

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FIFTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



947th PLENARY MEETING

Wednesday, 14 December 1960,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 87:

Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (concluded) . 1271

President: Mr. Frederick H. BOLAND (Ireland).

AGENDA ITEM 87

Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (concluded)

1. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to vote on the various proposals that are before it in connexion with agenda item 87.

2. I propose to submit to the vote first the draft declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples submitted by the USSR in document A/4502.

3. I propose, secondly, to submit to the vote the amendments submitted by Guatemala [A/L.325] to the draft resolution submitted by forty-three African and Asian countries [A/L.323 and Add.1-6].

4. Thirdly, I propose to put to the vote the amendments submitted by the USSR [A/L.328] to the forty-three-Power draft resolution.

5. Fourthly, I propose to put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by forty-three African and Asian countries [A/L.323 and Add.1-6].

6. That leaves only the draft resolution submitted by Honduras [A/L.324/Rev.2]. In connexion with this document, I have been informed by the head of the delegation of Honduras that he does not desire that this draft resolution should be submitted to the vote.

7. I call on the representative of Indonesia on a point of order.

8. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia): It was not the intention of my delegation to explain its vote before the voting takes place, but we believe that an explanation of paragraph 6 in the draft resolution submitted by the forty-three Powers may persuade the representative of Guatemala to withdraw his amendments to this draft resolution. In fact, my delegation requests the representative of Guatemala to withdraw his amendments for the following reasons. Allow me to read paragraph 6:

"Any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations."

9. When drafting this document my delegation was one of the sponsors of paragraph 6, and in bringing it into the draft resolution we had in mind that the con-

tinuation of Dutch colonialism in West Irian is a partial disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of our country.

10. As we have often explained here, the Dutch are using the right of self-determination—in fact, they are misusing it—to justify the continuation of their colonial activities in West Irian. We do not consider it necessary to explain this again, particularly as we have already done so in our statement during the general debate on this item [936th meeting]. It is for this reason that we consider that the idea expressed in the Guatemalan amendments is already fully expressed in paragraph 6 of our draft resolution, and it is for the same reason that we consider that the territories and peoples which the Guatemalan delegation had in mind have been taken into consideration in our paragraph 6.

11. Since I am on this rostrum and attempting to persuade the representative of Guatemala to withdraw his amendments, I should like to take this opportunity of explaining our vote on the draft resolution and on the amendments...

12. The PRESIDENT: I am very reluctant indeed to interrupt the representative of Indonesia, but I gave him the floor on a point of order and, as I announced at the end of the meeting this morning, the list of speakers, including those wishing to give explanations of vote, was finally closed this morning. I should like very much to be able to allow the representative of Indonesia to continue, but I am afraid that, on the basis of the procedure which we have adopted, it is no longer open to me to do so.

13. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia): I apologize. I hope that my effort to persuade the representative of Guatemala may be considered as a point of order.

14. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Guatemala on a point of order.

15. Mr. HERRARTE (Guatemala) (translated from Spanish): I have just heard the statement of the representative of Indonesia, who requested my delegation to withdraw its amendments [A/L.325] to the forty-three-Power draft resolution [A/L.323 and Add.1-6].

16. As a matter of fact, we heard this morning several of the sponsors of the draft resolution giving their interpretation of paragraph 6. We fully accept this interpretation and, although we would have liked to have the principle of territorial integrity more clearly expressed, as it is in the text contained in our amendments, I raise no objection and will ask the President, on behalf of my delegation, not to put our amendments to the vote.

17. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Ghana on a point of order.

18. Mr. QUAISON-SACKEY (Ghana): I must apologize for taking the time of the Assembly to raise a point

of order, but I am moved by the hope that delegations who submitted amendments to our draft resolution might find their way clear to withdrawing them, and I appeal to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics also to withdraw its amendments [A/L.328], particularly its proposed paragraph 8.

19. I make this appeal because I find that on reading that particular paragraph in conjunction with our paragraph 5, the two do not read very well. In paragraph 5 of our draft declaration [A/L.323 and Add.1-6] we say:

"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 ...".

20. Paragraph 8 proposed by the USSR (A/L.328) calls upon the colonial Powers to "enter into negotiations". The same idea is there. One says "transfer all powers"; the other says "enter into negotiations". The only novel aspect of their paragraph is the date which they have fixed. I think those of us who took part in the drafting of the African-Asian draft know very well the various views expressed before paragraph 5 was put in. Therefore on the basis that we shall be voting on the draft declaration of the Soviet Union without any amendment, we feel that all amendments to our draft resolution should be withdrawn.

21. Therefore, in that spirit, may I appeal to the representative of the Soviet Union to withdraw his amendment.

22. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The Soviet delegation has already explained the reasons why we considered it essential to introduce the amendments to which the representative of Ghana has just referred. In our statement we emphasized that our motive was to facilitate the adoption at this session of a resolution that would basically settle this question of the elimination of colonialism. Accordingly, we did not submit any amendments to the actual paragraphs of the resolution introduced by the forty-three African and Asian countries, precisely in order to facilitate the positive solution of this problem.

23. As regards the additional paragraphs proposed in our document, and, in particular, the additional paragraph 8, to which the representative of Ghana referred, we consider that addition absolutely essential because the main issue now is how to implement this decision on the liquidation of colonialism and the liberation of dependent and colonial peoples, and the paragraph in question contains an effective indication of how to solve this problem and sets a time-limit for its successful solution.

24. We know, of course, that there is no one single point of view on this question, even among the African and Asian countries themselves; we believe, however, that the absence of such a single point of view will not make it difficult for those countries that regard the elimination of colonialism as an urgent and pressing problem to vote for the proposal introduced in the amendment to which I have just referred since, in the last analysis, the representative of Ghana, when he spoke here expressing his views, the views of his Government, said that the Government of Ghana considered that the deadline for the completion of this process of liquidating the colonial system should be the beginning of 1962.

25. Thus, between our proposal and the view defended by the Government of Ghana there are no major differences of substance. Of course, there are other points of view too, but I believe that the voting should disclose the positions of all countries and reveal who is interested in the speedy elimination of the colonial system. We regret, therefore, that we shall not be able to comply with the Ghanaian representative's request and shall press for a vote on both our amendments.

26. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to the vote. The Assembly will have before it three documents which I propose to submit to the vote in the following order: first, the draft declaration proposed by the Soviet Union and contained in document A/4502; secondly, the amendments submitted by the Soviet Union [A/L.328] to the forty-three-Power draft resolution; and finally, the forty-three-Power draft resolution itself [A/L.323 and Add.1-6].

27. Coming to the first vote which is the vote on the draft declaration submitted by the Soviet Union, as representatives may remember, a request was made this morning [946th meeting] to have the vote on this draft declaration in parts: first, a separate vote on the part beginning with the words, "... the States Members of the United Nations solemnly proclaim the following demands:" and including the numbered paragraphs 1, 2 and 3. Then a vote will be taken on the rest of the draft declaration, and finally a vote on the draft declaration as a whole.

28. I now put to the vote the part of the draft declaration submitted by the Soviet Union [A/4502] beginning with the words, "... the States Members of the United Nations solemnly proclaim the following demands:" and including the following paragraphs numbered 1, 2 and 3.

29. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Mexico, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Morocco, Nepal, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Togo, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali.

Against: Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, France, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg.

Abstaining: Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Senegal, Somalia, Tunisia, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Austria, Bolivia, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Gabon, Guatemala, Haiti, Iran, Ivory Coast, Laos, Madagascar.

That part of the declaration was rejected by 35 votes to 32, with 30 abstentions.

