

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**1192nd
PLENARY MEETING**

Friday, 14 December 1962,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 11:</i> Report of the Security Council	1103
<i>Agenda item 26:</i> Question of convening a conference for the purpose of signing a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons: report of the Secretary-General Report of the First Committee.	1103
<i>Agenda item 27:</i> International co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space: reports of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, the World Meteorological Organization and the International Telecommunication Union Reports of the First Committee and the Fifth Committee.	1103
<i>Agenda item 25:</i> The situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples: report of the Special Committee established under General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVI) (continued)	1104

President: Mr. Muhammad ZAFRULLA KHAN
(Pakistan).

AGENDA ITEM 11

Report of the Security Council

1. The PRESIDENT: If no one wishes to speak on this item, I shall consider that the General Assembly adopts the draft resolution submitted by the United Arab Republic and Venezuela [A/L.411] and, therefore, takes note of the report of the Security Council.

The draft resolution was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 26

Question of convening a conference for the purpose of signing a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons; report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/5323)

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the First Committee.

2. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary) (Rapporteur of the First Committee): I have the honour to present to the General Assembly the report of the First Committee

[A/5823] dealing with the Secretary-General's report entitled: Question of Convening a Conference for the Purpose of Signing a Convention on the Prohibition on the Use of Nuclear and Thermonuclear Weapons.

3. The Committee considered this item, proposed by Ethiopia, at its 1285th to 1288th meetings. In the discussion, the speakers emphasized the importance of prohibiting nuclear weapons, because, in their opinion, such prohibition would contribute to the reduction of international tension and would also help to solve the problem of general and complete disarmament.

4. I have the honour to recommend for adoption by the General Assembly the draft resolution set out in the report.

5. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in its report [A/5823].

The draft resolution was adopted by 33 votes to none, with 25 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 27

International co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space: reports of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, the World Meteorological Organization and the International Telecommunication Union

**REPORTS OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/5341)
AND OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/5350)**

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the First Committee.

6. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary) (Rapporteur of the First Committee): I have the honour to present to the General Assembly the report of the First Committee [A/5341] on international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space; reports of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, the World Meteorological Organization and the International Telecommunication Union.

7. The discussion covered many problems of the wide field of outer space exploration and of human activities related to it. Different views have been explained. Many suggestions have been tabled. Nevertheless, as hitherto, unanimity characterized the activity of the Outer Space Committee this time, again, the discussion in the Political Committee resulted in the unanimously adopted twenty-four-Power draft resolution on international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space, dealing with the legal as well as with the scientific and technical aspects of outer space activity.

8. I feel it necessary to mention another sign of unanimity, namely, the excellent documents submitted jointly by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America.

9. I have the honour to recommend herewith for adoption by the General Assembly a draft resolution in the report of the First Committee before you.

10. The PRESIDENT: I would remind the Members of the General Assembly that a report on the financial implications of the draft resolution contained in the report of the First Committee is before them [A/5350].

11. The PRESIDENT: The First Committee has unanimously adopted the draft resolution which appears in paragraph 8 of its report [A/5341]. May I take it that the General Assembly also adopts this resolution unanimously?

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 25

The situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples: report of the Special Committee established under General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVI) (continued)*

12. The PRESIDENT: It will be recalled that the general debate on this item has been completed, subject to one right of reply. It remains for the Assembly to consider a draft resolution submitted by twenty-two delegations [A/L.410]. A report on the financial implications on this draft resolution has been circulated [A/5351].

13. Before calling on the first speaker, I should like to draw the attention of the Assembly to document A/L.413, which was circulated this morning. As the report of the Special Committee [A/5238] is a bulky document, it was felt that it would be convenient for representatives if the various draft resolutions submitted to the General Assembly for its consideration by the Special Committee were grouped together in one document. The draft resolutions have been reproduced without any change from the report of the Special Committee. Thus document A/L.413 is not a new document; it is hoped that it will be easier to refer to it when we come to consider the various draft resolutions recommended by the Special Committee.

14. I now call upon the representative of Saudi Arabia, who has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

15. Mr. SHUKAIRY (Saudi Arabia): I have asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply to the statement made by Sir Patrick Dean, the representative of the United Kingdom, on 26 November 1962 [1175th meeting]. But before doing so, let me place on record our gratification that the United Kingdom delegation has provided me with another occasion to speak on the question of colonialism. To speak again on this item means that we speak again in support of the cause of freedom. It also means that we speak again on the perils of colonialism. Lastly, and what is more important, we speak again on the evils of British imperialism.

16. In addressing the Assembly on his Government's role in the question of colonialism, the representative of the United Kingdom reiterated an already rusty argument, namely that the United Kingdom has willingly granted independence to so many millions of peoples in so many countries. This argument has become a naked falsehood which hardly needs refutation. That

millions of peoples dominated by the British have become independent is a fact of history that cannot be denied. But that the United Kingdom granted them their independence is a British fairy tale, without a head and without a tail.

17. The British have never granted independence. This is a fact of history which hardly calls for any testimony. The peoples earned their independence in the battle-fields after years and years of struggle and after thousands upon thousands of patriots have fallen in the field of action. I do not wish to break open the already sealed annals of the liberation movements in Asia and Africa. Early in the beginning of this century, the history of Egypt was one of bloodshed in its struggle to throw off the yoke of British domination. In Iraq, in the early twenties, there was a virtual war with the British to force them out of the country. In India, the remains of Gandhi will tell of the brutalities of the British in suppressing the movement for independence. One need only read Mr. Nehru's book The Discovery of India to realize the great sacrifices of the people of India to achieve their independence. In Cyprus—and this is a case cited by the representative of the United Kingdom—President Makarios can tell the Assembly of his exile and of the sufferings of his people in their liberation movement. In Palestine, which reflects the blackest chapter in British history, the United Kingdom was granted a mandate by the League of Nations to prepare the country for independence, and the disastrous result is quite well known to the United Nations. The Holy Land was partitioned and its people uprooted, dispossessed and expelled from their ancestral homeland. And the representative of the United Kingdom comes here to boast of the peaceful progress towards liberty, progress and independence.

18. Thus the record of the United Kingdom on the question of colonialism is one that merits condemnation rather than pride and gratification. In no case has the United Kingdom granted liberty. Liberty was forced upon the British by fire and sword.

19. There are a few cases, very few, I admit, where the people concerned became independent without firing a single shot. But here, it must be remembered, the British either exhausted their interests or the colonized country became a burden on the British Exchequer. Colonialism to Great Britain is not glory or grandeur; it is cold interests based on cold figures. When a given country satisfies the British interest, the British fight to the last man. But when the cow has been milked to the last drop or when it is fed at a high cost, the cow is left free. This is how independence with the British had to be fought at times and was simply let go at other times.

20. Even after granting independence, the United Kingdom endeavours to maintain its colonial interests. Trinidad and Tobago's recent independence is a case in point. Only a few days ago, Dr. Eric Williams, Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago, announced his rejection of a British loan amounting to \$14 million. In explaining his rejection, Dr. Williams stated: "I asked for a loan to put the people of Trinidad and Tobago to jobs, not to provide jobs for British workers." In his statement to the Assembly, the representative of the United Kingdom wondered about the sources of my information. I advise him not to make a hasty and reckless denial. For his benefit, I refer him to The New York Times of 26 November 1962, where he can

* Resumed from the 1181st meeting.

read the statement of the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago.

21. None the less, to expose the role of the United Kingdom with regard to colonialism, we need not dig into the archives of the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The report of the Special Committee is sufficient in itself to vitiate the claims of the United Kingdom. In fact, were it not for the colonial policy of the United Kingdom, the United Nations would not have passed the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, nor would it have established a Committee to implement that Declaration. To add insult to injury, the United Kingdom has lamented that the expenses of this Committee have amounted to \$100,000, but the United Kingdom seems to forget that it is because of British intransigence that the United Nations has had to bear that much labour and expense. Instead of expressing deep concern over the \$100,000 of United Nations funds spent, the United Kingdom would do better to express concern over the wealth and treasure of the people of Asia and Africa that have found their way to the British Treasury for countless generations.

22. I now turn to specific matters, which disclose the distinct distortions of fact of the representative of the United Kingdom. Let me take first the question of Nyasaland. The representative of the United Kingdom has stated: "... the representative of Saudi Arabia alleged that the white settlers in Nyasaland owned the greater part of the fertile land in that country" [1175th meeting, para. 112]. I can only say that this is a mutilation of the statement I made to the Assembly.

