

United Nations
**GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1635th
 MEETING**

Wednesday, 16 November 1966,
 at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 23:</i>	
<i>Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: Aden (continued)</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	241
<i>Agenda item 67:</i>	
<i>Question of Territories under Portuguese administration: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples</i>	
<i>General debate</i>	243
<i>Requests for hearings (continued)</i>	
<i>Requests concerning Territories under Portuguese administration (agenda item 67)</i>	243
<i>Request concerning Equatorial Guinea (agenda item 23)</i>	244
<i>Request concerning Oman (agenda item 70)</i>	244
<i>Organization of work</i>	244

Chairman: Mr. FAKHREDDINE Mohamed
 (Sudan).

AGENDA ITEM 23

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: Aden (continued) (A/6274, A/6276, A/6300/Rev.1, chap. VI; A/6317, A/6374, A/6478)

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. ADEBO (Nigeria) congratulated the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples on its report on Aden (A/6300/Rev.1, chap. VI). He thanked the petitioners who had appeared before the Committee and assured them of his delegation's full sympathy for their cause. From the United Kingdom's statement that independence would be granted to Aden by 1968 it would appear that the question had been settled and that a delegation from the Federation of South Arabia could be expected to take its rightful

place in the Committee at the twenty-third session of the General Assembly. After reading the report and listening to the petitioners, however, he had some misgivings. Although the Territory would soon attain independence, it still had no popularly elected government, it was under emergency regulations and many of its politically vocal citizens were in detention. Moreover, there were at least four political parties, which did not agree among themselves.

2. In view of the situation obtaining in the area, his delegation considered that the United Nations had an important role to play and that it should assume that role without further delay. If its action was to be effective, it was essential that the Government of the United Kingdom should co-operate with the United Nations so that independence would be achieved in harmony. The statement made by the United Kingdom representative at the Committee's 1633rd meeting had been extremely promising and he hoped that other delegations would accept it in the sincere spirit in which he believed it had been made. Although in that statement the United Kingdom had not withdrawn its reservations, he felt that if the promises made in it were fulfilled the reservations would be much less objectionable.

3. The most important task in South Arabia was the establishment of a representative government to which power could be transferred in 1968. The United Kingdom representative had indicated his country's willingness to assist in that task and his delegation had no reason to doubt the sincerity of the administering Power in the present case. In order to assist the United Nations, however, he appealed to the United Kingdom to withdraw formally all its reservations concerning General Assembly resolution 2023 (XX) and to implement fully the measures recommended in operative paragraph 8 of that resolution. The full implementation of those measures would create an atmosphere conducive to the success of elections to be held under United Nations supervision. The government which emerged as the result of such elections should then lead the country to independence.

4. Another obstacle to independence in the Territory was the divergence of views among the various political parties there. He appealed to those parties to overcome their differences and present a united front. There was a real danger inherent in their present attitude to one another. Independence could not be enjoyed in a state of isolation; once the country was independent it would have a duty to live in harmony with its neighbours. The political parties should realize that there were people who would be only too happy to see them divided.

5. Although Aden would not attain independence for another two years, immediate action should be taken

to ensure that it would attain genuine independence which would bring happiness and prosperity to the whole Territory.

6. Mr. SZILAGYI (Hungary) said that the report of the Special Committee, together with the statements made by the petitioners and the answers they had given to questions, had revealed the truth concerning the situation in South Arabia and the colonial policies pursued by the United Kingdom. Instead of striving to grant genuine independence to the Territory in accordance with the wishes of the population, the United Kingdom Government was hoping to maintain its influence over the Territory after independence. Its statement that independence would be granted by 1968 was not convincing, for there appeared to be two different interpretations of independence. The administering Power had declared a state of emergency in the Territory and even a member of the Government of the so-called Federation of South Arabia had declared that people were arrested without cause. The torture inflicted on prisoners had aroused the indignation of the world. Such a state of affairs should not be allowed to continue. The statement made by the United Kingdom representative at the 1633rd meeting appeared to call upon the United Nations to assist the administering Power in carrying out its neo-colonialist schemes concerning the Territory. That representative had claimed that full agreement was within reach, but there was in fact a wide gulf between the views of the administering Power and those of the anti-colonialist forces.