30. The PRESIDENT: I will now put to the Assembly the rest of the Soviet draft declaration. I think that the request for a roll-call covers the declaration as a whole, so I propose to put this part to a vote by roll-call also.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Albania, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Niger, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Afghanistan.

Against: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Abstaining: Austria, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Finland, Gabon, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Libya, Mexico, Nepal, Nigeria, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia.

The rest of the declaration was rejected by 43 votes to 25, with 29 abstentions.

31. The PRESIDENT: As neither part of the draft declaration has received the approval of the Assembly, it is perhaps unnecessary to submit to the Assembly the draft declaration as a whole.

32. I now propose to put to the vote the amendments submitted by the USSR [A/L.328] to the forty-three-Power draft resolution. Separate roll-call votes have been requested on each of the paragraphs in document A/L.328. Therefore, I now put to the vote the first of these two paragraphs, paragraph 8.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Indonesia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Guinea, Hungary.

Against: Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Laos, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Costa Rica, Denmark,

El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland.

Abstaining: Indonesia, Nepal, Nigeria, Paraguay, Senegal, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Leopoldville), Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, Ghana, Haiti, India.

The paragraph was rejected by 47 votes to 29, with 22 abstentions.

33. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to vote on paragraph 9, which is the second amendment proposed in document A/L.328.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Haiti, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Hungary, India, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroun, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea.

Against: Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Greece.

Abstaining: Haiti, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Laos, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Senegal, Upper Volta, Argentina, Austria, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chile, Congo (Brazzaville), Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Gabon, Guatemala.

The result of the vote was 41 in favour, 35 against, and 22 abstentions.

The paragraph was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

34. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now proceed to vote on the forty-three-Power draft resolution [A/L.323 and Add.1-6].

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Haiti, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroun, Canada, Central Afri-

can Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Portugal, Spain, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Dominican Republic, France.

The draft resolution was adopted by 89 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.^{1/}

35. The PRESIDENT: A number of representatives have asked to explain their votes after the voting. I give the floor to the first of these, the representative of Canada.

36. Mr. NESBITT (Canada): I wish to explain the vote of the Canadian delegation on the forty-three-Power draft resolution on the granting of independence to colonial countries.

37. The Canadian delegation welcomed the initiative taken by the sponsors of this draft resolution, which we think a very good one and for which we were very pleased to vote. We are inclined indeed to congratulate the United Nations itself upon an achievement which should give encouragement to our Member Governments and peoples at a moment when perhaps the United Nations can do with a breath of encouragement. It is an event worth noting, when forty-three nations, some with, some without a history of colonialism, agree upon the content of a resolution of this breadth and depth in an area by no means devoid of controversy.

38. In a resolution of this length and importance there are inevitably passages which one might wish on first reading to have seen differently worded. For this reason, we have cause to be grateful to the several sponsors who took the trouble of explaining or interpreting various clauses and expressions. We were pleased to hear from some of the sponsors, for example, that a condemnation of all colony-holding States in the past and present is not intended. Canada would belie its own history, its history under two colonizing States over a period of 200 years, if we were not to affirm that the partnership and harmony of one country and another, even though at first not in terms of mutual equality, must often result in benefit to both. A dozen speakers have given this testimony in the present debate.

39. When, however, that harmony vanishes, the benefits fail, and then the whole of the old colonial system must perish, as it is perishing before our eyes.

40. Nevertheless, history also has its rights and prerogatives, of which no power on earth can deprive it. If interrupted too recklessly, too precipitately, in its course, history takes its own revenge. We do not need to look far to see examples of this.

41. We note with care, therefore, what this resolution says; it says: let all colonies be liberated. It does not say, and several of its sponsors have pointed out that it does not mean: let all colonies and territories, regardless of their circumstances, regardless of their

readiness, regardless even of their own wishes, be liberated at this moment. The resolution does not try to force any people against its own wishes and against its own best interests into any particular form of government or into any prescribed relationship in reference to any other country. Nor does it seek to forbid to any territory the right to maintain a connexion with another territory if it desires to maintain that connexion. To do these things would, in fact, be contrary to the principles already recommended by the Fourth Committee for adoption in this Assembly, following consideration by that Committee of the report of the Special Committee of Six on the Transmission of Information under Article 73 e of the Charter [A/4526].

42. In voting for this draft resolution, Canada is glad to have had the opportunity of joining the sponsors who have put forward this resolution and the many speakers who have supported it and clarified its terms, as well as those administering Powers who have demonstrated their compliance with its principles.

43. I should now like to add a word of explanation in connexion with the vote which the Canadian delegation cast against the Soviet draft declaration in document A/4502. The sponsors of the African-Asian draft resolution [A/L.323 and Add.1-6] made it very clear in their statements before the Assembly that they wished this matter of the independence of colonies and Trust Territories to remain completely divorced from the great Powers' rivalry and the political objectives of any of the great Powers. We had hoped that the delegation of the USSR would have taken this evident and laudable desire of the sponsors into consideration and refrained from pressing their declaration to a vote, couched as it is in highly inflammatory terms. At the very least, we had hoped that the Soviet delegation would not have seized this as an appropriate opportunity to wage propaganda warfare.

44. Contrary to these reasonable expectations, the Soviet delegation, in every intervention, has attacked the administering Powers, always extravagantly, often savagely, and in nearly every case unjustly. Under these circumstances, we now feel free to recall to the mind of the Assembly certain words spoken by the Prime Minister of Canada from this rostrum at the beginning of this session. Mr. Diefenbaker invited the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, who then stood before us as the self-proclaimed liberator of the colonial peoples, "... to give to those nations under his domination the right of free elections—to give them the opportunity to determine the kind of government they want under genuinely free conditions." [871st meeting, para. 197.] By doing so, Mr. Khrushchev could show that he really desired "the complete and final elimination of the colonial régime in all its forms and manifestations". These circumstances constitute part, but by no means all, of the reasons why the Canadian delegation voted against the Soviet draft declaration.

Mr. Hasan (Pakistan), Vice-President, took the Chair.

45. Mr. ORMSBY-GORE (United Kingdom): My delegation has listened to the long debate on this item with the greatest attention, for it is a debate on a matter of vital concern to us. An important part of the obligations we owe to the international community concerns the remaining overseas territories under our administration. These obligations are covered by two

^{1/}The delegation of Dahomey, which was absent when the vote was taken, subsequently informed the President that it would have voted in favour of the draft resolution (see paragraph 99 below).

sections of the United Nations Charter, different in character but with the same objectives—Chapter XI, covering Non-Self-Governing Territories, and Chapters XII and XIII, covering Trust Territories.

46. The debate has shown that there is widespread understanding and indeed appreciation here in the United Nations of the manner in which we are discharging those obligations. The degree to which the peoples of these territories, with our help, can succeed in creating new nations, undivided, strong and genuinely independent, is, we believe, crucial both to their own future happiness and to the progress and well-being of mankind as a whole. It is with this in mind that we have approached this debate.

47. Many of the sponsors of the forty-three-Power draft resolution, which has just been adopted by the Assembly, have made it clear by what they have said in the debate that their basic objectives are the same as ours. They are indeed the objectives set forth in the Charter of the United Nations. For this reason we would like to have been able to vote for the declaration, especially since, as some of the sponsors have said, it is intended to be universal in its application, to bring within its scope those forms of—and I use the words of the resolution—"alien subjugation, domination and exploitation", the practitioners of which try to exempt themselves from the strictures of world public opinion.

48. But in a matter as important as this, we have felt bound to look most closely at the wording of the resolution, and, to our regret, we came to the conclusion that its wording in certain respects was not such that we could support it. We would have been prepared in a matter which concerns us so closely to have had discussions on the drafting with the sponsors. We believe that had this been done we could have contributed some suggestions from our own experience which would not have derogated from the basic purpose of the draft and could have, at the same time, made it possible for us to accept it.