23. I beg leave to quote the whole portion of my statement pertaining to this matter:

"In Nyasaland the white settlers own 1 million acres of the most fertile lands, while the Blacks, and I hate to use this term, are no more than hired labourers. Let us remember that in Nyasaland there are 600 times more Blacks than Whites. In Nyasaland the Blacks number 600 times the Whites and still most of the fertile lands are owned by the Whites." [1168th meeting, para. 130.]

It can readily be seen what a distortion the representative of the United Kingdom committed in quoting my statement.

24. The representative of the United Kingdom has questioned the sources of my information. In this regard, I have two sources to quote. I will read first from Gunther's Inside Africa,

"There are very few white settlers in Nyasaland, but they own about a million acres of the best land. Africans, as in Kenya, complain that their own areas are so overcrowded that economic well-being is impossible, whereas huge white-owned tracts are kept empty and undeveloped. About 200,000 Africans work on the European tea and tung plantations."^{1/}

Mr. Gunther, let me say, is a well-known American author, traveller and journalist. He is not a communist, and the information which he got on the spot in Nyasaland is sufficient to show that the denials of the United Kingdom representative are nothing but posterous, reckless and irresponsible.

25. My second source is the Encyclopaedia Britannica. I read from the volume on Nyasaland as follows:

"Most of the tea is grown on European estates ... Although the African is primarily an agriculturalist working on his own farm, many have taken to wage earning on European estates or in the Union of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia..."

"In 1951 the number of Africans working outside the protectorate was 148,000."^{2/}

These are the words of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, not the Encyclopaedia Sovietskaya. I hope that the United Kingdom representative will not be so reckless as to denounce his own Encyclopaedia.

26. The United Kingdom representative also spoke of "the shamelessly inaccurate accounts which have been given to this Assembly by representatives of the communist delegations and their associate, the spokesman of the Saudi Arabian delegation" [1175th meeting, para. 111]. I reject this insinuation of the United Kingdom representative as insolent, baseless and unfounded. Assuming the charge to be true, to give the Assembly incorrect accounts is not shameless. What is really shameless is to dominate millions of peoples for so many centuries, to rob their wealth, to exploit their sweat and labour, to buy their raw materials at the cheapest price and to sell them finished goods at the highest. This is the shameless practice, behaviour and demeanour. This is what is really shameless, and this is what the British have been perpetrating throughout the world for so many centuries.

27. My accounts are neither shameless nor inaccurate. I have read to you the Encyclopaedia Britannica, the harvest of the brightest brains of the United Kingdom. As for substance, I have defended the cause of liberty of the peoples in Asia and Africa. This task is a source of pride and gratification for me and for all the United Nations representatives who support the cause of freedom. If anyone in this hall should feel ashamed when the question of colonialism is considered, it must be the delegation of the United Kingdom. Rather than speak of my shamelessly inaccurate account, the British would do better to walk out of the Assembly as a sign of regret and repentance over their callous cruelty to the people of Asia and Africa.

28. That I am an associate of the communist delegations is another falsehood on the part of the United Kingdom delegation. It is on record that I was the first speaker on this item. I opened the debate on this matter, hence I am an associate to no one. It would be more true for the representative of the United Kingdom to say that other delegations have been my associates, and not vice versa.

29. On the other hand, it is a matter of pride for me to associate myself with any delegation that advocates the cause of liberty. This is our record in the United Nations. We have supported liberty whenever a battle for liberty has been fought. I have associated myself with the Asian delegations on all issues of freedom. I have associated myself with the African delegations on all matters of racial discrimination. I have never associated myself with the British delegation because it was for ever and ever on the side of colonialism, and never, never, on the side of freedom. Should the United Kingdom delegation, against its historic tradition, uphold a cause of liberty, at least for once, I would not hesitate to associate myself with the British

^{1/} John Gunther, Inside Africa, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1953, p. 645.

^{2/} Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1. 16, p. 657.

delegation. Let them try for once, and they will find me there.

30. But the United Kingdom representative seems to have forgotten that Great Britain was a devoted ally of the communist States during the Second World War. It was more than an association; it was a comradeship of arms. Now that their islands are safe and their necks are secure, the British denounce any association with the communist delegations on the issue of colonialism. For the British, such an association is a virtue, and for others it is a vice. This is British logic and British consistency.

31. The truth of the matter is that I am really an associate, but in each and every struggle for national sovereignty and independence. Like all freedom-loving delegations, we are associates of freedom and associates of all peoples fighting for their freedom. We are associates of all the leaders of Africa and Asia in their struggle for liberation.

32. When the United Kingdom representative was belittling my statement from this rostrum, a great leader from Africa sent me this telegram:

"My party and I compliment you on your recent demand for removal of British military bases in Kenya and Aden. Kenya African National Union (KANU) unreservedly opposes all forms of foreign military bases on our soil. On this question, there is no room for negotiation with the British; regardless of size or content of their base in Kenya, it must go.

Jomo Kenyatta."

I am an associate of such leaders fighting for a noble cause. I take pride in their association, as much as I take pride in British dissociation.

33. The United Kingdom representative, in speaking on the three Commission Territories, said as follows:

"[They] are ... politically quite independent of the Republic of South Africa, and, despite the reckless allegations of the representative of Saudi Arabia, this remains British policy." [1175th meeting, para. 109.]

Let us see who makes these reckless allegations. Is it the United Kingdom delegation or the Saudi Arabian delegation? This refutation is a wilful misrepresentation of my statement. In my statement to the Assembly, I said that in spite of their denials, the United Kingdom is harbouring a policy intended to annex these territories to the Union of South Africa. These intentions are betrayed by the very same testimony adduced by the United Kingdom. On 13 April 1954, Sir Winston Churchill referred to this question as follows: "There can be no question of Her Majesty's Government agreeing at the present time to the transfer." Well, "at the present time" is the crux of the whole question. The expression used by Sir Winston Churchill is pregnant with the danger of annexation to come at a later time, at any time.

34. We have had another piece of evidence quite recently. In the report of the Special Committee, under the heading "Observations by members", the position of the representative of the United Kingdom is given as follows:

"The facts of geography and of economic life made it inevitable that the Territories were closely linked with South Africa in many ways. For example, there had been a customs union between the Territories and South Africa for over fifty years. In addition, a

large number of inhabitants of the Territories found employment in South Africa ..." [A/5238, chapter V, para. 130.]

35. Again, in his statement to the Assembly, the representative of the United Kingdom spoke of Basutoland as "an enclave situated in the heart of South Africa" [1175th meeting, para. 103]. These words are intended to prepare the minds of Members of the United Nations to accept annexation. I hope the representative of the United Kingdom will not condemn the report of the United Nations as a forgery or his statement before the Assembly as a shameless and inaccurate account.

36. But if the denials of the United Kingdom on annexation are genuine, why is it that the United Kingdom voted against the Committee's resolution which declared the territorial integrity of these territories [A/5238, chapter V, para. 214]? Had the United Kingdom been sincere in its professions, the least it could have done would be to vote for all the paragraphs of the Committee's resolution which denounced annexation and supported freedom and independence. The United Kingdom did the reverse: it voted against the resolution, and it comes to the rostrum here to establish an alibi for its guilt.

37. British distortion, however, was not confined to the question of annexation. It embraced the so-called constitutional reforms in the area. In the report of the Committee, the position of the United Kingdom representative is stated as follows:

"... one of the most important [problems is] the question of the place of the chiefs in the newly-emerging patterns of African society." [Ibid., para. 134.]

38. Anyone reading these words might exclaim how progressive the British administration is. But let us look at the true situation. I can do no better than yield to the Encyclopaedia Britannica again. I read from the volume on Bechuanaland. This is what the Encyclopaedia Britannica says of the British administration and its intentions as far as progress is concerned, and of the place which the chief of the tribe should have in African society:

"In 1948, Seretse, son of Khama's son Sekgoma II and heir to the Bamangwato chieftainship, married an English woman, Ruth Williams. For reasons set forth in a White Paper"—a White Paper was prepared by the British Government to handle the situation of this gentleman, the leader of his tribe, because he had married an English woman—"the British Government refused to recognize him as chief and excluded him from Bechuanaland."

