

United Nations
**GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records

**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1742nd
 MEETING**

Friday, 8 December 1967,
 at 11.15 a.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

<i>Agenda item 97:</i>	
<i>Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations (continued)</i>	
<i>Statement by the Chairman.</i>	411
<i>Consideration of draft resolution A/C.4/L.882.</i>	411
<i>Agenda item 70:</i>	
<i>Question of Oman (continued):</i>	
<i>(a) 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>(b) Report of the Secretary-General</i>	
<i>Consideration of draft resolution A/C.4/L.880 and Add.1 (concluded)</i>	412
<i>Agenda item 69:</i>	
<i>Question of Fiji: 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 (continued)</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	414

Chairman: Mr. George J. TOMEH (Syria).

AGENDA ITEM 97

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations (continued)* (A/6700/Rev.1, chap. I, annex III, and chap. V, annex; A/6825, A/C.4/L.882)

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

1. The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the 1739th meeting of the Committee held on 6 December 1967, the representative of the United Arab Republic had suggested that the representatives of specialized agencies should be invited to make statements on that agenda item. In the absence of any other comments by the Committee members, he had requested representatives of the specialized agencies at that meeting to take note of the invitation.

*Resumed from the 1739th meeting.

2. Since then he had got in touch, through the Secretariat, with all those specialized agencies (the ILO, FAO, UNESCO, WHO, IBRD and IMF) whose representatives had attended meetings of the Fourth Committee during the debate on the item in order to ascertain whether they intended to make statements in response to the Committee's invitation. None of them had indicated a particular desire to make a statement.

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION A/C.4/L.882

3. Mr. KARASIMEONOV (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the thirty-six sponsors, introduced draft resolution A/C.4/L.882, which reflected the suggestions and recommendations made in that connexion during the debate in the Fourth Committee and at the meetings at Headquarters and in Africa 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. In the preamble, the co-sponsors had taken into account all the facts and documents relating to decolonization, especially General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), as well as the agreements under which the United Nations co-ordinated the specialized agencies' programmes. They had also recalled that national liberation movements in southern Africa had requested the specialized agencies for urgent assistance, particularly in regard to education and health. The purpose of the operative part of the draft resolution was to define clearly the General Assembly's position concerning the co-operation of the specialized agencies and international institutions associated with the United Nations in the work of decolonization; it contained various requests and recommendations designed to render their participation in that work effective. Southern Africa being the main arena of the anti-colonialist struggle, it recommended co-operation with the Organization of African Unity and, through it, with the national liberation movements. Similarly, in accordance with the opinion of the vast majority of the delegations which had taken part in the debate, it recommended that the specialized agencies and international institutions should not grant any assistance to the Republic of South Africa and Portugal until they renounced their policy of racial discrimination and colonial domination. As the Member States held the ultimate responsibility for the implementation of United Nations resolutions, it requested all States, directly or through action in the specialized agencies and international institutions, to support the peoples who were fighting to be free. Finally, it requested the co-operation of the Economic and Social Council and the Secretary-General in co-ordinating and facilitating the activities of the specialized agencies and reporting thereon to the General Assembly.

4. Mr. DEBRAH (Ghana), speaking on behalf of the Afro-Asian group, said that draft resolution A/C.4/L.882 crystallized the views which had emerged during the debate on the measures which should be taken by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations in order to implement the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. One of the disastrous consequences of colonialism was the problem of the refugees, which was referred to in the fifth preambular paragraph. The object of the sixth preambular paragraph was to show the national liberation movements that the United Nations had heeded their call for help and was ready to translate its support for General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) into practical action. It also underlined the urgent need for action by UNESCO, WHO, FAO and the International Red Cross to alleviate the sufferings of the refugees.

5. Operative paragraph 1 recognized the principle that the specialized agencies, the International Atomic Energy Agency and the international institutions associated with the United Nations had an obligation to co-operate fully with the United Nations in achieving the objectives of resolution 1514 (XV) and to ensure that their activities did not run counter to General Assembly resolutions. Paragraph 2 expressed the General Assembly's appreciation of the co-operation of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the specialized agencies in that respect. Paragraph 3 referred to the urgent needs of the oppressed peoples in Southern Rhodesia and in Territories under Portuguese administration. The purpose of paragraph 4 was to deprive South Africa and Portugal of all assistance. Paragraph 5 urged all States to make an effective contribution to help achieve freedom and self-determination for all peoples, and paragraph 6 and 7 requested the Economic and Social Council and the Secretary-General to assist the specialized agencies and international institutions concerned to take steps to implement the relevant United Nations resolutions. It was to be hoped that in that way there would no longer be any confusion in people's minds as to the role of each agency or institution. The recommendations of the draft resolution were the logical consequence of the principles laid down in the Charter, and their aim was to enhance the Organization's prestige and authority and stimulate the decolonization process.