49. The majority of the peoples now covered under Chapters XI, XII and XIII of the Charter live in territories under United Kingdom administration. We have a special responsibility, therefore, to ensure that our position on the matters covered by the declaration is not misunderstood. For example, paragraph 1 of the declaration is, I must assume, simply not applicable to the people in these territories for which we are responsible, since it refers to a system of alien domination which is contrary to the United Nations Charter, whereas the United Kingdom administration of dependent territories is conducted strictly in accord with the relevant provisions of the Charter. I wish that the sponsors could have made this more explicit in the text of paragraph 1. As it is, I think that it may be open to misinterpretation.

50. There are other paragraphs in the declaration which cannot be held to apply to territories for which the United Kingdom is responsible. For example, the seventh paragraph of the preamble reads:

"Convinced that the continued existence of colonialism prevents the development of international economic co-operation, impedes the social, cultural and economic development of dependent peoples...".

The policies which the United Kingdom Government is pursuing in connexion with the territories under

its administration are framed strictly in accord with Article 73 of the Charter. Under this we are obliged to ensure the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the dependent peoples and to promote co-operation with international bodies with a view to the practical achievement of these purposes. This we do, and the manner in which we do it is well known and is exhaustively examined by various organs of the United Nations.

51. All delegations here are aware, for example, of the participation of territories under United Kingdom administration in the work of such bodies as the Economic Commission for Africa. The development of inspiring examples of international economic co-operation of this kind has not been impeded by the fact that these territories are not yet fully independent. Equally, social, cultural and economic development is going steadily forward in the territories under our administration through the joint efforts of the peoples concerned and ourselves.

52. My delegation regrets the criticism implied, in this and other paragraphs, of the policies which we are carrying out in accordance with our Charter obligations. We also feel that the declaration might in several places have laid more stress on the positive responsibilities of those who still administer dependent territories. For instance, we accept that the inadequacy of preparedness in the various fields mentioned in paragraph 3 should not serve as a pretext—and by pretext I mean what one of the sponsors defined as "fabricated grounds of unpreparedness"—for delaying independence. But we also share the views of those sponsors who urged that constructive steps must be taken in the political, economic, social and educational fields as a preparation for independence in order that independence, when it comes, can be effective and have real meaning. We think that the declaration could have been improved if these constructive aspects could have found a place in it.

53. On the other hand, paragraph 2 of the declaration seems to my delegation to be out of place in this context. The United Kingdom, of course, subscribes wholeheartedly to the principle of self-determination set out in the Charter itself, and we feel that we have done as much to implement this principle during the past fifteen years as any delegation in this Assembly. Nevertheless, members of the Assembly will be familiar with the difficulties which have arisen in connexion with the discussion of the draft International Covenants on Human Rights and in defining the right to self-determination in a universally acceptable form. These difficulties have not yet been finally resolved by the Assembly, and we feel that it might have been better not to make the attempt now in a rather different context.

54. Some of the sponsors have described paragraph 5 of the declaration as the key paragraph and have emphasized that what this means is that immediate steps should be taken for the necessary preparation for the final transfer of power to the inhabitants of the territories and that there should be no deliberate procrastination and delay in this. The United Kingdom delegation entirely agrees with these sentiments, although we wish that this paragraph too might have been expressed more clearly. The method and timing of progress towards independence must be a matter for the people themselves to work out together with the administering Power. The circumstances of every

territory are different, and there is no one pattern which can be imposed from outside upon them all. In this respect, the speech of the representative of Australia [933rd meeting] describing the problems facing New Guinea is worth close attention, particularly by those who, like the representative of the Soviet Union, have used the debate for the repetition of outworn political slogans and have revealed an astonishing ignorance of the whole subject.

55. For all the reasons I have mentioned, my delegation abstained on this draft resolution. Nevertheless, I should like to say that we do regard it as a considerable achievement that forty-three delegations should have been able to agree upon the text of a declaration upon so controversial a matter as this. We should like to pay tribute to those delegations which we know have worked hard and long to produce a text which could command as wide a support as this one has. We should especially like to congratulate them on having produced a text which, in spite of the imperfections which we still see in it, has succeeded in emancipating the subject of the granting of independence to all colonial countries and peoples from the tendentious and unconstructive language of the Soviet draft declaration which was rejected by this Assembly. I do not think that the Assembly would expect me to comment on the extraordinary collection of falsehoods in the speech of the representative of the Soviet Union on a number of occasions, and particularly on 7 December. Anyone familiar with the political situation in East Africa, for example, will know how completely he misrepresented it. The aspirations of the people of Africa are not what Mr. Zorin says they are and he cannot speak for them. The amendments that his delegation submitted again showed how ill qualified he was to speak on their behalf and how much he has to learn of the real problems involved.

56. We are proud of the work which we are doing in co-operation with the peoples of the territories for which we are responsible, helping them by every means at our command to create new nations, prosperous and free. We look to the future not to the past, a future in which new and strong nations will take their places in the world community without fear of internal strife or outside pressure.

57. In the course of this debate one of the sponsors of the draft resolution referred with approval to a paragraph in the report of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories which concludes with the following sentence:

"The Committee is confident that the knowledge that their ultimate destiny is for them to choose, will encourage the inhabitants of the Territories to multiply many times their own efforts to build a new and prosperous future for themselves during a period of smooth, constructive and purposeful transition."
[A/4371, part two, para. 25.]

58. We share that confidence and we are grateful to all those Members of the General Assembly who share it also and who have shown understanding of the policies which the United Kingdom is following to bring about this new and prosperous future with all speed.

59. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands): My delegation voted for the draft resolution which was sponsored by forty-three African and Asian countries [A/L.323 and Add.1-6]. We did so because we agree with the principles it contains, which are also the principles by

which we are guided in the administration of the only Non-Self-Governing Territory still under our administration.

60. Our agreement with the principles of the resolution does not mean that we are entirely happy about all of its wording. Although we are convinced, for instance, that independence will foster the development of international economic co-operation and will promote social, economic and educational development, we do not consider that the mere fact of dependence necessarily impedes development. As administering Power we are doing all we can to promote these various forms of development in Netherlands New Guinea, as is indeed our duty under the terms of Article 73 e of the Charter.

61. I could give some more examples of not fully accurate phrasing, but the fact that we voted for the resolution as a whole proves that we did not consider them of decisive importance and so I shall not revert to them.

62. What we cannot accept, however, is the inference drawn by one speaker in the debate from paragraph 6 of the declaration. That paragraph is a reaffirmation of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the United Nations Charter. As such it naturally has our full support and approval. But we fail to see by what strange kind of reasoning the representative of Indonesia could possibly deduce from the terms of paragraph 6 of the declaration that the right of self-determination should be granted to all peoples of the world except only to the people living in the western half of the island of New Guinea, which is Netherlands New Guinea. Such a contention is contrary to the Charter and most certainly finds no basis in the resolution.

63. Mr. HERRARTE (Guatemala) (translated from Spanish): In supporting the draft resolution of the African-Asian Powers [A/L.323 and Add.1-6], my delegation had introduced the amendment contained in document A/L.325 to the effect that the principle of the self-determination of peoples may in no case impair the right of territorial integrity of any State or its right to the recovery of territory. This reservation seemed to be absolutely desirable since there are many territories disputed or claimed by other States as an integral part of their respective countries which are improperly held by colonial Powers, and in such disputes the solution cannot run counter to the principle of self-determination, as that would infringe the other very important principle of a country's territorial integrity.