7. His delegation did not consider the Government of the so-called Federation of South Arabia to be really representative of the population, since it had been set up by the administering Power in an undemocratic manner to serve the colonial policies of the United Kingdom. He could not accept that Government's statement that when violence ceased the state of emergency would be lifted and the detainees released. Violence was the very bulwark of colonialism and was used by the administering Power to intimidate the peaceful population and to force it to give up the struggle against colonialism. The United Kingdom should understand that the population of the Territory did not wish to become a tool of colonialism. His delegation condemned the United Kingdom's actions in maintaining the state of emergency and in imprisoning and torturing the people. Those actions showed that the United Kingdom's supposed acceptance of the purposes of the General Assembly resolutions of 1963 and 1965 was not supported by the facts.

8. The United Kingdom representative had mentioned two remaining obstacles to full agreement, which gave rise to further doubt concerning the intentions of the administering Power. The first related to the sending of a United Nations mission to the Territory. The United Kingdom Government appeared to be willing to co-operate in the sending of such a mission provided it had the right to determine its composition. That showed a lack of confidence in the United Nations and in the Secretary-General, yet the United Kingdom expected the Members of the United Nations to have confidence in its own policies in Aden and South Arabia. The United Kingdom was clearly afraid of what an impartial United Nations mission would find in the Territory. His delegation agreed with

those who thought that a United Nations mission should not be sent as long as the state of emergency was in force. In the present circumstances the population would have no opportunity to express their opinions freely. The administering Power should show, by its actions, that it really wished to end its colonial domination over the Territory; it would then have a right to ask, and obtain, the co-operation of the United Nations.

9. The United Kingdom representative's statement at the 1633rd meeting that the existing treaties would cease to have effect when the Territory became independent was most welcome, but there appeared to be a contradiction between that statement and the announcement that the United Kingdom Government would provide the Government of the Federation of South Arabia with a five-year military aid programme. Professor Michael Howard, of the University of London, had stated in an article entitled "Britain's Strategic Problem East of Suez" that the United Kingdom retained 55,000 men of the British armed forces east of Suez and recruited some 20,000 more in the area, at a total cost of about £317 million. Despite its armed forces, however, the United Kingdom had been compelled to withdraw in some areas and to change its colonialist methods. After its enforced departure from the Suez Canal zone, it had made Aden the centre of its military power in that area and, realizing that armed force alone was not sufficient to suppress the people's aspirations for independence, it had created a new political structure, the so-called Federation. As Mr. Mackawee had said at the 1622nd meeting, the United Kingdom's military and political activities in the area were intended to foster Western imperialist interference, to keep open a strategic route to colonial positions in the Indian Ocean and South-East Asia, to safeguard the flow of Middle East oil, to subdue local belligerency and, above all, to provide a springboard for United Kingdom military intervention in neighbouring areas. The Hungarian delegation fully shared that view.

10. The people of Aden and South Arabia had suffered too long under colonial rule and he assured them of the sympathy and support of the Hungarian people. His delegation would support any proposal which would help the Territory to achieve genuine independence.

11. Mr. WAZIRI (Afghanistan) said that his Government had consistently supported the just claims of the people of Aden and South Arabia to independence and self-determination and had voted in favour of General Assembly resolutions 1949 (XVIII) and 2023 (XX).

12. It was generally agreed that the future of South Arabia depended upon the unity of its inhabitants, who should be enabled to express their wishes freely, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). Any attempt to divide the people could only lead to trouble in the future. It was essential that the administering Power should accept all the provisions of the United Nations resolutions concerning the Territory without reservations and should co-operate with the Organization in their implementation.

13. The United Nations resolutions called for a freely elected Government; that meant that all régimes that had been imposed in the area should be dissolved. His delegation considered that the proposal for a

United Nations presence in the area implied that the Organization would participate in all the steps necessary to ensure the independence of the Territory and the transfer of power to genuine representatives of the people. It was a sacred duty for the United Nations to ensure that its resolutions were fully implemented and that the people achieved genuine independence. The United Nations should also keep developments in the area under review until a truly representative Government had taken power. It was for the United Nations to decide what form its presence in the area should take in order to ensure the freedom of the population, the release of all political detainees and the return of those people who had been exiled or deported for political reasons, the abolition of the state of emergency and the holding of elections for a provisional government.