He was excluded from his homeland, in pursuance of a White Paper of the British Government. The quotation from the Encyclopaedia Britannica continues:

"This provoked resentment in the tribe, which culminated in disturbances and bloodshed. Most Bamangwato asserted their continued adherence to Seretse and refused to accept or to nominate anyone else as chief. In 1956"—and this is the sad outcome—"after he had renounced all claim to the chieftainship for himself and his children, Seretse Khama was allowed to return to Bechuanaland."^{3/}

He was allowed to go back to his homeland only after he had renounced all his rights—and this happened

^{3/} Ibid., vol. 3, p. 287.

simply because he had married an English woman. I make no comments and I draw no conclusions. This is a well-deserved condemnation of the British by the British Encyclopaedia itself^{1f}

39. Lastly, there is the question of the military bases in Aden. In his statement to the Assembly, the representative of the United Kingdom said:

"It is perfectly true that the British Government has important defence obligations in that general area." [1175th meeting, para. 119.]

40. This pretext of the United Kingdom, by which it proposes to defend itself, is more criminal than the crime itself. British defence obligations are paramount, it is said. They are certainly sacred—but only for Great Britain and within the British Isles. But defence obligations discharged on our lands are, by definition, aggression. We do not wish our lands to be military bases or a field of military operations. Neither do we wish to subject our homelands to a war to which we are not a party. These British defence obligations have no place in the Arab countries. Arab lands are for Arab defence, and the British Isles are for British defence. After all, we might ask: who has vested in the United Kingdom these defence obligations on Arab territory, in the Arab homeland? Such obligations are self-elected by the British and for the British. Let the British defend themselves in the British Isles, if they choose—not in our lands and not at the cost of the lives of our peoples.

41. In conclusion, let me express the hope that the United Kingdom will know in the future how to treat the statements of other delegations. Here in the United Nations we may disagree on interpretations, we may disagree on conclusions, but as to the facts, it is disgraceful and most degrading for any delegation to misstate the facts and to misrepresent the facts. The United Kingdom delegation, I am afraid, has not stood this test. In Asia and Africa the British practice colonialism, and here in the United Nations, on the question of colonialism, they practice distortion. If they cannot make a contribution by emancipating their colonial peoples, let them make no contributions of distortion in this Organization.

42. I trust that the United Kingdom representative will not again come to this rostrum with a distortion, with a falsehood. The Encyclopaedia Britannica is available, and indeed the whole library of the United Nations is accessible.

43. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia): We have before us, among others, the Twenty-Two-Power draft resolution [A/L.410]. Indonesia has the honour to be one of the co-sponsors of this draft, and has actively participated in the drafting. It therefore gives me great pleasure to be able to elaborate in some detail on the main features of the proposed resolution.

44. I shall begin by briefly summarizing its three salient points: first, there is the solemn reaffirmation of the well-known principles and objectives enshrined in the two previous resolutions on decolonization, namely resolution 1514 (XV) and resolution 1654 (XVI); secondly, the decision to enlarge the Special Committee by the addition of seven members; and thirdly, the request to the Special Committee to make recommendations concerning the fixing of a time-limit for the complete application of the Declaration on independence.

45. The second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution points out that the Declaration on decolonization and the establishment of the Committee of Seventeen raised great hopes, not only amongst colonial peoples, but also indeed "everywhere". The word "everywhere" was deliberately included in acknowledgement of the fact—for the co-sponsors do believe it to be a fact—that the hopes of the colonial peoples are to a growing extent shared by the ordinary populace of former, as well as present, colonial Powers. In our opinion, it was largely because of this sympathetic and realistic disposition on the part of their peoples that most of the Western countries voted in favour of the two earlier resolutions on decolonization, thus enabling both of them to be adopted by an overwhelming majority vote in the General Assembly.

46. However, the draft resolution has unfortunately had to go on to register regret that, in many of the colonies, the provisions of the Declaration have not so far been fully carried out and that in certain cases preliminary measures have not even been taken. Certain colonial Powers have refused to co-operate, or have shown a negative attitude towards co-operating, with the Special Committee and have thereby considerably delayed the implementation of the Declaration. The draft resolution expresses deep concern over this attitude. And it also expresses the conviction that such an attitude constitutes a source of international conflict and disharmony which, in turn, seriously impedes international co-operation and creates increasingly dangerous situations likely to threaten peace and security in the world. Hence, operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution deplores the refusal of certain administering Powers to co-operate with the Special Committee. Operative paragraphs 5 and 6 call upon the Administering Powers concerned to cease all armed action and repressive measures directed against dependent peoples, and to implement paragraph 5 of the Declaration in order that all colonial territories and peoples may accede to independence without delay. Members may recall that operative paragraph 5 of the Declaration [resolution 1514 (XV)] states that:

"Immediate steps shall be taken, in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories or all other territories which have not yet attained independence, to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories, without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire, without any distinction as to race, creed or colour, in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom."

I should like to remind this Assembly that that resolution was adopted by an overwhelming majority.

47. I come now to the second of the three salient points in the draft resolution, namely, the decision to enlarge the Special Committee established by resolution 1654 (XVI), as contained in operative paragraph 7. This decision springs from a recognition of the urgent need for the Special Committee to accelerate its activities, so that it can report on all the remaining territories to the eighteenth session of the General Assembly. An enlarged membership would enable the Committee to divide itself into five or six groups. Each group, possibly aided by a member of the Secretariat, could then report to the Special Committee in pleno on an agreed number of the dependent territories that still have to be examined or visited. The draft resolution does not propose a re-

constitution of the Committee, because we wish to keep the valuable knowledge already accumulated by the existing members.

48. In choosing seven as the proposed number of new members, account was taken of the need to ensure an adequate representation of those countries deeply interested in decolonization, combined with the need to maintain a proper geographical distribution of seats.

49. The draft resolution contains no specific recommendations as to the actual allotment of the new seats. However, my delegation believes—and here I wish to emphasize that I am now speaking only for the Indonesian delegation—that at least four of the seven seats should be allocated to Asian and African nations. Also, since most of the territories on which the Committee still has to report are located in the area of Asia and the Pacific, Indonesia considers that it would now be fair if Asian countries received two of the new seats. My delegation's own idea of the best distribution of the seven seats proposed is: two for Asia, two for Africa, one for Eastern Europe, one for Western Europe, and one for Latin America. But again I wish to emphasize that this is purely my delegation's own idea.

50. The rest of my introduction to our draft resolution will be largely taken up with the need to fix a time-limit for the complete termination of colonialism—the third salient point in the proposed resolution and one of crucial importance in the implementation of decolonization. Reference to it in the draft will be found in the final preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 8 (b).

51. We may recall that operative paragraph 5 of the Declaration on decolonization calls for immediate steps to be taken by the colonial Powers concerned to transfer all power to the peoples of the dependent territories. It really should not surprise anyone to learn that when we inserted the word "immediate" in front of the word "steps" we actually did mean to incorporate an express injunction as regards the timing of these steps. One would have thought that "immediate steps" is a simple enough phrase, not the least bit obscure in its meaning nor open to too many interpretations. But apparently such is not the case, for in the two years that have elapsed since the adoption of the Declaration it has become all too obvious that "immediate steps" has not necessarily been interpreted by the colonial Powers as one might have expected from looking both words up in the dictionary, namely, as direct action to be taken instantly, at once, now. Some of the colonial Powers, for example, clearly regard "immediate" as a relative term—relative, that is, to a vast period of time—since those Powers have not even begun to take the most modest steps towards implementing decolonization. Other Powers appear to think that "immediate" applies only to certain minimal preliminary measures—in other words, to the first one or two measures of a whole series of lengthy steps, which they envisage as necessary for the proper transference of power. Indeed, the newly-free nations are almost alone in interpreting the phrase "immediate steps" in its literal sense; that is, as direct action—as specified in the terms of paragraph 5—to be taken instantly, at once, now.

52. Accordingly, the co-sponsors of the present draft resolution considered they ought to try to narrow down the meaning of this provision, which has thus been given such a liberal interpretation by the majority of

colonial Powers. The need for urgency and speed must be brought home to the Colonial Powers. And at the same time, the champions of speedy and complete termination of colonialism must receive some assurance that the element of immediacy expressed in the Declaration on decolonization is more than an empty gesture in their direction. We therefore deemed it imperative to request that the General Assembly authorize the Special Committee to make recommendations concerning the fixing of a time-limit for the complete application of the 1960 Declaration.