64. It is true that paragraph 6 of the resolution contains a positive statement to the effect that "any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations". However, my delegation thought it appropriate to make its point of view clearer, as is set out in the amendments already mentioned. Nevertheless, my delegation made no objection to withdrawing its amendments in view of the statements made by several of the sponsors in interpreting paragraph 6 and the request made by the representative of Indonesia, on the understanding that the rights it was seeking to safeguard would be duly protected by paragraph 6.

65. We are extremely gratified that the draft resolution of the African and Asian countries has been

approved by such a large majority. In any case my delegation wishes to state that the adoption of the resolution cannot in any way affect the legitimate rights that Guatemala has been maintaining against the United Kingdom regarding the Guatemalan territory of Belize. The occupation of this territory is no more than a sequel to the old British piracy practised on the coasts of Central America and merely represents the triumph of might over right.

66. I must on this occasion place on record the fact that, at the San Francisco Conference, Guatemala expressly reserved its rights when the international trusteeship system was discussed^{2/} and also during the discussion concerning reports from countries administering non-self-governing territories. It has restated these reservations in this Assembly, in the Trusteeship Council and in various United Nations committees when it was necessary.

67. The Republic of Guatemala has maintained the same attitude at the various inter-American conferences that have dealt with the abolition of colonialism, an idea to which it has given its warmest and most enthusiastic support. At the Chapultepec Conference in 1945, when the American States endorsed the principles of the Atlantic Charter,^{3/} Guatemala also entered a formal reservation^{4/} to the effect that the principle of self-determination could not affect its right of territorial integrity as regards the problem of Belize, being a territory in dispute.

68. Consequently, my delegation maintains that the resolution adopted will not affect territories which are the subject of dispute or litigation.

69. Mr. PERERA (Ceylon): The delegation of Ceylon in its intervention on 28 November [926th meeting] explained its position regarding documents A/L.323 and A/4502. Today the delegation of Ceylon has voted for both parts of the Soviet draft declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. We agree in toto with every word that is stated in the declaration of the Soviet Union and contained in document A/4502. The delegation of Ceylon abstained on the first of the Soviet amendments in document A/L.328 to the forty-three-Power African-Asian draft resolution, and we abstained for the following reasons.

70. First, in paragraph 5 of the African-Asian draft resolution we have, to some extent, covered the ground dealt with in the first paragraph of the Soviet amendments. Secondly, we abstained on the first paragraph because we found that it does not perhaps cover every possible issue that may arise in the future. I refer particularly—and this is in line with the intervention by the delegation of Ceylon on 28 November—to the fact that not only must we safeguard ourselves against the colonialist Powers that still exist in the world, but we must also safeguard the position of the colonial peoples in the event of the colonial Powers combining to continue and perpetuate colonialism. It was the view of the delegation of Ceylon that although the principle contained in the first paragraph of the amendment of the Soviet Union may be correct, what in principle may be correct does not go far enough.

71. In short, the Government of Ceylon takes a more revolutionary position regarding the substance of the first of the Soviet amendments. It is the submission of the delegation of Ceylon, in explaining our vote, that it is tantamount, to some extent, to a fetter on certain rights which all colonial peoples will have.

72. I do not wish to refer to items which are now being discussed in the First Committee of the Assembly, but I would say that any attempt made by a group of colonial Powers, or by a single colonial Power, to perpetuate colonialism would also mean that in future the right of conquest would give the peoples of those colonies the right to rebellion. In that sense, the Government of Ceylon goes further than the first paragraph proposed in document A/L.328.

73. It is for that reason that the delegation of Ceylon abstained on that paragraph. But may I say that on the principles contained therein, we are in agreement with the Soviet Union; and if colonial peoples, through their elected representatives, can negotiate with the colonial masters, or the colonial Powers, we shall welcome it. But we also act on the principle: "peacefully if we may, forcibly if we must"; in short, the principle that the right of conquest gives the right of rebellion to the people, and not merely the right to negotiate.

74. For those reasons we abstained on the first paragraph of the Soviet amendments but we voted for the second paragraph, which would have placed this question on the agenda of the sixteenth session. We did so because we feel that this is in line with what is contained in document A/4502—and here I repeat, the delegation of Ceylon accepts every word in the Soviet draft declaration—and because it is necessary to put the colonial Powers "on the spot", if I may use that expression. That is why we voted for it.

75. I take this opportunity, while explaining our vote, to say that the Government of Ceylon, through the delegation of Ceylon, expresses its gratitude to the Soviet Union for having requested the inclusion of this item in the agenda of the fifteenth session.

76. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): More than two months have passed since Mr. Khrushchev, the Head of the Soviet Government, submitted to the General Assembly for its consideration the declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples and called on all Members of the United Nations to adopt a decision on the immediate and complete elimination of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations [869th meeting].

77. That proposal proved to be a powerful means of mobilizing all anti-colonial forces and a broad discussion developed around it in which more than seventy delegations took part. Of great significance was the fact that with the exception of a very insignificant group of colonial Powers and their stooges, the great majority of delegations condemned colonialism and demanded its complete and immediate elimination. The discussion in the United Nations on the question of the liberation of all colonial countries and peoples shows that powerful forces opposed to the shameful colonial system have come into being in the world today and have joined together. At the present time the relationship of economic, political and military factors is such that the colonial Powers can now no longer maintain their colonial possessions under their domi-

^{2/}United Nations Conference on International Organization, II/4/24.

^{3/}See Final Act of the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace, Mexico City, February-March 1945 (Pan American Union, Washington, D.C., 1945), resolution XII, p. 50.

^{4/}Ibid., Declaration by Guatemala, p. 109.

nation and cannot avert the collapse of the colonial system. A situation has come about in which the peaceful elimination of the colonial system is possible. If all States, all forces that are demanding freedom and independence for the colonial peoples unite and together take action against the attempts of the colonial Powers to maintain their domination over territories and peoples not their own.

78. Taking this real relationship of forces into account, the Soviet Union took the initiative in the United Nations and called on all States to declare themselves in favour of a peaceful solution of the problem and of the adoption, within the framework of the United Nations, of measures which would help to bring about the complete elimination of the colonial system. The declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples that has just been adopted by the General Assembly is a great victory for the united front of anti-colonial forces represented in the United Nations. It is noteworthy that only eight colonial Powers—Portugal, Spain, Belgium, the Union of South Africa, Australia, the United Kingdom, France and the United States—did not approve that declaration, although they did not venture, in face of the powerful anti-colonial front, openly to oppose its endorsement. The whole world can now see who in fact is in favour of eliminating the shameful colonial system and who is opposed to it.

79. The Soviet delegation expresses its gratification that the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations have supported the fundamental provisions of the Soviet draft declaration that are reflected in the text of the declaration now approved by the General Assembly. We are happy, too, that thirty-two delegations actively supported with their votes all the operative paragraphs of the Soviet draft declaration, and that twenty-nine delegations voted in favour of the Soviet proposal for the granting of independence to all colonial countries and peoples not later than 1961.

80. The fact that forty-one delegations have deemed it necessary to place the question of the implementation of the resolution just adopted on the agenda of the sixteenth session of the General Assembly indicates that the question will inevitably come up at the sixteenth session. The whole course of the discussion on this item confirms that the Soviet Union's action in raising the question of the elimination of colonialism in the General Assembly has fully justified itself. The draft declaration submitted by the Soviet Government on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples played an effective and positive role in determining the position of delegations and in preparing the ground for the adoption of the solemn United Nations declaration on the elimination of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations. The declaration submitted by the Soviet Union is a living document of historic importance, a programme of action for the peoples of the colonial countries. It will serve as a symbol of the support of all peace-loving forces for the national-liberation movement in the colonies and will be a call to all peoples to make an end of colonialism without delay and to erase this monstrous phenomenon, this blot on the twentieth century, from the face of the earth.