6. Mr. GAMIL (Yemen) thanked the Bulgarian delegation for proposing the inclusion of the item in the General Assembly's agenda and pointed out that the right of peoples to self-determination was laid down in the Charter and in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The United Nations had undertaken to help oppressed peoples; and it was therefore logical that the specialized agencies and international institutions should be asked to co-operate. Some of them, it was true, had taken steps to implement resolution 1514 (XV), but others were still giving assistance to the colonial Powers which had categorically refused to implement the United Nations resolutions. Accordingly the draft resolution expressly urged the specialized agencies and the international institutions to refrain from helping the colonial Powers which persisted in their policy of oppression. The achievement of inde-

pendence by the colonial countries and Territories was the responsibility of the entire international community; hence operative paragraph 5. The Committee's discussion on the item showed the vital importance of the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV) by the specialized agencies and international institutions concerned, and the time had come for the activities of all the organizations of the United Nations family to be harmonized.

7. The CHAIRMAN announced that Burundi, Guinea, Pakistan and Rwanda had asked to be added to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.882/Add.1).

AGENDA ITEM 70

Question of Oman (*continued*):*

- (a) 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/6700/Rev.1, chap. XIII; A/C.4/L.880 and Add.1);
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General (A/6909)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION A/C.4/L.880 AND ADD.1 (concluded)

8. Mr. HOPE (United Kingdom) felt it necessary to reaffirm his Government's attitude on that question. At the time the item had been included in the General Assembly's agenda, his delegation had stated that Oman was a sovereign State and that the Fourth Committee and the Special Committee had no right, in consequence, to deal with the State's domestic affairs. The relations between the United Kingdom and the Sultanate of Muscat and Oman were the normal ones existing between two sovereign States, and the arguments advanced during the debate showed complete ignorance of the situation. The Sultanate of Muscat and Oman was not and never had been a British colony; there was an agreement between the two countries whereby the United Kingdom maintained two air staging posts which were used exclusively for supply purposes; there were no British forces stationed in that country, apart from some fifty British officers and men serving on secondment who could in no sense be regarded as mercenaries. Various United Nations Member States had been maintaining international or consular relations with Oman for a considerable time, and their number was increasing. He objected to the inclusion in the Special Committee's report (A/6700/Rev.1, chap. XIII) of the Trucial Sheikdoms, which had nothing to do with Oman. He also repudiated the charges against the United Kingdom in draft resolution A/C.4/L.880, and said he would vote against it, whether the draft was voted on as a whole or paragraph by paragraph. Consideration of the item in the Fourth Committee was out of order, he added.

9. The CHAIRMAN announced that Congo (Brazzaville) and Cyprus had added their names to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.880/Add.1).

10. Mr. MAKKAWI (Lebanon) said that his delegation had co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.4/L.880 and Add.1 on the ground that the Territory of

*Resumed from the 1740th meeting.

Oman was not an independent sovereign country and that it came under the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The United Kingdom representative had enlarged at the preceding session on the principle of self-determination and its application, and had maintained that if it were not applied in Gibraltar, the provisions of the Charter would be discredited; and the week before, the United Kingdom delegation had announced that the Kuria Muria Island had passed over to Oman in accordance with that same principle. It was out of the question, however, to apply a particular criterion to one part of the world and not to another, and the United Kingdom should not deny the Omani people's right to self-determination. Oman's supposed sovereignty and independence was a façade which concealed the real situation in the interests of the administering Power.

11. His delegation considered that the United Nations and the specialized agencies should give Oman the help it needed, and hoped that the draft resolution would be approved by the Committee.

12. Mr. AL-DAOUD (Iraq) said he had listened with close attention to the United Kingdom representative's statement on Muscat and Oman. Early in the eighteenth century, the United Kingdom, in order to safeguard the route to India, had concluded a series of treaties with Oman and the Trucial Skeikhdoms which gave it privileges and provided that the Sultans were not to establish relations with other States to grant them concessions. Throughout the nineteenth century, Muscat had been used as a naval base to which British ships repaired. In point of fact, the Sultanate of Muscat and Oman was a victim of occupation and exploitation, and was completely subject to British control. The Territory contained British bases, and there were British advisers and even British Ministers in the Cabinet. Real power was exercised by the British Resident, who directed the Territory's external affairs. In the words of the well-known historian Arnold Toynbee, British policy in most of the southern Arabian States had consisted of maintaining in power rulers who became ever more unpopular, and hence ever more dependent on British support, as their subjects made progress in acquiring education and developing a modern outlook. He wondered how many of those rulers would retain their thrones if British support was withdrawn from them. When the United Kingdom granted nominal independence to an unpopular and unrepresentative sovereign and kept him in power by the force of British arms, that so-called independence was simply a sham.