14. Mr. ISMAIL (Malaysia) said that the question of independence for South Arabia had been fully debated and the views of the administering Power, the petitioners and Member States had all been heard. There appeared to be a certain lack of communication between the administering Power and the people of South Arabia. The United Nations found itself in the middle, with the result that, instead of there being only two parties involved in bargaining and negotiating, the views of all the various Member States had to be taken into account. For instance, in the discussion about the form of independence to be achieved in South Arabia, many different opinions had been expressed. His delegation therefore called on the people of South Arabia to join forces so that they would be in a position to bargain and negotiate with the administering Power, while the United Nations acted as a watchdog, or adviser, or policeman if the actions of the administering Power required it. It was necessary, and not too late, for the petitioners to seek some common ground and present a united front. Personal differences should be put aside for the sake of the future nation.

15. Other issues had been discussed during the debate, including the United Kingdom's global strategy and policy east of Suez, its interest in oil in the Middle East and in communications in the Middle East, the type of political system required in South Arabia, neo-colonialism in South Arabia, the United Kingdom's colonial policy and the question of arrest and torture of detainees. All those were peripheral to the central issue, which was how to ensure the independence of South Arabia in accordance with the wishes of the population and not of the United Nations. Certain facts, together with the statement made by the United Kingdom representative at the 1633rd meeting, would help the Committee in its task: those facts were that independence would be granted by 1968 and that the United Kingdom military base at Aden would be dismantled and all existing defence treaties terminated at that time. It had been agreed in principle, by all parties concerned, that a United Nations mission should be sent to the Territory, but there was still some suspicion that all the people of South Arabia, in particular the detainees, might not have full access to the mission. The United Kingdom representative had given a verbal undertaking that they would have such access, but it would be helpful if he could confirm it in writing. In any event, as the

representative of Ceylon had said, a United Nations mission could still be useful and could ascertain the views of the population. It was important that such a mission should be given full freedom of movement. It was to be hoped that the state of emergency would be lifted, but it should not be allowed to hinder the sending of a mission.

AGENDA ITEM 67

Question of Territories under Portuguese administration: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (A/6292, A/6294, A/6300/Rev.1, chap. V; A/6335/Rev.1, A/6337, A/6340, A/C.4/673 and Add.1)

GENERAL DEBATE

16. Mr. ALJUBOURI (Iraq), speaking as Rapporteur of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, introduced chapter V of that Committee's report (A/6300/Rev.1), which dealt with its work during 1966 concerning the question of the Territories under Portuguese administration. He drew particular attention to the resolution adopted by the Special Committee on 22 June 1966, reproduced in paragraph 675, and to the Committee's recommendations set forth in paragraph 688, of chapter V.

Requests for hearings (continued)

REQUESTS CONCERNING TERRITORIES UNDER PORTUGUESE ADMINISTRATION (AGENDA ITEM 67) (A/C.4/673 AND ADD.1)

17. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the request for a hearing (A/C.4/673) received from Mr. Albert Nank, a private individual, in connexion with the situation in Portuguese Guinea.

18. Mr. DE MIRANDA (Portugal) said his delegation had consistently maintained that the only petitioners admissible under the United Nations Charter were those from Trust Territories. It therefore had strong reservations about the hearing of petitioners from other territories. He wished his delegation's reservations to be recorded in respect of the present request for a hearing and any similar request which might follow.

19. His Government's reservations with regard to debates on any Portuguese Territories were already on record and needed no restatement. He requested that those reservations should be considered to have been reiterated.

20. Mr. THIAM (Mali) said that his Government did not recognize the Government of Portugal and his delegation considered the Portuguese representative's statement null and void. He was surprised that the Portuguese representative should object to hearing a petitioner from so-called Portuguese Guinea since two thirds of that country were under the control of nationalist forces and it was not clear for whom in the Territory the Portuguese representative claimed to speak.