81. Mr. NINCIC (Yugoslavia): I would just like to say a word in explanation of the votes my delegation has just cast on the draft resolutions that were before us.

82. My delegation has voted in favour of that part of document A/4502 which, in our view, contained the declaration proper. We abstained with regard to the rest of the document because we felt it was of an explanatory nature, and that to vote for it might well have created a precedent. That is why we did not deem it possible to accept every word of the text thus formulated, no matter how much we were in agreement with its general context. Had the document been put to the vote as a whole, we would, of course, have voted in its favour.

83. My delegation also voted in favour of the forty-three-Power draft resolution, which we felt met the basic requirements of the situation and whose overwhelming adoption a moment ago constitutes, in our view, a highly important and most welcome event.

84. We also voted in favour of the Soviet amendments to that draft resolution which, in our view, would have strengthened it quite considerably.

85. Mr. JHA (India): The declaration that has just been adopted is truly one of the landmarks in the progress of the United Nations. I believe that future historians will regard it as one of the noblest declarations, one of the noblest resolutions coming out of the United Nations; and there is no doubt that this resolution will rank perhaps as the most constructive achievement of this session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. It is a resolution which will inspire everyone, inspire the peoples who are under colonial domination, and give them hope and faith, not only in themselves but in the United Nations. We have no doubt that it will enormously expedite the processes which are working towards the liberation of dependent peoples.

86. I take the floor for just a few minutes in order to explain the voting of my delegation on the draft declaration contained in document A/4502 and on the amendments contained in document A/L.328.

87. My delegation voted for the three paragraphs of the draft declaration numbered 1, 2 and 3 in document A/4502. There was nothing in these paragraphs which was contrary to the expressed views and attitudes of the Government of India. Indeed, we found in these paragraphs all that my country has stood for ever since the inauguration of the United Nations and the views expressed by the responsible leaders and the Government of India. Therefore, we whole-heartedly supported those three paragraphs.

88. As for the rest of the document, we would like to say that we are entirely in accord with a very large part of it. Indeed, the rest of this document contains statements which are highly noble and inspiring. For example, it says:

"We all inhabit the same planet. On this planet we are born, we work, raise our children and pass on to them all we have achieved in life. And although there exist different States in the world, all men are born equal in dignity."

This is a noble statement, and there is no one—certainly not in my delegation—who would have the slightest hesitation or compunction in voting for this.

89. As I said, we are in whole-hearted agreement with most of the draft declaration, but our understanding as regards voting on a historic declaration of this nature, which goes into the formal records of the United Nations, is that if we vote for it, we subscribe

to each and every sentence of it, and we found some difficulty in doing that. We found that some parts, some statements, or perhaps the manner of expressing certain views, were such as did not accord with the traditional position and the traditional attitudes of the Government of India. We were, therefore, unable to vote in favour of it and we abstained on that part of the document.

90. Coming to the amendments contained in document [A/L.328, we abstained on the first amendment, which would have figured as paragraph 8 in the forty-three-Power draft resolution. I should like to make it clear on behalf of my delegation that we would welcome, and we do welcome, the immediate emancipation and freedom of all dependent peoples. None would be happier to see the end of the colonial system in all its forms and manifestations by the end of 1961 so that the world might become a completely free world by that date. But in the discussions that preceded the vote—very lengthy discussions and, if I may say so, very thorough discussions, which were conducted with a great sense of responsibility and of realization of the importance of this declaration—it was felt that we should strike a somewhat different line; we should keep the resolution in the form of a declaration of principles which will be a source of inspiration and guidance perennially and which can be used and cited at any time. It was felt that any circumscription of those principles by putting a target date would be somewhat out of tune with the conception that was behind that resolution.

91. Secondly, we felt that the proposed paragraph 8 in some ways—of course it was an advance in the sense that it wanted independence to be attained at the end of 1961—was some sort of limitation on the key paragraph, which is paragraph 5 of the forty-three-Power draft declaration. Paragraph 5 is very clear. It says:

"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..."

It seemed to us that the idea of negotiations embodied in the proposed paragraph 8 was in some way a limitation inasmuch as negotiations presuppose the possible introduction of some conditions or reservations. The thing behind paragraph 5—at least from the point of view of my delegation—is that there is nothing further to be done; no pretext can be advanced for delaying the freedom of dependent peoples. All that is necessary is to take immediate steps. Those steps, naturally, have to be taken in accordance with democratic practices, but the steps cannot be delayed on any ground, and no negotiations can be a ground for delaying the taking of immediate steps—and these immediate steps might even mean immediate independence, that is to say, even before the end of 1961. Therefore, while we fully appreciated the spirit behind the proposed paragraph 8, we felt, being sponsor of the forty-three-Power draft resolution, and with the thinking that went behind paragraph 5 of that text, that we should abstain on paragraph 8 as proposed in document A/L.328.

92. We had no difficulty in deciding to vote for the second Soviet amendment because we feel that the whole question cannot be left like that. The question of implementation of this resolution must come before the General Assembly at its sixteenth session in some form or other.

93. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Indonesia has asked for the floor to exercise his right of reply.

94. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia): It is not only in order to exercise our right of reply that I have taken the floor; my delegation wishes also to explain its vote on the amendments submitted by the USSR in document A/L.328.

95. My delegation participated intensively in the preparation of the forty-three-Power draft resolution. We felt that it was a happy compromise between views that were very far apart. It took us about four weeks to draft this resolution and, therefore, it is understandable that the sponsors should have some difficulty in accepting amendments. As a matter of fact, we were inclined to accept the amendments submitted by the USSR but, as I explained before, we took the position that it would not be helpful to accept any amendment to our resolution. That was also the reason why we succeeded in persuading the representative of Guatemala to withdraw his amendments.

96. Now I should like to make use of my delegation's right of reply to the representative of the Netherlands.

97. The representative of the Netherlands has tried to interpret paragraph 6 of our declaration in his own way. In fact, what he tried to do was to tell us that his delegation knew better than the forty-three sponsors of the draft resolution what their desire was in submitting this resolution. We have had some experience of Dutch masterfulness in the interpretation of resolutions and agreements. I should like to draw the attention of the Assembly to something that happened between the Netherlands and Indonesia about fifteen years ago when we concluded an agreement with the Dutch. This agreement was called the Linggadjati Agreement. In that agreement there was a provision that if the parties did not agree on its interpretation, this difference of opinion should be submitted to arbitration. At that time I was a Member of the Dutch Parliament and I experienced much astonishment that the Dutch Parliament and Government succeeded in convincing themselves that this provision of arbitration did not in fact mean anything resembling arbitration. In fact, they managed to convince themselves that while there was a provision for arbitration in the agreement, it was not necessary for them to accept arbitration.

98. This is a kind of interpretation that we know from the Netherlands. I can understand that the Netherlands could try to treat Indonesia, which was very inexperienced, this way, but I am quite surprised to see the representative of the Netherlands come to this forum and try to give his own interpretation of a resolution that has been sponsored by forty-three members of this body. Obviously, the representative of the Netherlands knows better what we wish than we ourselves. It is very difficult to characterize this, but I think we may just call it Dutch.

99. The PRESIDENT: Before I proceed with the list of speakers I have an announcement to make. The representative of Dahomey has asked me to announce his inability to attend the voting on this item, but he wishes it to be recorded that had he been present he would have voted for the forty-three-Power draft resolution [A/L.323 and Add.1-6].