53. It should be noticed that operative paragraph 8 (b) of the draft resolution speaks of "recommendations" for the fixing of a time-limit, not of "a recommendation". This was quite deliberate; the use of the plural leaves the Special Committee a much more open field by affording it the possibility of producing alternative types of recommendations, as might seem most appropriate. Thus the Special Committee will have the alternative of recommending: (1) a blanket time-limit within which all dependent territories are to have attained their independence; or (2) a specific time-limit for each territory examined; or (3) a combination of (1) and (2), that is a combination of a blanket time-limit and individual time-limits for each dependent territory.

54. It is clear that, contrary to what many people have thought, our draft resolution does not empower the Committee itself actually to fix the time-limit. This will be the task of the General Assembly, which may either accept or reject the target-date, or target-dates, recommended by the Special Committee.

55. I should like to draw the Assembly's attention to the fact that, under its terms of reference as stipulated in operative paragraph 4 of resolution 1654 (XVI), the Special Committee is requested to make recommendations concerning the progress and extent of the implementation of the Declaration. Hence, even without the relevant provision in the present draft resolution, the Committee is entitled, if it so desires, to make recommendations on a time-limit. But, in order to prevent lengthy debates in the Special Committee as to the desirability of this course, and in order also to emphasize the element of immediacy enjoined in the Declaration but overlooked in practice, the co-sponsors of the draft resolution consider it essential that the Committee now be explicitly requested to make recommendations concerning a time-limit or time-limits.

56. The way in which the Committee works is well known to us all. Its recommendations are based on a thorough study of the territories, on its knowledge of the needs and desires of their peoples and on its appraisal of the views of the colonial Powers concerned. If, as may conceivably occur, the people of a particular territory specifically ask the Committee not to fix a time-limit for them, or to delay fixing the time-limit and persuade the Committee of the wisdom of this request, the Special Committee will naturally report it to the General Assembly. The co-sponsors of the draft resolution are convinced that the Special Committee has sufficient knowledge and experience to enable it to recommend definite time-limits for each of the territories that have not yet attained independence. And on this basis we therefore also believe that it should not be too difficult for the Committee to arrive at a recommendation for a blanket time-limit covering all the territories involved. The Indonesian delegation would go even further than this. We—and here it should

be understood that in this context I am speaking only for my own delegation—we contend that the blanket time-limit should not, in fact, exceed two or three years. We are not at all impressed with the supposedly strong argument that it would be irresponsible to transfer sovereignty to territories which, because of the smallness of their population or land, cannot possibly be considered economically or politically viable, and in the statement I made at the plenary meeting last month I explained why my delegation is not impressed with this argument. With your permission, I will now repeat the substance of what I said on the subject at that time.

57. I said then that a major problem now confronting us is how to honour without further delay the right of self-determination as expressly recognized, in the face of difficulties to be overcome regarding inadequacy of preparedness in many of the territories. My delegation is convinced that the problem can be solved, but only if we are not afraid of new and bold ideas. One thing is certain: the United Nations must expect to play a significant, not to say decisive, role in implementing the final stages of decolonization. Indeed, as I hinted earlier, our Organization should be prepared to take on an entirely new task.

58. An instance of the kind of task my delegation has in mind is afforded by the case of West Irian. The role of the United Nations as temporary administrator over this territory during the period of transition from Dutch to Indonesian administration could well become a historic example of the way in which our Organization could assist small dependent territories from a state of dependence to one of independence. It is in this connexion that I hope the Special Committee will include in its report on each of the dependent territories to which sovereignty must be transferred, specific recommendations as to the form of independence which would seem most appropriate for the territory concerned.

59. Once colonial peoples, however small, have gained or have been given their sovereignty, it is up to them to decide what they want to do with their newly-won sovereignty: whether they want to join with older sovereign States, whether they want to form a unit with other newly sovereign States in order to attain greater political and economic viability, or whether they wish to see if they can succeed on their own. In this context it may not be irrelevant to remind Members that the Eastern and Western portions of Pakistan are more than a thousand miles apart, and that Alaska and Hawaii are both several thousand miles away from the main body of the United States. So distance cannot be considered as any kind of barrier to forming political units.

60. However, it may be that, for a while at least, some of the newly independent territories will prefer to remain entirely sovereign, despite the difficulties entailed. Personally, I am of the opinion that many of these small nations will in fact quickly come to a realization of the necessity for joining larger political units—more quickly than some of us think likely now. Moreover, I feel that most of the dependent territories would be willing to take heed of any recommendations that the Special Committee may have to make in this respect.

61. Let me now briefly indicate some of the practical aspects of the new role, with regard to decolonization, which my delegation envisages for the United Nations. In essence, we are proposing that the Special Com-

mittee be requested and authorized to make recommendations on two additional matters: on the form of independence that would seem most appropriate for a given territory, along the lines just described; and on the advisability of the United Nations itself playing an active part in the administration of a given territory for a certain period of time.

62. To carry out this new task, we think that the Special Committee will probably require a preparatory report, compiled by experts of the Secretariat, which would analyse the various possibilities of application in the territories concerned. This preparatory report should also particularly concern itself with the question whether, for a certain period of time, a territory should consider actually sharing its sovereignty with the United Nations, and not with the colonial Powers; or whether the United Nations should merely assist in the administration of a territory until it has reached a final stage of secure political and economic viability, either on its own or by joining with a larger political unit.

63. On the basis of the findings of the preparatory report and its own deliberations, the Special Committee should thus be in a position to make sound recommendations for the consideration of the Assembly, which will then be able to decide upon the most desirable course of action for each territory. Should it be decided—with the agreement of the territory and its people concerned—that United Nations assistance in the job of administration is required, it may well be that the most suitable body to undertake this work will be the Special Committee itself. To that end, I would suggest that a considerable adjustment of the Department of Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories is required. I feel that this explains why my delegation believes that the time-limit to be recommended by the Special Committee should not exceed two or three years.

64. The task of the enlarged Special Committee, as outlined in operative paragraph 8 (a), (b), (c) and (d) of the draft resolution is self-explanatory. The Committee is invited to seek the most suitable ways and means and to propose specific measures for the speedy and total application of the Declaration, and to report on it not later than the eighteenth session of the General Assembly. Furthermore—and this is very important—the Committee is called upon to apprise the Security Council of any developments in the dependent territories which may threaten international peace and security.

65. I have now all but completed my introduction to the draft resolution, for I assume that it is hardly necessary to explain why the co-sponsors included in operative paragraph 1 appreciation of the work accomplished by the Special Committee. Nor, by the same token, should any explanation be required for paragraph 2, which notes with approval the methods and procedures that the Special Committee has adopted for the discharge of its functions as outlined in Chapter I of its report [A/5238], paragraph 112, parts (a), (b), (c), (d) and (f). Likewise, the need for the last two operative paragraphs of the draft resolution, requesting all Member States, and especially the Administering Powers, to afford the Special Committee their fullest co-operation, and requesting the Secretary-General to continue to provide the Committee with all the facilities and personnel necessary for the implementation of this draft resolution, would also seem to be self-evident.

66. The drafting of this draft resolution took more than three weeks. It represents a difficult but happy compromise between two widely different views. It is the fervent hope of the co-sponsors that the General Assembly will give it the support which it so generously afforded to the two previous resolutions [1514 (XV) and 1654 (XVI)] on decolonization.

67. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United Kingdom to exercise his right of reply.

68. Sir PATRICK DEAN (United Kingdom): The General Assembly is by now well accustomed to the oratorical methods adopted by the representative of Saudi Arabia to advance his allegations. I do not propose to waste the time of this Assembly in continuing the arguments with him. The mass of the Assembly will, I am sure, treat his remarks with the contempt which they deserve.

69. I wish, however, to reply to one specific allegation that the representative of Saudi Arabia saw fit to make, namely, that my Government intends to permit the incorporation of the territories of Bechuanaland, Basutoland and Swaziland into the territory of South Africa. When I spoke earlier in this debate I specifically denied any such intention on behalf of my Government. Let me repeat this position categorically on behalf of my Government.

70. It is, of course, true that the South Africa Act of 1909 provided machinery whereby the territories could be incorporated in the Union of South Africa. The United Kingdom Government has always maintained that this did not constitute, and does not constitute, any obligation to transfer the territories to South Africa. The fact that the British Government has not repealed this Act does not, however, mean that we envisage transfer of the territories to South Africa, even as a remote possibility. The reason why we have not repealed this Act is that we believe it to be dead already and that any provisions which were not already dead ceased to have operative effect on South Africa's departure from the Commonwealth.