13. Turning to the conclusions set forth in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Oman,^{1/} with particular reference to paragraphs 693 and 694, he contended that it was only right after independence had been granted to Aden that the population of southern Arabia should achieve freedom, and he hoped that the United Kingdom would quit the region at an early date.

14. Mr. LADGHAM (Tunisia) said that Oman was not a protectorate in the usual sense of the term, but a special protectorate in the British style—in

other words, it exercised none of the functions relating to its foreign relations, although in the final analysis the Sultan was empowered to sign treaties—something he had not been able to do earlier. The Sultan's power was challenged by the Imam and by the people, according to what the petitioners had told the Committee. The United Kingdom representative had declared that the Sultanate was independent and that he could not speak on the latter's behalf but in fact he had done so, thus creating a situation without precedent in the annals of the United Nations. Under the agreements concluded between the Sultan and the United Kingdom Government, the former delegated a large part of his sovereignty to the latter. Oman's position could be compared with that which obtained in Tunisia during the French Protectorate; it was clear that the Sultanate constituted a typical case of protectorate status from the standpoint of international law. The reason why the question was being considered in the context of the Fourth Committee was that the problem was political, not legal: the population was rebelling against an oppressive régime, against the presence of British officers in the army and against the military bases, and on all those grounds the Tunisian delegation maintained that Oman was a disguised protectorate.

15. In conclusion, he hoped that the draft resolution would be supported by the majority of the Committee members.

16. The CHAIRMAN was anxious, before proceeding to the vote on the draft resolution, to give the floor to representatives who wished to explain their vote.

17. Mr. ADUKO (Ivory Coast) explained that his delegation was traditionally opposed to all forms of colonization and fully endorsed the principles guiding the sponsors of the draft resolution, but first and foremost it respected the Charter as the basis for all the Committee's recommendations and decisions, and did not feel that it should support an idea which was at variance with the principles of the Charter. Paragraph 6 of the draft resolution touched on the domestic policy of the State, and that, to his mind, constituted intervention incompatible with the Ivory Coast's foreign policy and the objectives of the Charter. His delegation accordingly had reservations in respect of paragraph 6, and also of paragraph 8 (a), for it felt that only an independent and sovereign Government of Oman could raise the question of the military bases. The Ad Hoc Committee on Oman was not in a position to affirm unequivocally whether Oman was an independent country, a protectorate or a British colony, and with that question in doubt, he felt that it would be better to abstain. Furthermore, the question was one of a military nature forming part of the problem of disarmament whose examination the General Assembly, in agreement with the Security Council, had entrusted to the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament which was meeting in Geneva, and it was therefore not the Fourth Committee's responsibility. Subject to those reservations, his delegation would vote in favour of the rest of the draft resolution.

18. Mr. CARRASQUERO (Venezuela) said that his delegation, in accordance with its support of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and its defence of all

^{1/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Nineteenth Session, Annexes, annex No. 16, document A/5846.

peoples subjected to colonial domination, would vote in favour of the draft resolution. It wished, however, to express its reservations with regard to operative paragraph 6. If a separate vote was asked for, his delegation would abstain on sub-paragraph (a) of operative paragraph 8. Venezuela was opposed to the establishment of new military bases, which would prolong the existence of the colonial régime, but it thought that the elimination of the existing bases was a matter for other organs of the United Nations. He would vote in favour of the rest of the draft resolution.

19. Mr. COLLAS (Greece) said that his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.880 and Add.1 because it reaffirmed the inalienable right of the Territory to self-determination and independence. The Greek delegation thought that the debate on the question of Oman in the Committee had been useful and constructive, in that it had allowed of the expression of different points of view and of the opinions of the majority of the international community. He wished, however, to express his reservations with regard to operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution; if that paragraph was put to a vote separately he would abstain because he did not think that that provision reflected the facts.