100. I give the floor now to the representative of Portugal.

101. Mr. GARIN (Portugal): I wish to explain briefly the vote of my delegation. My delegation has followed with great attention the debate on colonialism which the Assembly has just concluded. Much was said from this rostrum with which my delegation is in agreement. As was stressed by many representatives during the debate, the most criticized aspects of colonialism implied the idea of race superiority, of economic exploitation, and of subjugation of peoples for ideological or political purposes. With the exception of a few delegations I am sure no one in this Assembly is a defender of such features of colonialism, and my delegation wholeheartedly shares such feelings. In this context my delegation joins others in their anxiety for the termination of that kind of new and ruthless colonialism which is found within a great State or in those nations which during the last few decades have lost their independence or which enjoy nothing but symbolic independence.

102. Also, in respect of Trust Territories or other territories in regard to which there may be international obligations, it is certainly desirable that the principles of the United Nations Charter should be implemented, due respect being paid to the particular circumstances of each case, in a way and at a time which should not be detrimental to the real interests of all concerned.

103. My delegation had carefully studied the draft resolutions and the amendments submitted thereto. My delegation felt that although we have had a prolonged and exhaustive debate the texts before us were not sufficiently discussed in the debate with the care that the importance of the subject would seem to require. The texts which the Assembly has just approved do not, in our view, take into account the complexity of the various problems which they raise and the repercussions to which they may lead. Many implications and practical realities have not been taken into consideration and proper perspective is lacking; and certain political, economic and cultural aspects may be involved without due attention having been paid to them.

104. Also, we have heard from this rostrum leaders from four or five countries who have referred to the new type of colonialism which is certainly the worst and the most repugnant political and economic system that the world has ever been confronted with and which has brought about the tyrannical subjugation and oppression of many countries. My delegation would have thought that this type of colonialism would have found its proper place in the draft resolution and we believe that an effort in that direction could have been made for the benefit of mankind. The Assembly, however, felt differently and the text just adopted has therefore lost the wider meaning and impact which it could have had otherwise.

105. Finally, during the debate some unfounded and unwarranted attacks were addressed to my country, and a few delegations have been at great pains to connect principles and situations which in fact bear no relation and which were quite outside the scope of the debate. We had the opportunity to repudiate the accusations made, but the fact that they were made raised in our minds some doubts which the course of the debate did not otherwise dispel.

106. For all these reasons and in the context of the statement which I had the opportunity of delivering during the debate [934th meeting], my delegation found it necessary to abstain.

107. Mr. SHAWARBI (Yemen): The Government of Yemen strongly believes in the necessity of taking all measures which would lead to the granting of full independence to all peoples. The Yemen delegation therefore voted for the draft resolution contained in document A/L.323 and Add.1-6, calling for immediate steps to transfer all powers to the peoples of all dependent territories, and respect for the territorial integrity of any State.

108. Mr. OWANO (Cameroun) (translated from French): The delegation of the Republic of Cameroun does not need to explain the vote it has given in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the delegations from Africa and Asia, since it was a sponsor of that resolution. The quasi-unanimity of the vote sufficiently and eloquently stresses the importance of this historic fact and illustrates the absolute necessity of a community of views on finding solutions for African problems. If it still needed to be emphasized here, this vote would go to show that the needs of Africa and of the African countries can only be properly analyzed, surveyed and studied by Africans and the parties concerned and that, for all their goodwill, all the non-African countries cannot but hold different views from ours on the problems affecting us and cannot but follow methods which are inapplicable to our continent and our peoples.

109. The applause which greeted the vote makes comment superfluous.

110. I would like to add a few words to explain my delegation's vote on the Soviet draft declaration [A/4502] and the Soviet amendments [A/L.328] to the African-Asian draft resolution. I did not want to ask the Assembly to adopt the method which, I felt, would best have enabled it to express its views on the subject of the Soviet draft declaration. For I felt that the work of this Assembly was drawing to its close, that there were still decisions to be taken on important problems, that the discussions on this declaration had lasted long enough and that it was undesirable to protract the debate further on points of procedure. Had that not been so, we would have asked for separate consideration to be given to each of the three numbered paragraphs of the Soviet declaration. My delegation would have had good reasons for wanting separate votes to be taken on these particular paragraphs.

111. The first of the numbered paragraphs reads as follows:

"1. All colonial countries and Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories must be granted forthwith complete independence and freedom to build their own national States in accordance with the freely-expressed will and desire of their peoples. The colonial system and colonial administration in all its forms must be completely abolished in order to afford the peoples of the territories concerned an opportunity to determine their own destiny and form of government."

This part of the Soviet declaration is in conformity with the views of the Camerounian delegation, so we would have liked a vote to have been taken on this specific paragraph. My delegation would have voted in favour of this paragraph, except for the word "forthwith", which I would have asked to be deleted. I shall explain my position on this point later on in connexion with the Soviet amendment.

112. The second numbered paragraph reads as follows:

"2. Similarly, all strongholds of colonialism in the form of possessions and leased areas in the territory of other States must be eliminated."

Had a separate vote been taken on this paragraph, my delegation would have abstained because of the wording: "leased areas in the territory of other States". As I have already explained, it is the view of my delegation that neither the United Nations nor anyone else in the world can express an opinion on a lease or a contract made in a foreign country. So we would have abstained if a vote had been taken on that particular paragraph.

113. My delegation would have voted in favour of the paragraph numbered 3 in the Soviet draft declaration. Unfortunately, it was not voted on separately, and so we were unable to express our Government's view on that paragraph.

114. We abstained during the voting on the Soviet draft declaration because we thought that the African-Asian draft resolution summarized, in general terms, the Soviet point of view and that, besides, a country which had sponsored a resolution submitted by all the Powers concerned could not well dissent from the views it had already stated.

115. As regards the Soviet amendments [A/L.328], we would also have asked for the deletion of the second part of paragraph 8, which would then have read as follows:

"Calls upon the Powers concerned to ensure the transfer of full and sovereign power to the peoples of all dependent territories in accordance with the principles stated above and, for this purpose, to enter into negotiations with representatives of the colonial peoples".

That is where I would have stopped and I would have asked for a vote to be taken on this first part of paragraph 8. My delegation would have supported this paragraph for, as I have already said in connexion with paragraph 1 in the Soviet draft declaration [A/4502], I think that the words "forthwith" and "negotiation" cannot go together.

116. In the same way as we were obliged to abstain on the Soviet draft declaration because of the word "forthwith" in paragraph 1, so we had to abstain in the vote on paragraph 8 of the Soviet amendments because of the second part of the text of that paragraph. I did not manage to ask for a separate vote to be taken on the first part of that paragraph asking for negotiations to be initiated. The Camerounian Government is in favour of negotiations; it has welcomed the admission of seventeen new African and Asian Member States to the United Nations at this session of the Assembly—and the accession of these States to independence followed on negotiations. My delegation would have voted in favour of negotiations because they would have led inevitably to the independence and sovereignty of the African peoples.

117. Now I would like to explain why I voted in favour of paragraph 9 of the Soviet amendments reading:

"Decides to consider the question of the implementation of this resolution at its sixteenth regular session."

The Cameroun delegation considered that, whatever the Assembly decided, the question would have to be examined in future by our Organization. We supported this amendment because we thought that, even though a similar text was not included in our draft, this question would in any case be placed again on the agenda of the sixteenth session of the Assembly and that it was highly desirable that our draft resolution should contain provisions that would enable an evaluation to be made of the text we have adopted virtually unanimously.

118. Those are the reasons which induced my delegation to abstain in the voting on the draft declaration and amendments submitted by the USSR, and to cast our vote simply on a paragraph which was put to the vote separately.