71. To make this assurance doubly sure I should like to quote from a statement made by the Minister concerned, Mr. Peter Thomas, in the House of Commons on 26 February 1962. He had been asked a question about the 1909 Act and his reply was:

"In our view, this Act lapsed when South Africa left the Commonwealth."

Shortly afterwards on 29 March 1962, in answer to a request for an assurance that the future of the High Commission territories would not follow the direction in which South West Africa appeared to have gone, the Minister replied:

"I can assure my honourable friend that there is no question of that—and there never has been. I should not like his remarks to be held to indicate in any way that there is reason for fear on the part of the High Commission territories. We have made it abundantly clear that our responsibility to them remains, and that they will not be absorbed into South Africa."

I hope that in view of these clear and categorical statements by British Ministers, the Assembly will agree that this question is no longer a matter for discussion.

72. The PRESIDENT: I recognize the representative of Haiti, in explanation of vote before voting.

73. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) (translated from French): My delegation refrained from taking part in the general debate in order to avoid prolonging the deliberations of the General Assembly and thus to facilitate the task of the President, who is trying to ensure that the session will close on the scheduled date. Nevertheless, as my delegation is and always has been deeply interested in questions of decolonization and has ever been in the forefront of the struggle against colonialism, it would like to recall briefly that that struggle began with the first days of the independence of Haiti, which, although it had emerged with its economy literally ruined from a bitter struggle that had lasted more than fifteen years, was rich in the hope that the trail which it had just blazed would soon be followed by all the colonial peoples. Toussaint L'Ouverture, the precursor, when setting foot on the ship *Le Héros* which was taking him into captivity, cried out prophetically: "In striking me down they are felling the tree of freedom in Santo Domingo; but it will grow again, for its roots are many and deep."

Mr. Haseganu (Romania), Vice-President, took the Chair.

74. Haiti has extended the hand of brotherhood to all freedom-loving peoples, whether on the American continent, in Europe, in Asia or in Africa. It has fought for recognition of the equality of rights of peoples great and small. It has shown its active sympathy for them in international gatherings, in the now defunct League of Nations and in the United Nations. Many resolutions which are milestones on the long and difficult road to colonial emancipation bear Haiti's signature. I trust that I may be pardoned for recalling here the initiative taken at the sixth session of the General Assembly by the delegations of Haiti, India, Lebanon, the Philippines and Yemen in submitting a draft resolution^{4/} relating to the attainment of the objective of self-government or independence in the Trust Territories. It dealt, *inter alia*, with determining the time by which those Territories should attain independence. That draft resolution became General Assembly resolution 558 (VI) of 18 January 1952. In introducing the draft resolution the representative of Haiti explained its purpose in the following terms:

"... what we are seeking ... what we are aiming at in this draft resolution is to request the Administering Authorities to let us know what are the measures taken or contemplated ... to lead each of the Trust Territories, in the shortest possible time, to the ultimate goal of the International Trusteeship System, namely self-government or independence.

"We should also like to ask the Administering Authorities to inform us about how the particular circumstances of each Territory and its peoples and the freely-expressed wishes of the latter are being taken into account.

"We should like to ask the Administering Authorities still another question: are the existing provisions of the Trusteeship Agreements sufficient to take into account all the factors mentioned above?

"Finally, we would like to ask them one last question concerning the period of time which it is thought will be required for each Trust Territory to attain the final goal of the International Trusteeship

^{4/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Annexes, agenda item 12, document A/2061, para. 54.

System, namely, self-government or independence
..n5/

75. That statement was made at the sixth session of the General Assembly, ten years ago. It would not be too much to say that resolution 558 (VI) was the first blow struck at the rampart so sedulously guarded by the colonial Powers in their efforts to prevent the United Nations from having a part in any decision relating to dates for the attainment of independence by the colonial territories. We can scarcely be said to have mistaken at the time. One need only consult the records of the Fourth Committee to realize that fact and to see how desperately the colonial Powers struggled to defeat that resolution. The satisfaction with which my delegation remembers the vote in the General Assembly may be summed up in the opinion expressed by the friendly delegation of Guatemala, which, together with many others, supported the resolution. The Guatemalan delegation said that it was one of the most constructive proposals which had been adopted up to that time. My delegation is therefore happy to make known its position with regard to the draft resolution [A/L.410] which is now before us.

76. When the United Nations Charter was drafted, its authors concentrated their attention, as far as colonial affairs were concerned, on the idea that the self-determination and independence of peoples would be fostered primarily by the establishment and functioning of the Trusteeship System. That was why the Trusteeship Council was set up as one of the principal organs of the United Nations. All the former mandated territories, with the exception of South West Africa, were placed under the Trusteeship System, and in this sense the System has more or less served its purpose, for eight of the eleven Trust Territories are now independent, and the three which are left are the smallest and least populated.

77. On the other hand, the hope of using the Trusteeship System as an instrument for the evolution of all the colonial territories did not materialize, as no administering Power agreed voluntarily to place its colonies under that System. The United Nations then tried to foster the evolution and liberation of the colonies by having recourse to the declaration contained in Chapter XI of the Charter and by setting up [resolution 146 (II)] a committee to study the information received by the United Nations pursuant to Article 73 e relating to economic, social and educational conditions. An intelligent approach and a progressively broader interpretation of its terms of reference have made of this Committee a useful instrument for keeping the attention of the United Nations focused on the Non-Self-Governing Territories and exercising a certain pressure on the administering Powers. Nevertheless, the influence of this Committee has been limited owing to the fact that it was not authorized to consider political developments or able to give its attention to the colonial territories where some of the most thorny problems have arisen, such as the Portuguese colonies and Southern Rhodesia.

78. Then came the welcome revolutionary developments of recent years which have out-distanced the slow action of the United Nations. The colonial territories have freed themselves one after another—sometimes by peaceful means, sometimes by violence—and new sovereign countries have come by the dozen to

take their rightful places in the Organization. This tempest naturally brought about a revolution in concepts and procedures in so far as the still dependent territories are concerned. The days of drawing-up detailed questionnaires for the Trust Territories or examining the educational statistics of the Non-Self-Governing Territories were over. The sacrosanct principle of the parity of Administering and non-Administering Members in the Trusteeship Council and the Committee on Information, ceased to have any validity.

79. It was now a question of completing the work of decolonization as quickly as possible in those cases where it still remained to be done. That is the meaning both of the historic resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, embodying the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, which marks a turning-point in the evolution of the philosophy of anti-colonialism, and of resolution 1654 (XVI) of 27 November 1961, which opened the way to new action by the United Nations. We are now at this final stage, and our role is to bring to a successful conclusion as rapidly as possible the new task laid down in the Declaration of 1960 concerning the abolition of colonialism. The goal being clearly defined, we must now perfect our methods of action.

80. Here I should like to digress for a moment. If the Members of the Assembly will turn to rule 101 of the rules of procedure, they will see that among the Main Committees of the General Assembly the Fourth Committee is known as the "Trusteeship Committee, including Non-Self-Governing Territories". This title accurately reflects the spirit of 1945 according to which the Trusteeship System was to be the corner-stone of the Organization's activities relating to colonial matters. As, however, from the very beginning, doubts were expressed concerning the scope and effectiveness of that System, the words "including Non-Self-Governing Territories" were added to the name of the Fourth Committee, even though the addition as it was rendered in French was not very grammatical.

81. This name no longer seems in keeping with reality. Today when the Fourth Committee concerns itself with South West Africa, the Portuguese territories and even the report of the Trusteeship Council, it is concerning itself with decolonization. I should therefore like to propose that the name of the Fourth Committee be changed and that henceforth the Fourth Committee be called the "Decolonization Committee". I believe in the value of symbolism, and I think that this decision would underline and make clear to all the importance which the United Nations attaches to this question. I should think that the slight amendment to rule 101 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure which this would entail would not give rise to any difficulties.

82. The delegation of Haiti would be grateful if all delegations would make known their views on this matter and would indicate the procedure which they think would be the most practical for amending rule 101 if they are in favour of the proposal. I hope that the President will be so good as to give us guidance in this matter. If necessary, my delegation would be willing, with the support of friendly delegations, to submit a formal draft resolution in order that the Fourth Committee, beginning with the General Assembly's next session, might bear the new name "Decolonization Committee".