20. Mr. CASTILLO ARRIOLA (Guatemala) stated that, in conformity with his Government's traditional support of the liberation of peoples and the elimination of colonialism, he would vote in favour of the draft resolution. He thought, however, that operative paragraph 6 and sub-paragraph (a) of operative paragraph 8 violated the principle of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of States.

21. Mr. RAOELINA (Madagascar) said that his delegation approved of most of the draft resolution, which was in line with the ideas and principles of his country. While he would support the draft resolution as a whole, he had reservations with regard to operative paragraph 6 and sub-paragraph (a) of operative paragraph 8, because he thought that it was not for the Committee, but for other organs of the United Nations, to deal with the question of military bases and installations.

22. Mr. CUEVA TAMARIZ (Ecuador) said that he would vote in favour of the draft resolution because he was in agreement with the general statements in it about the need to comply with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). Nevertheless, he had reservations with regard to operative paragraph 6 and sub-paragraph (a) of operative paragraph 8, because he thought that problems of a military nature were not within the competence of the Committee.

23. The CHAIRMAN put the draft resolution on the question of Oman (A/C.4/L.880 and Add.1) to the vote.

At the request of the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, the vote was taken by roll-call.

Nigeria, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian

Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ecuador, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Madagascar, Maldives Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger.

Against: Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand.

Abstaining: Sierra Leone, Thailand, Brazil, Burma, China, Colombia, Ethiopia, France, India, Iran, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Malaysia, Mexico.

Draft resolution A/C.4/L.880 and Add.1 was adopted by 70 votes to 16, with 18 abstentions.

24. Mr. CASTALDO (Italy) said that, on the basis of the relevant report of the Special Committee, Oman could not be regarded as a colonial Territory or as a protectorate and that there had been no developments since the publication of the report to justify those conclusions. Consequently, the Italian delegation had been unable to support the draft resolution.

25. Mr. GARCIA (United States of America) explained that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution because the United States had maintained relations with the Sultanate of Muscat and Oman since 1833. In the light of those relations, which were based on the principle of equality and had been agreed upon by two sovereign States without the intervention of any other Power, the United States could have no doubt about the sovereignty and independence of Muscat and Oman and considered that the decision to take up that item was questionable from both the legal and the moral points of view.

26. Mr. ASIROGLU (Turkey) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution, but he would have abstained on operative paragraph 6 if that paragraph had been put to the vote separately.

27. Miss BENNATTON (Honduras) expressed her delegation's reservations with regard to operative paragraph 6 and sub-paragraph (a) of operative paragraph 8, which it did not consider appropriate.

AGENDA ITEM 69

Question of Fiji: 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 (continued) (A/6700/Rev.1, chap. VII)

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

28. Mr. PEJIC (Yugoslavia), referring to the critical remarks that the administering Power had made at the

1738th meeting with respect to the decisions on Fiji adopted by the General Assembly, the Fourth Committee and the Special Committee, maintained that those decisions, and especially General Assembly resolution 2185 (XXI), took into account the complex situation in the Territory and outlined a formula that could lead the people of Fiji to self-determination and independence in the shortest possible time. The resolution to which he had referred reaffirmed the right of the people of Fiji to freedom, called for general elections in accordance with the principle of "one man, one vote", the fixing of an early date for independence and the abolition of all discriminatory measures. In adopting that resolution the Assembly had borne in mind the fact that if they were free and independent the different communities of Fiji would be in a better position to attain political, economic and social harmony and to promote the further stable development of the country.

29. Even a cursory analysis of the methods proposed by the United Kingdom representative for the promotion of social harmony in Fiji and for bringing the Territory to independence raised doubts with regard to their effectiveness. The electoral system did not favour the great majority of the population, made up of indigenous Fijians and inhabitants of Indian origin, but the European majority, and thus

ran counter to the basic democratic principle of "one man, one vote". That discrimination was also reflected in the composition of the Council of Ministers of Fiji, four of whose eight members were European, three were indigenous Fijians and one was of Indian origin. It could scarcely be expected that that system would guarantee harmony among the different communities in the Territory.

30. Moreover, it was important to remember that the role of the Governor was an important element in appraising the situation in the Territory and in the exercise of full power by the people of Fiji to exercise full authority. The broad jurisdiction of the Governor was a considerable limitation on the powers of the elected organs to adopt decisions and it hampered the progress of the Fijians towards self-determination.

31. His delegation did not deny that progress had been made in Fiji, but it maintained that that progress had been too slow and that if it continued at the same pace the people of Fiji would remain in their present position for a long time.

32. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that the administering Power would change its negative attitude towards the sending of a visiting mission to Fiji.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.