119. To conclude, I would say that the Camerounian Government and I myself are thoroughly convinced that the result of the voting on the African-Asian draft resolution proves absolutely beyond a doubt that any action that may be taken in Africa will be doomed to failure unless the Africans are consulted and unless an opportunity is given them of expressing their wishes and indicating how they expect them to be realized.

120. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): We believe that the draft resolution which we sponsored dealt fully and satisfactorily with the problem of foreign domination and colonialism, with which the people of Cyprus had been concerned for quite a long time. We therefore abstained from voting on any other declarations or on amendments to our resolution except in so far as concerned the implementation of our resolution.

121. This session had been noted until now for its ineffectiveness, as no agreement had been reached on any of the issues before it and, therefore, no fruitful results were yielded. Jokes even went around about the "Do-Nothing Committee" and the "Special Do-Nothing Committee". But the resolution that has just been adopted almost unanimously more than compensates for ineffectiveness in other directions. It redeems this session and, indeed, places it high in the records of the United Nations. By this resolution, ideals and concepts which have been in the minds and in the hearts of men through the ages, and for which wars were waged, now take in a peaceful way a concrete form and realization. This is a great and historic fact. This resolution has a significance which is far-reaching. History will place this session in rank of importance immediately after the original session by which the United Nations was established, for the document which has now been adopted is an epoch-making document, second only to the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, on both of which it is based and both of which it revitalizes; for they needed revitalization, and this resolution does in effect revitalize them.

122. This resolution puts an end to a long chapter in history, that of domination by force and subjugation and exploitation, and a new chapter is opened, one based on equality and the brotherhood of man. We therefore can, with modesty, be proud about the resolution which has just been almost unanimously adopted.

123. Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) (translated from French): I come to the rostrum to explain my delegation's vote on the Soviet Union's draft declaration. We voted for the three numbered paragraphs in the

said draft because they condemn colonialism everywhere and in all its forms. We find in it, essentially, the condemnation of a new and sinister manifestation of colonialism: Zionist colonialism.

124. How can a certain representative of Israel dare deny the fact when we see a motherland taken away from its inhabitants by brute force and occupied by people scraped together here and there from all over the world? While these aliens occupy the country they have invaded, a whole people is left without a home and without a mother country. Colonialism in Asia...

125. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

126. Mr. COMAY (Israel): I would just like to ask the President whether it is in order under rule 90 of the rules of procedure, dealing with explanations of vote, for a delegation, in explaining its vote on a draft resolution, to indulge in a renewed attack on another Member State. I would recall that this attack was made before, and in the legitimate exercise of its right of reply my delegation briefly replied to it at the end of the debate on this item and before we came to the voting and the explanations of vote.

127. I would therefore suggest that it would be in accordance with the rules of procedure and in accordance with the interests of winding up our debate if the President ruled out of order any renewed attacks, to which I have already had occasion to make a reply here today.

128. The PRESIDENT: I would request the representative of Lebanon to confine himself to the explanation of his vote.

129. Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) (translated from French): The explanation of vote that I am giving relates to a text which my delegation did not help to draft. Lebanon, together with other countries from all over the world, submitted to the Assembly a draft resolution [A/L.323 and Add.1-6] which has been adopted. My explanation, however, concerns a different text which was submitted by another delegation and which bears on certain points on which I must give some explanations, since I voted for this new text. With the permission of the President, I shall continue the explanation of this vote given by my delegation in support of the Soviet draft declaration [A/4502].

130. I was saying that colonialism in Asia and in Africa really does come, all the same, under the scope of colonialism. This colonialism in Asia and in Africa occupies, or has occupied, certain regions without dispossessing their inhabitants or pillaging everything that belonged to them. These inhabitants are now becoming independent again and masters of their own country. That was not what happened in another colonized country and that is still what I am referring to. I am referring to Palestine, a country which has not only been occupied but stripped, not merely of its possessions but even of its inhabitants. And the representative whom you have just heard was brazen-faced enough to deny that this was colonialism, whereas we have here a case of double colonialism, as it were, since the country is deprived both of its sovereignty and of its territory. Not only did the representative in question deny the facts but he has also, unwittingly, given the lie to a certain personality whom all Jews respect and who was the actual founder of Zionism a hundred years ago and who, as we all know,

entreated Great Britain to help in creating a Jewish national home in Palestine, so that Palestine might become, as he said, a bridge-head for European colonialism in Asia.

131. Unfortunately, though colonialism has disappeared or is disappearing from Asia, the bridge-head has remained and that is precisely what has got to be eliminated.

132. Secondly, the condemnation of colonialism made in the Soviet text, in favour of which my delegation has voted, castigates the manifestation of the endemic evil of racial discrimination. Can the brazen denials of the representative of Israel, or even of the delegates who spoke before him, conceal a reality which is so blatant? Israel is, after all, a Jewish State. Therefore, it follows incontrovertibly that a non-Jew is a citizen of a different category. Is it not in a Jewish State's Parliament that people are discussing the question whether the Jews of the Exodus were six thousand or sixty thousand or six hundred thousand and where the Head of the Government, Mr. Ben Gurion, because he ventured to express views differing from those held by certain other political parties, is now faced with an interpellation and even, possibly, a vote of confidence? Is that body a Parliament or a synagogue? We are perfectly justified in asking that question.

133. The Jewish State of Israel being what it is, a non-Jew is, in point of fact, treated as a second-class citizen, as a gentile, as the Jews used formerly to say. We are again passing through an era of gentleness! It is this new manifestation of colonialism that is condemned by the Soviet text which we voted for.

134. Thirdly, and finally, the representatives of Israel uttered vehement protests when we explained how Palestine had been invaded and colonized. They protested, more particularly, against the charge of having employed Hitler-like methods against the population of the Holy Land. After all, though, it was not the Arabs who compared Israeli behaviour with Hitler's of ten years previously. It happened in 1948 in the Security Council and the person who spoke in those terms was not an Arab representative. The one who was aroused by the disgraced behaviour of Jews and who said that the Jews in Palestine had been...

135. Mr. COMAY (Israel) (from the floor): A point of order.

136. Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) (translated from French): I have finished, Mr. President.

137. The PRESIDENT: As the representative of Lebanon has finished, I give the floor to the representative of Israel on a point of order.

138. Mr. COMAY (Israel): I think the kindest thing I can do about the last speaker's statement is to repudiate it in toto and refer him for the reasons to the statement I made this morning [946th meeting] in reply to the statement his delegation made earlier.

139. My delegation fully supported the draft resolution submitted by a group of Asian and African countries, and we are happy that it has been adopted without opposition. This result gives proper expression to the dramatic changes that have come over the world in our time. We feel that it is in the best interests of the subject peoples themselves that attainment of independence and the transfer of powers should, wherever

possible, take place in an agreed and orderly manner, and not in circumstances of conflict and chaos.

140. It is for that reason that we have voted against proposals which would categorically insist that all Non-Self-Governing Territories should become independent forthwith, or even by the end of 1961. The more flexible and realistic wording of draft resolution A/L.323 and Add.1-6 commended itself to us more strongly, particularly as it constitutes the common ground which evolved in the discussions among the sponsors themselves.

141. We have also voted against a declaration which injected the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples into the controversies of the cold war. We believe this, too, is not what is beneficial for the peoples concerned and not what they want themselves.

142. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America): I wish to explain the attitude of the United States towards the forty-three-Power draft resolution, which has just been adopted without opposition, and the reasons for our abstention in the vote. The United States, as I said in my previous intervention in this debate [937th meeting], warmly supports and endorses the interest and concern of the United Nations in promoting larger freedom for peoples everywhere. The support of freedom is a concept springing from deeply-held beliefs of the American people. We accordingly welcomed the underlying purpose of this resolution sponsored by the forty-three delegations, which we understand to be the advancement of human freedom in the broadest sense.