83. I now return to the draft resolution which is before the General Assembly. The delegation of Haiti

^{5/} Statement made at the 239th meeting of the Fourth Committee, the records of which are in summary form only.

approves the continuance of the Special Committee established by virtue of resolution 1654 (XVI) and the enlargement of its membership, as is now proposed. My delegation approves without reservation the idea that this body should be confirmed as the central organ concerned with decolonization in all its forms and should be directly responsible to the General Assembly.

84. The draft resolution does not say so expressly, but it would seem to be obvious that all the other subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly which are currently dealing with decolonization questions should cease to exist. This has been clearly and brilliantly demonstrated by a number of speakers during the general debate, notably by the representatives of Guinea [1169th meeting] and Iraq [1170th meeting].

85. Only the Trusteeship Council, whose current role has moreover been considerably reduced, could continue to exist, in the absence of an amendment to the Charter, until the day when the very force of circumstances will oblige it to commit hara-kiri. The General Assembly has before it a draft resolution of the Fourth Committee [see A/5310, para. 27, draft resolution III] calling for the termination of the Special Committee for South West Africa and similar draft [see A/5349, para. 30, draft resolution III] concerning the Special Committee on Territories under Portuguese Administration. The delegation of Haiti considers that these are judicious proposals and that they are, indeed, in line with the measures which must be taken if the functioning of the United Nations is to be made more efficient.

86. It seems to us that this action could be carried still further. The Assembly, we think, should also put an end to the Sub-Committee on the Situation in Angola. It is obviously not desirable to perpetuate the present situation in which the problem of Angola is the subject of four different debates: a twofold debate in the plenary meetings, when the Assembly examines the report of the Special Committee of Seventeen ^{9/} [A/5238] and the report of the Sub-Committee on the Situation in Angola [A/5286], and a twofold debate in the Fourth Committee, when it examines the report of the Special Committee on Territories under Portuguese Administration [A/5160] and the report of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories [A/5215].

87. This dispersal of the discussion is not only a waste of time but also a source of confusion and contradiction from which only the colonial Power can benefit. The sole argument advanced for the maintenance of the Sub-Committee on the Situation in Angola is the need for a body which can maintain liaison with the Security Council. This argument carries little weight, for the Committee of Seventeen may call the attention of the Security Council directly to any situation which it is examining, and this is provided for, moreover, in the draft resolution before us.

88. Furthermore, the maintenance of a Sub-Committee on Angola independently of the enlarged Committee of Seventeen would inevitably entail duplication even if the Sub-Committee's terms of reference were restricted. How could it judge whether it was necessary to put an item before the Security Council other than by making a very extensive study of the situation in

Angola, hearing petitioners, visiting the neighbouring territories and even conducting an inquiry in Angola itself—in other words, except by carrying out all the activities which should be reserved to the enlarged Committee of Seventeen? Of course, the latter Committee could appoint a standing sub-committee on Angola if it saw the need to do so.

89. My delegation does not see the logic of prolonging the existence of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories. Some think to justify its continuation by calling it a technical committee, but it no longer fills this role. While in the past it studied social, economic and educational questions, the Committee on Information has undertaken as its main topics of study (see paragraphs 152 to 154 of its report [A/5215]) the development of the legislative and the executive power, the introduction of a system of democratic elections, the freedom of action of political parties, etc.—in other words, the very means of access to independence with which the Committee of Seventeen is concerned.

90. This duplication is all the more futile and, as of now, dangerous in that the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories has available to it only official information received from the administering Powers, that it has never agreed to hear petitioners and that, moreover, its membership would continue on a basis of parity (an equal number of non-Administering and Administering Members), whereas the Trusteeship Council itself has been functioning for some time with a majority of non-Administering Members. This practice, which is modelled on the rule followed in the Trusteeship Council and which might at one time have been justified, is now outmoded.

91. The abolition of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories would prevent the repetition of certain rather absurd procedures which have been applied. For example, while the report of the Committee of Seventeen, which deals with the political situation in certain Territories such as Basutoland, Swaziland and so-called Spanish Guinea has been discussed in plenary meetings, the Fourth Committee has heard the petitioners from those Territories express their views on the same situation but has done so within the artificial and narrow framework of the examination of the report of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories.

92. This has led to an extraordinary performance, which must have been perplexing to the layman. Repeated appeals, one might almost say supplications, have been addressed to the members of the Fourth Committee by persons who wished to take part in the general debate on a number of agenda items being jointly discussed which had no direct connexion with the hearing of petitioners—persons who, and this is even more serious, wanted to submit draft resolutions but were delayed in doing so because everything was being held up by the debate in the plenary meetings on the report of the Committee of Seventeen.

93. The abolition of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories would not, of course, alter the procedure provided for in Article 73 e of the Charter. Information would continue to be submitted to the Secretary-General by the administering Powers. It would be analysed and summarized by the Secretary-General as in the past, and this documentation would be put at the disposal of the enlarged Committee of Seventeen. Once all the activities concerning decolonization had been centralized in the

^{9/} Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

hands of this Committee, there would be nothing to prevent it from organizing its work on the basis of specialized sub-committees for the particular Territories being studied so that it might be able to examine a large number of different situations concurrently with speed and efficiency.

94. My delegation would have no objection to authorizing the Committee of Seventeen, if the need should arise, to include in its sub-committees Members of the United Nations which were not members of the enlarged Committee. The important thing is that the work of all the sub-committees should be co-ordinated and should be under the direct and sole authority of the enlarged Committee, which would become, as it were, a new principal organ of the United Nations. In this way it would be possible in the future to avoid duplication and triplication, multiple and badly co-ordinated reports and repetitive separate discussions on a single question which are a cause of extreme apathy.

95. These are the few ideas which my delegation wanted to set forth, the few suggestions which it wished to present to the Assembly for its consideration now that we are examining the draft resolution [A/L.410] concerning the work of the Special Committee which has been made responsible for ensuring the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960. It submits them in the spirit of frank and loyal co-operation which has always guided its activities in the United Nations.

96. Mr. HELEN (Sweden): Now that we are faced with draft resolution A/L.410, sponsored by a great number of African-Asian States, it might be useful to regard it in the light of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)], presented by the then forty-three African-Asian States, and adopted overwhelmingly by this Assembly two years ago.

97. The Swedish delegation, which cast its vote in favour of this document, did so because it found the basic ideas, expressed in the Declaration, sound and adequate, and because we were of the opinion that they were in accord with the Charter Provisions on the principle of self-determination. This principle is no innovation, no invention of the United Nations, it is as old as the history of civilized man. It has, however, taken on added urgency during the last few years. Our opinion on this main point was stated before the General Assembly on 14 December 1960 in the following words:

"The Swedish Government and the Swedish people have followed with intent interest and great sympathy the historical process by which the large majority of formerly dependent peoples have come to enjoy the great boon of national freedom. If the declaration will help to keep the desire for freedom burning in men's minds everywhere, it will serve a useful purpose." [946th meeting, para. 11.]

There seems to be little doubt that this purpose has indeed been served by the Declaration during the two years since it was adopted—two years of intensified decolonization which have brought many new Members into the United Nations.

98. Public opinion in Sweden, as expressed by representatives of our political parties and of our strong labour unions, and by many of our most intelligent writers and journalists, has shown deep engagement in what is going on in territories still under colonial

rule, as well as in those which are now enjoying the treatment for which they have been striving.

99. This opinion is clearly and forcefully reflected in the attitude of Sweden, as a nation and as an active Member State of the United Nations. We favour a speedy, energetic, and realistic decolonization. Sweden is proud of having been a supporter of the Declaration from the very outset. Thus, the Swedish Government is still in favour of the basic ideas of the Declaration and of seeing them thoroughly developed in draft resolution A/L.410.

100. Nevertheless, my delegation has some doubts concerning certain parts of the draft resolution, especially operative paragraphs 2 and 8. I want to stress that these doubts are of a mainly practical nature.

101. It is in the interests of all concerned—that is, of the dependent peoples themselves, the metropolitan Powers and the United Nations—that the transition from dependence to nationhood should take place in an orderly and peaceful manner as possible. The Declaration contains a paragraph stating that inadequacy in political, economic, social or educational preparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence. We agree: nothing should be used as a pretext for denying peoples the freedom they seek.

102. We are convinced, however, that the process of decolonization will be most effectively furthered, and that the new nations themselves will most benefit if there is a certain amount of balance between the will to freedom in a new country and the practical possibilities of exercising this freedom without having it jeopardized. It may not always be feasible to achieve this balance, but it still seems worth aiming at.

