet mature enough for self-government and are not ready to live without the yoke of colonialism—these are but signs of the death pangs of colonialism and of its racist and, we could add, fascist ideology of superior and inferior races.

146. The policy of the colonialists only serves to confirm that colonialism is an ideology of racism, of the domination of one people over another, of the strong over the weak—an ideology of political, economic and social enslavement of one country by another.

147. But such a policy has not stood and will not stand the test of time. It claimed to be irreproachable at a time when many countries now Members of the United Nations were still under foreign rule. In those days also, the myth was spread abroad that the peoples of those countries, who have now thrown off the chains of colonialism, were not ready to live under conditions of equality and freedom and that they were not capable of independent development. But who can quote one single example, in corroboration, of a country in which the colonialists were too hasty in abolishing colonialism and granting independence, or of a country that refused independence and wished to submit once again to the yoke of colonialism? Such examples do not exist and never could!

148. On the other hand, there is abundant evidence that it was only after the expulsion of the colonialists that the former colonies were able to enter on an era of progress, and that the peoples of the former colonial territories have the capacity and the ability to develop economically, socially and politically.

149. How effectively the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Declaration on decolonization are implemented and when the final destruction of colonialism takes place will determine not only the ways and means which will be used to abolish it as a reality, but also the time-table for the elimination of the consequences of colonialism in the liberated countries. The elimination of the consequences of colonial slavery is a question of very great, vital, importance and its solution depends directly upon the speed with

<sup>10/</sup> Official Records of the Security Council, 18th year, Supplement for October, November and December 1963, document S/5448 and Add.1-3.

<sup>11/</sup> Ibid., Supplement for July, August and September 1963, document S/5380.

<sup>12/</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventeenth Session, Annexes, addendum to agenda item 54, document A/5160 and Add.1 and 2, para. 407.

which the resolutions and the other positive recommendations of the General Assembly concerning colonialism are implemented. To delay or prevent their implementation would postpone indefinitely the elimination of the baleful consequences of colonial domination.

150. The report of the Special Committee and the demographic archives of the United Nations abound in facts concerning the grievous political, economic, social and cultural consequences of colonialism. In South West Africa, according to the statistics for 1960 in the possession of the United Nations, the mortality rate per 1,000 inhabitants of the coloured population is more than twice that for the white population. In Portuguese Guinea there is one doctor for every 23,000 inhabitants, and in Nyasaland one for every 33,000 inhabitants.

151. One could cite such figures endlessly. The figures are eloquent; they speak, they cry out. There is no doubt that if the United Nations distributed as official documents not only the resolutions of the General Assembly and of United Nations committees, the reports of the committees, sub-committees and commissions which have gone to study the situation on the spot, the statements of petitioners, maps and other material, but also regularly circulated as official documents photographic evidence and documentary films, then we would have an even more tragic picture of the fate to which colonialism dooms millions of completely innocent people. The picture would be more dreadful still if (you will forgive me if I imagine this for a moment), let us say, the meetings of the Fourth Committee took place not in New York but in the colonial country which the Committee was discussing; if the General Assembly, when discussing the question of the situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on decolonization, held its meetings not within these walls but somewhere in Africa. Then we should undoubtedly hear the living and powerful voice of protest of millions of people against the completely unjustified delay in granting them freedom and independence.

152. We all know very well that the adoption of a resolution is not everything. That does not put an end to a problem; it is, in fact, only the beginning. The important thing is the effectiveness and speed with which the provisions of the resolution are carried out. On this depends not only the authority of the resolution in question, but also the prestige of the United Nations itself in the eyes of the world. We can no longer countenance a situation in which year after year the only provision of the resolutions on colonialism that is faultlessly carried out is the one stating that the question of Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa, the Portuguese colonies, and so on, should not be removed from the agenda of the General Assembly.

153. It is time we all laid our cards on the table. The policy of delay and procrastination is the policy of the colonialists, and not of the United Nations. We can no longer allow a minority of colonial countries to continue disregarding the will of the majority of the countries of the United Nations in their own economic and strategic interests. It is high time that those who pursue a policy of discrimination with regard to the resolutions of the General Assembly and who prejudice the ability of the United Nations to discharge its tasks should get their deserts.

154. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR is firmly convinced of the historical inevitability of the downfall

of colonialism. At the same time it recognizes that tremendous efforts by the peoples and by the United Nations are necessary in order to make that downfall a fact. That is why my delegation resolutely supports the most radical measures to ensure the speediest possible implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. We stand for the immediate implementation of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council on colonial matters, because it is only by pursuing this path that we can ensure the unconditional fulfilment of the hopes of the colonial and dependent countries and peoples for freedom and independence.

155. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I now give the floor to the representative of the United Kingdom, who has asked to exercise his right of reply.

156. Mr. KING (United Kingdom): The last speaker but one, if I understood him correctly, claimed that Aden is part of Yemen. I am authorized to state that Her Majesty's Government has no doubt as to its sovereignty over the territory of Aden, and I wish formally to reserve the rights of Her Majesty's Government on this question.

157. With regard to the numerous allegations made about my Government's policy in Aden, the majority of these are answered in chapter V, paragraphs 162 to 179, 266 to 285 and 364 to 392 of the report of the Special Committee [A/5446/Rev.1]. However, my delegation would like to reserve its right to reply at greater length if it thinks it appropriate.

158. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I give the floor to the representative of Yemen, who has asked to exercise his right of reply.

159. Mr. TARCICI (Yemen): My delegation has had the privilege of speaking for perhaps an hour and a half in order to prove that historically, economically, ethnically and geographically Aden forms an integral part of Yemen, and it has substantiated its arguments with documentary evidence.

160. After that long and well-substantiated statement, the representative of the United Kingdom announces to us once again that his Government and his delegation have no doubt regarding the authority of his country over Aden. If the representative of the United Kingdom, in taking that position, is referring to the treaties which Her Majesty's Government has signed with local chiefs, we ask permission to explain what those treaties are, on what basis they are founded and what their form and duration are. I do not wish to detain the General Assembly at this late hour in order to give particulars about these treaties and about the legal or illegal attitude of the United Kingdom Government in the southern part of our country under its occupation. But, with the President's permission, I reserve the right to explain the whole situation at tomorrow's meeting or at the following meeting.

161. Nevertheless, I draw the attention of the United Kingdom delegation to the fact that those treaties cannot have any value whatsoever, since they were drawn up to remain in force forever. In fact, the United Kingdom signed treaties with local chiefs in perpetuity—in other words, until the end of the world. Among those local chiefs, I remember one of our good citizens, the Sheikh of Al Aqrabi; he is the chief of a locality of 1,500 persons, whose fortune consists, in times of prosperity, of 300 goats and a few camels.

The United Kingdom Government calls this locality the State of Al Aqrabi.

162. If the United Kingdom Government has no doubt about its authority over that occupied part of Yemen and if its authority derives from that type of treaty, you have some idea of the nature of British authority and British rights over the part of our Yemen which it occupies.

163. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Before adjourning the meeting, I have to announce

that the Chairman of the Fourth Committee has asked me to inform the Members of the Assembly that the Fourth Committee will be holding two meetings tomorrow: one in the morning and one in the afternoon.

164. I would appeal to representatives to keep their statements as short as possible so that we can hear all the speakers without exceeding the number of meetings which it is reasonable to set aside for the consideration of this item.

*The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.*