143. The concept of human freedom, as the resolution just passed makes perfectly clear, applies not only to peoples who are achieving self-government or independence under the administration of the various Member States, but also to other peoples whose desire to live under free institutions of their own choosing is brutally stifled. Freedom is indeed indivisible.

144. Now, there are difficulties in the language and thought of this resolution, which I shall comment on more specifically in a moment, which made it impossible for us to support it, because they seem to negate certain clear provisions of the United Nations Charter. This we deeply regret, that these questions of language could not have been straightened out, and we regret it because, as I have said, the United States endorses the support of the United Nations, as set forth in its Charter, for the basic quest of people everywhere for political institutions and governmental forms in keeping with their rights to live in dignity and in freedom.

145. One thing is clear, however. This resolution applies equally to all areas of the world which are not free, whether they are in the Western hemisphere, in Africa, Asia or Europe. It speaks of freedom from alien subjugation, domination and exploitation for all peoples. It proclaims that all people have the right to self-determination. It condemns colonialism in all its manifestations. Members of the United Nations would not be true to their trusts and responsibilities under the Charter if they failed to consider the plight of some of the peoples to whom the Charter's provisions and those of the new declaration are clearly relevant. I refer specifically to peoples living under Soviet colonial domination, whose plight I mentioned in my previous intervention.

146. We found difficulties, as I noted earlier, in the language and thought of this resolution. For instance, it is hard to understand why a resolution on this broad subject should be completely silent on the important contributions which the administering Powers, including my own Government, have made in the advancement of dependent peoples towards self-government or independence.

147. The resolution also is heavily weighted towards complete independence as the only acceptable goal, thus ignoring the Charter provisions for self-government of dependent areas within larger political contexts. We see this reflected in the title of the resolution and in many of its paragraphs. The penultimate preambular paragraph, for example, speaks of the inalienable right of all peoples to complete freedom, which seems to point to full independence in all cases.

148. For our part, we must question the wisdom of espousing principles which would result in some cases in unnecessary political fragmentation and which would also fly in the face of political and economic realities in many areas of the world. Full democratic self-government within a larger and stable political system is sometimes a more worthy immediate objective than full political independence.

149. In examining with care, as we have done, the major aspects of this resolution, we reached the conclusion that paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 are susceptible to serious misinterpretations which could cause basic misunderstanding of the attitude of the various Governments here on the need for orderly and effective preparations for self-government or independence in accordance with the Charter provisions. Although we are sure that this was not the intent of the sponsors of the resolution, paragraph 3 permits the interpretation that the question of preparation for independence is wholly irrelevant. Adequate preparation for self-government or independence is a matter of elementary prudence and is a responsibility which must be accepted by those administering dependent peoples. It is clearly essential that emerging peoples be reasonably able to undertake the responsibilities they will have to face. On the other hand, we would never agree that false allegations in respect of political, economic, social or educational preparation should be used to retard political development.

150. Paragraph 4, written in unqualified language, seems to preclude even legitimate measures for the maintenance of law and order, and this is, of course, incompatible with the obligations of the Administering Authorities towards the peoples under their administration.

151. As for paragraph 5, here again is a very strong statement that only complete independence and freedom is the acceptable political goal for dependent peoples. This paragraph also calls for immediate steps to transfer all powers to the peoples of Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories, without any conditions or reservations.

152. The record of the United States in taking steps for the self-government or independence of peoples under its administration is an open book. We are proud of that record. We have taken many steps in the past, we are taking steps now, and we will take further steps in the future, and we will do this in a manner in consonance with our international respon-

sibilities under the Charter and our responsibilities for the people under our administration. Like many other Members of the United Nations, we regard the provisions of Chapters XI and XII of the Charter, which deal specifically with Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories, as controlling so far as the Territories for which we are responsible are concerned. The United States Government will continue to advance these Territories and their peoples towards self-government or independence in accordance with the provisions of the Charter and the obligations we have assumed under the Trusteeship Agreement for the Trust Territory we administer.

153. I would call attention to a very wise statement which was made from this rostrum not long ago by the representative of India who, while discussing his delegation's position on another matter, said, "We do not feel that we could fully support it unless we could support every word of it". This is the major reason why the United States felt constrained to abstain on this particular vote. I should like to say, however, that I am sure that the devotion of the United States to the principles of human freedom and political advancement will be judged by what the United States has done, is doing and will continue to do in the cause of freedom. I have every confidence that our support of these principles will be considered on the basis of our record in action as it really is, and not as it is distorted or may in the future be distorted by the words of others.

154. I will turn now very briefly to the Soviet draft which the Soviet delegation pressed before the Assembly in this debate. That draft would have added nothing useful to the forty-three-Power draft resolution, which we all knew would be adopted without opposition. We regret that the Soviet representative insisted on pressing it, as well as on pressing his amendment to the forty-three-Power draft resolution; in view of the Soviet record of imperialism and colonialism in the relatively brief history of the USSR, and particularly since the Second World War, it would have been a travesty to adopt the Soviet proposal on this question, and we therefore voted against it.

155. Mr. BEN ABOUD (Morocco) (translated from French): All the declarations and resolutions concerning the eradication of colonialism in all its forms follow the normal trend of history and all of them, without exception, correspond to the hopes of mankind as a whole for the advent and the consolidation of the reign of positive and real freedom. That is why we voted in favour of the draft declaration submitted by the Soviet Union [A/4502], more especially as regards the three numbered paragraphs. Of course, the substance of the provisions contained in this declaration is to be found, more or less, in the declaration which is contained in the African-Asian draft resolution [A/L.323 and Add.1-6]. We are pleased to note that this latter document has been adopted without opposition.

156. We voted in favour of the draft declaration submitted by the Soviet Union so that we might by so doing contribute to the final abolition of the enslavement, overt or covert, of man by his fellow man. Nevertheless, if there is an objection at this late hour to giving a lengthy enumeration of the reasons for our vote, we feel it is important to state one at least of these reasons.

157. The three numbered paragraphs in the Soviet Union's declaration refer to: real and not fictitious independence, complete and unequivocal; the elimination of colonialist strongholds, which nowadays disturb the tranquillity of the international atmosphere, and respect for territorial integrity.

158. The same principles are mentioned in the African-Asian draft resolution. In particular, paragraph 6 explains very well what our delegation understands by territorial integrity. When we discussed this document and agreed to become a sponsor, we had in mind a long list of examples of the partitioning and disruption of the unity of national territories. I shall confine myself to mentioning three of these examples.

159. First, there is the attempt, which we trust will prove futile and unsuccessful, to dismember the Congo, particularly in Katanga.

160. Secondly, I would mention the regrettable dismemberment and occupation of Palestine, which we trust is only temporary and brief, by this new phenomenon of foreign colonialism known as international Zionism.

161. Thirdly, there are the efforts—employing the soft and silent tactics of the viper—of French colonialism to partition Morocco and disrupt its national territorial unity, by setting up an artificial State in the area of Southern Morocco which the colonialists call Mauritania. The population of that area does not even know the word "Mauritania". If you tell a Bedouin of so-called Mauritania that you are in Mauritania, he will not understand what you are talking about. In that area a miniature capital has been created out of absolutely nothing; up to now it did not even have a single hotel. A newly-built school has even been converted into living quarters.

162. Thus, the Soviet draft declaration for which we voted follows a line similar to that of the African-Asian declaration demanding the radical and complete elimination of colonialism, be it European or Zionist, and of the kind of balkanization that is being practised in Africa, the Middle East and elsewhere.

163. The PRESIDENT: All delegations wishing to explain their votes have now done so and the item "Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples" is concluded. The Assembly may well congratulate itself on this accomplishment.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.