103. Having this conviction, we find it necessary to stress—as we have done before, and until now in accord with the views expressed by many of the African-Asian States themselves—that it is not realistic for this Assembly to fix an over-all time-limit, theoretically evolved for the independence of all the territories which are still dependent. We cannot ignore the fact that too rapid a transition of a territory from colonial status to independence may cause serious difficulties for its own people.

104. The Charter of the United Nations itself has taken this into account both in Chapter XI, dealing with Non-Self-Governing Territories, and in Chapter XII, which is concerned with territories under trusteeship. In Article 73 b, the administering Powers are requested to develop self-government and to assist in the progressive development of free political institutions in the territories "according to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and their varying stages of advancement". The corresponding Article, dealing with Trust Territories, that is, Article 76 b, also speaks of the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples as having to be taken into account.

105. The fixing of a time-limit—or time-limits, as the representative of Indonesia has just discussed in his introduction—more or less automatically valid for different territories, does not seem to allow for the wide flexibility that the Charter—we think wisely—presupposes. Neither does it seem to take into account the fact that in most cases the transition to independence, luckily, has come about as the result of negotiations between the metropolitan Power and the elected leaders

of the political parties in the territories. The draft resolution in its operative paragraph 5 calls upon the administering Powers to show respect for the rightful leaders of the peoples concerned and their political activities. Would it then really be wise for the United Nations, by fixing an over-all time-limit, to circumscribe the possibility of these leaders to select the moment which, to them, seems most advantageous to open negotiations leading to the birth of their nation?

106. And how can it be possible for the eighteenth General Assembly to be fully assured that in fixing, once and for all, such a time-limit for the full implementation of the Declaration, no dependent territory is being given unreasonable hopes of early self-determination?

107. How can we, on the other hand, be sure that no territory is by-passed? The draft resolution speaks of all territories mentioned in operative paragraph 5 of resolution 1514 (XV). Who is to make a definitive list of such territories? The wisdom of the General Assembly is certainly great, but I would doubt that it is great enough for such a task.

108. The methods of work of the Special Committee have been a controversial matter in the general debate on this item. Nevertheless, the sponsors of the draft resolution have decided to express in the resolution not only our appreciation to the Special Committee but also their view of the usefulness of the methods and procedures developed in the course of the work within the Committee. I cannot see how it could be possible for us in the Assembly, having studied the report and listened to the general debate on this item, to have a well-founded and definite opinion on this matter, which is controversial among the members of the Committee themselves.

109. According to one of the preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would reaffirm its conviction that any delay in the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence has created or would create—the language is somewhat ambiguous—"increasingly dangerous situations likely to threaten international peace and security". Under operative paragraph 8, the General Assembly would, furthermore, request the enlarged Committee "to apprise the Security Council of any developments in these territories which may threaten international peace and security".

110. My Government cannot but approve the tenet that situations which may or may be likely to threaten international peace and security should be brought to the attention of the Security Council as it is this body which, under Article 24 of the Charter, has the primary responsibility—and in fact represents the primary power—to maintain peace and security. It must, on the other hand, be borne in mind also that however a situation may be characterized by the General Assembly, or by a subsidiary of the Assembly, it is for the Security Council itself independently to determine the nature of the situation facing it, and the steps it finds appropriate and necessary to take.

111. In spite of the questions, reservations and comments now made, the Swedish delegation finds the draft resolution as such in many respects a useful contribution to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. We think that the metropolitan Powers still involved in the drama of decolonization should be made aware of world opinion as expressed in the resolutions

of the United Nations. This opinion of ours applies as much to those metropolitan Powers, whose democratic machinery is often criticized in the public debates in our country, as to Powers whose traditions and honesty of purpose we have for a long time greatly admired. The Swedish delegation is certainly convinced of the fact that some of the administering Powers are forcefully striving in the direction of a speedy and realistic decolonization. Nevertheless, we believe in the value of the awareness of world opinion among all the administering Powers as to the implementation of this Declaration.

112. The vote of the Swedish delegation will be cast in accordance with the opinions expressed in this statement.

113. Mr. GREN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The Soviet delegation attaches great significance to the fact that the draft resolution [A/L.410] now before us is the product of lengthy discussion and effort on the part of a large group of sponsors. We feel that we must express our appreciation to the sponsors for the work which they have done. The sponsors of the draft resolution proceeded on the basis of the purposes and principles set forth in the Declaration contained in resolution 1514 (XV).

114. As is well known, resolution 1514 (XV) was adopted unanimously; no one opposed it. That resolution solemnly proclaimed the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations.

115. Two years have passed since the historic Declaration was adopted. Last year, when resolution 1654 (XVI) concerning the situation with regard to the implementation of that Declaration was adopted, many delegations, as we know, expressed their views concerning the fixing of specific terms for the liquidation of colonialism. At the current session these demands for the fixing of specific terms for the liquidation of colonialism have been voiced even more loudly and, as everyone is aware, a specific proposal has been made to the effect that the final date for the liquidation of colonialism should be United Nations Day, 24 October 1963.

116. My delegation, in considering the draft resolution, attaches great importance to the question of fixing a specific date for the liquidation of colonialism. In our opinion it would be better if the draft resolution was more specific on this point and indicated a final date for the liquidation of colonialism. The Special Committee on the implementation of the Declaration would thus have a more definite directive. It would be more appropriate to indicate a specific date for the final liquidation of the colonial system in the draft resolution itself than to entrust that task to the Committee of Seventeen.

117. My delegation considers it appropriate that this draft resolution should invite the Special Committee "to apprise the Security Council of any developments in these territories which may threaten international peace and security".

118. The need to give the Special Committee such powers has long been apparent, for the situation in many of the territories is such that it is indeed a threat to peace, as has already been recognized in a number of resolutions which are under consideration or have been adopted by the General Assembly.

119. At the same time the twenty-two-Power draft resolution has, in our opinion, a number of weaknesses. We have in mind primarily the absence of anything in it to the effect that the States administering dependent territories should withdraw their troops and military missions and dismantle foreign bases in those territories.

120. Similarly, the draft resolution includes no paragraph in which States Members of the United Nations that are giving such aid to the colonial Powers as can be used by them for waging war against or applying repressive measures to the indigenous population of the dependent territories are called upon to halt that aid immediately.

121. At this stage, when the peoples of the colonial territories are demanding the transfer of full powers to them, it is of the utmost importance to emphasize in the draft resolution the need to ensure that the indigenous population will really have the opportunity to exercise all democratic rights and freedoms and to take part in elections based on direct and universal suffrage.

122. It would also be very useful to mention in the draft resolution the need to annul any agreements with the dependent territories which might entail a direct or indirect limitation on the sovereignty of the future independent States or which have as their purpose the granting of special rights and privileges to the metropolitan countries or to their citizens or to undertakings in those States; the need to abrogate any previously adopted legislation designed to join the dependent territories or any parts of those territories to the administering countries in any way; and the need to restore to the indigenous inhabitants all the lands taken away from them under any pretext whatsoever.

123. Considering these deficiencies, we are of the opinion that the twenty-two-Power draft resolution is not fully adequate to the tasks confronting the United Nations at this time in connexion with the liquidation of the colonial system.

124. We have reached the stage of extirpating the remnants of the shameful colonial system, and the sooner we put an end to that system the fewer will be its victims, the less the sufferings of the colonial peoples and the greater the possibility of strengthening world peace.

125. My delegation would therefore prefer that all the points just outlined by us should be reflected in the twenty-two-Power draft resolution. However, our attitude to draft resolution A/L.410 which has been submitted by the twenty-two-Powers is, on the whole, favourable, even though we consider it insufficient and incomplete.

126. As far as the work of the Special Committee itself is concerned, my delegation notes as a positive element that in the draft resolution in question the General Assembly expresses its appreciation to the Special Committee on the situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples for the work it has accomplished and takes note with approval of the methods and procedures which the Special Committee has adopted for the discharge of its functions.

127. This provision of the draft resolution reflects the prevailing opinion expressed during the debate on the report of the Committee of Seventeen [A/5238].