21. Mr. NKAMA (Zambia) said that he endorsed the Malian representative's remarks. His Government was convinced that the continuance of Portuguese colonial rule in Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea was contrary to the wishes of the peoples of those Territories. He entirely agreed that requests for hearings should be granted. His delegation was fully committed to the attainment of freedom for the long-suffering and oppressed peoples of Africa.

22. The CHAIRMAN said that if there were no further objections he would take it that the Committee decided to grant Mr. Nank's request for a hearing.

It was so decided.

23. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the request for a hearing (A/C.4/673/Add.1) from Mr. Mário de Andrade, of the Conferência das Organizações Nacionalistas das Colônias Portuguesas (CONCP). If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee granted that request.

It was so decided.

REQUEST CONCERNING EQUATORIAL GUINEA
(AGENDA ITEM 23) (A/C.4/675)

24. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the request for a hearing (A/C.4/675) received from Mr. Antonino Eworo Obama, President of the Partido Político Idea Popular de la Guinea Ecuatorial (IPGE). If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee granted that request.

It was so decided.

REQUEST CONCERNING OMAN (AGENDA ITEM 70)
(A/C.4/674)

25. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the request for a hearing (A/C.4/674) from Mr. Robert Edwards, Chairman of the Committee for the Rights of Oman.

26. Mr. F. D. W. BROWN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had pointed out in the General Committee that the Sultanate of Muscat and Oman was a sovereign, independent State and had expressed reservations about the inclusion of the item concerned in the General Assembly's agenda. His delegation must formally object to the Committee granting a hearing to petitioners from or concerned with Oman. The Committee for the Rights of Oman supported a small group of people, living outside their country, who were in rebellion against the legal Government of a sovereign, independent State. As at the previous session, his delegation considered that the hearing of such persons might establish unwelcome precedents for sovereign States represented at the United Nations.

27. Mr. ABDEL-WAHAB (United Arab Republic) said that the United Kingdom recognized neither the General Assembly resolutions nor the principles of the United Nations. Operative paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 2073 (XX) on the question of Oman, which had been adopted by a vast majority, recognized the inalienable right of the people of the Territory as a whole to self-determination and independence in accordance with their freely expressed wishes. Opera-

tive paragraph 4 stated that the colonial presence of the United Kingdom in its various forms prevented the people of the Territory from exercising their rights to self-determination and independence. There was no doubt that the Territory of Oman, the Trucial States and Muscat were United Kingdom colonies.

28. Mr. F. D. W. BROWN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation must object formally to the hearing of petitioners from the Committee for the Rights of Oman. There was no doubt whatsoever that Oman was a sovereign State. Neither Oman nor the other States to which the United Arab Republic representative had referred were United Kingdom colonies.

29. Mr. NKAMA (Zambia) supported the hearing of petitioners from the Committee for the Rights of Oman.

30. Mr. SY (Senegal) said that, since the United Kingdom representative had spoken for Oman in the Committee, it was obvious that the Territory did not enjoy all the attributes of a sovereign independent State. He therefore supported the hearing of petitioners from the Committee for the Rights of Oman.

31. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no further objection he would take it that the Committee had decided to grant Mr. Edwards' request for a hearing.

It was so decided.

Organization of work

32. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that only one month remained for completion of the ten items remaining on its agenda.

33. Mr. DIALLO Seydou (Guinea) said that the delegations which were delaying the work of the Committee were those of the United Kingdom and Portugal, which made no useful contribution to the debate and hampered the Committee's work by formulating pointless reservations.

34. Mr. F. D. W. BROWN (United Kingdom) pointed out that his delegation had been specifically requested to speak first in the debate on Aden and had done so.

35. Mr. JOUEJATI (Syria) observed that the United Kingdom representative's observation was particularly unfortunate since many delegations had deferred making statements on the question of Aden until a letter, which they had been assured was constructive, from the United Kingdom Government to the Secretary-General had been received.

36. Mr. F. D. W. BROWN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had not exerted pressure on other delegations to await the letter from his Government, which he hoped would be circulated in the near future.

37. Mr. THIAM (Mali) said that delegations were in fact withholding statements on the question of Aden since the letter from the United Kingdom Government would concern many factors vital to the issue. He hoped the United Kingdom representative would request his Government to hasten delivery of it.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.