128. As the volume and complexity of the work of the Special Committee are increasing the draft resolution provides for enlarging the membership of the Special Committee by the addition of seven new members. With regard to this paragraph of the resolution, we should like to stress that if the General Assembly decides to enlarge the membership of the Special Committee, any such enlargement should be made on the same basis as that on which the Special Committee of Seventeen was established. Many speakers who took part in the general debate expressed such a wish, and this position was widely supported.

129. We emphasize this circumstance because the Special Committee, as may be seen from the draft resolution, is approaching the decisive stage in its work of carrying out the task entrusted to it in resolution 1654 (XVI) and the present resolution.

130. That being so, it is extremely important to maintain the fair representation of geographical regions which is already reflected in the membership of the Committee and to ensure that all the groups of countries in the United Nations are represented among the new members. Taking this principle into account, we are ready to support the proposal of the sponsors of the draft resolution concerning the enlargement of the membership of the Special Committee.

131. In the light of the foregoing observations we shall support the draft resolution submitted by twenty-two countries of the Afro-Asian Group and shall vote in favour of it.

Mr. Zafrulla Khan (Pakistan) resumed the Chair.

132. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) (translated from Spanish). The delegation of Peru has on various occasions clearly and emphatically expressed its sympathy for any measure designed to accelerate the emancipation of the countries that have been subjected to colonial domination. We have considered this movement towards emancipation to be one of the characteristics of the present era, one of the tasks which the United Nations should view most sympathetically and to which it should devote its unstinted co-operation. Our thinking could be expressed as follows: the greatest and most representative event of the nineteenth century was the independence of the American countries, and the most noteworthy event of the twentieth century is the independence of the new countries of Asia and Africa. For this reason, we view the independence of the African and Asian countries with profound feelings of sympathy and solidarity.

133. There is even something more, there is a cultural tradition dating back to the very beginning of our spiritual life. With the discovery of America, there emerged the principles of international law formulated by Vitoria, and Vitoria was the first authority on philosophical and legal matters to state with the utmost clarity the principle of self-determination, self-government and inviolability and of the right of all the peoples of the earth to govern themselves. It is in this spirit that the delegation of Peru has viewed the work entrusted to the Special Committee of Seventeen, and naturally we can but support and applaud the task that it has accomplished.

134. With regard to the great movement of emancipation, it will not be superfluous to draw a modest parallel between that movement and our own. The movement for emancipation in Latin America was beset by enormous difficulties. It took shape at a time

when England, which viewed our independence in a sympathetic light, found itself forced, owing to the Napoleonic invasion of Spain, into an alliance with the Spanish Empire, and even the United States, which could also look on our independence with a platonic sympathy, was occupied with the negotiations for the purchase of the two Floridas. Thus, as Bolívar said, our independence was achieved virtually in defiance of the entire world.

135. Fortunately for our brothers in Asia and Africa, their movement for emancipation—although it has in many cases been achieved by dint of a heroic struggle which we have admired and have followed with a strong feeling of solidarity—has benefited to a great extent from the co-operation of the great colonial Powers, which has resulted from a change in attitude that mankind can only applaud and that places those Powers under a distinct obligation to pursue their efforts and extend their full and disinterested co-operation to the new countries. However there is an element still more favourable to the emancipation of the countries of Africa and Asia, and that is the existence of the United Nations.

136. At the time of our struggle, there was only the shadow of an understanding between the United States and England directed against what could be called the nucleus of reactionary or highly conservative European Powers. There was, however, no institution that could encourage and assist the emancipated countries and help speed up the emancipation of those which had not yet achieved independence.

137. The great advantage enjoyed today by our brothers in Africa and Asia who have just attained independence and whom we have welcomed so cordially as Members of this Organization, and by those who are on their way to independence and are destined one day to acquire such membership, lies in the existence of the United Nations. That is why, from the very beginning, the delegation of Peru has been so insistent that the United Nations in all its acts and in all circumstances should lay stress on universality as its essential characteristic. This universality enables us and has enabled us to incorporate the new countries of Africa and Asia into the international community with full authority, and we have every hope that we shall be able to conclude and round off this task of integration through the incorporation of the other countries whose independence we are fostering.

138. Since such is the position of the delegation of Peru, the Assembly will fully understand that—unreservedly endorsing as we do the work of the two Peruvian representatives in the Committee of Seventeen—we take a sympathetic view of what has been done and generally approve of the draft resolution [A/L.410] that has been submitted to us.

139. Nevertheless, I must say quite frankly, with reference to certain words or terms in the draft resolution, that all of us who cherish the United Nations are very anxious that no resolution should be open to criticism on the grounds that the exact term or the precise and appropriate expression required has not been used. We believe that we should avoid anything that constitutes or implies exaggeration, inaccuracy or a step perhaps not in keeping with the dictates of prudence. It is in this sense, with all due respect, and although I am not submitting any kind of amendment, that I must say that my delegation would for example have preferred, with reference

to the delay in granting independence, that it is "capable of creating" a situation, instead of describing it as "creating" one, because the use of the indicative suggests a categorical affirmation regarding something that is actually occurring, whereas the word "capable" merely suggests that it might create a situation.

140. Similarly it has been felt by many Latin American countries, all of which are so very much at one with our brothers in Africa and Asia in their movement of emancipation, that perhaps the expression "an appropriate time-limit" used in the preamble and in the operative part is somewhat vague, and that it would have been better to refer to "appropriate time-limits" or perhaps not attempt to set any automatic, mechanical date, since the processes with which we are here concerned may need—to speak—to be helped along to a greater or lesser extent and will require for their fulfilment and completion a period of time that cannot be fixed beforehand. However, these reservations which I make in my search for perfection and in a spirit of complete sincerity and constructive criticism do not in the slightest degree weaken my enthusiastic support both for the spirit and in general for the letter of the draft resolution, and this is why the Peruvian delegation intends to vote in favour of it.

141. It is our hope that the movement of emancipation will continue to take its inspiration from the provisions of the United Nations Charter and will remain absolutely faithful to the spirit imbuing and inspiring it, untouched by any cold-war issues, and retaining its disinterested and noble character as the greatest manifestation of that spirit of liberty which in reality underlies all human progress. And I am sure that my words will be echoed in all the organs of the United Nations, for in fact it is not enough for these peoples to achieve freedom. They are embarking upon life as free nations in difficult economic circumstances; they are doing so in the wake of experiences, often including wars, which have left behind wounds, sufferings and other unfavourable consequences. For these very reasons, the United Nations—and I say this most sincerely—has before it an admirable field of action in which it can contribute with its technical and economic assistance towards strengthening the independence of the countries that have already acquired it and towards the early emancipation of the countries that are still yearning for their freedom. This is the great task confronting the United Nations, to which we must all contribute with our votes and with our encouragement.

142. Mr. LUOMAN (Mauritania): I am addressing myself to document A/L.410, which we have before us at present.

143. We would be very unfaithful to our own consciences if we thought we could set the clock back with regard to the freedom of peoples and nations. Let us try to accept the challenge of the fact that we live in a changing world, absolutely different from that of yesterday.

144. In this context, I would want to refer to the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)]. It is apparent from the report of the Special Committee [A/5238] that some of the Powers which still administer dependent territories have not yet been able to look at this global problem as they should. We call upon those countries to change the spectacles with which

they used to look at this problem and to co-operate with us with a view to emancipating that portion of humanity which still suffers under the colonial yoke.

145. The draft resolution before us is clear and complete proof that we still have to work to accomplish those principles whose implementation the Charter made incumbent upon us. The significance of that draft resolution is twofold. First, the freedom of the people concerned has to be effected through the efforts of the United Nations. Secondly, action to this effect must be taken quickly and drastically and without delay.

146. Operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution addresses itself to the Administering Powers which are using arms to subdue the freedom movements in these territories in question, and it calls for the cessation of the use of force. Operative paragraph 6 calls for immediate steps to be taken by these Powers to help prepare colonial territories and peoples to accede to self-government and independence without delay. The co-sponsors of this draft resolution also

aim to help speed up this process of self-determination and decolonization.

147. It has been suggested that seven members be added to the existing membership of the Special Committee. We believe that such an addition to the membership would very probably facilitate the task of the Special Committee and help bring about the implementation of the Declaration on the freedom of peoples and territories from the colonial yoke.

148. My delegation has become a co-sponsor of this draft resolution, and it urges all Members to vote for its adoption.

149. The PRESIDENT: Representatives will kindly remember that the Assembly, on convening at 3 p.m., will listen to an address by His Excellency the President of Chile. I therefore trust that they will all be in their seats punctually.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.