

BREACH OF INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATION: A LEGAL DIAGNOSTIC OF UNITED NATIONS RESOLUTION 1608, OF APRIL 21, 1961.

A Synopsis of the Tragic and Pathetic Tale of how Cameroun, a former United Nations Trust Territory, Recolonized another United Nations Trust Territory--The Republic of Ambazonia (The British Southern Cameroons)--in violation of International Trust, Responsibility and Obligation.

Introduction:

In 1916 the Armies of France, Britain and Belgium jointly defeated the Germans in the Kamerun and took over the territory, sharing it between France and Britain. The arrangement was made law by the Anglo-French Treaty of that same year. The Paris Peace recognized these arrangements, followed by the League of Nations in 1922 and then the United Nations in 1945. Both the League and the United Nations operated systems that protected former German territories as well as other territories not directly under the colonial authority of any superpower as Mandated Territories and Trust Territories respectively. Thus when it came to decolonization that is, granting self-government or independence to these territories the United Nations did make several blunders concerning German Kamerun, which by 1960 was represented as British Cameroons (Northern Cameroons and Southern Cameroons) and French Cameroun following the Anglo-French Treaty of 1916.

However, prior to decolonization, France had taken portions of Kamerun which it had ceded to Germany before the war and reunited them to French Equatorial Africa, leaving Cameroun as the biggest territory that was once under German Kamerun. While the territories reunited with French Equatorial Africa are not the subject of this paper, the British Cameroons, specifically Southern Cameroons and Cameroun are, because during the separation from 1916-1960 both territories underwent different political orientations which effectively gave them different cultures, educational and legal systems - and so it became important that if the two were to be reunited again, they had to be under some form of a loose Federation which effectively preserved their various sovereignties and hence, colonial heritage. The arrangements for the Federation were made under the direct supervision of the United Nations Trusteeship Council, which supervised the Trust Territories and reported to the United Nations General Assembly, and in preparing them for self-government or independence. What has come under scrutiny in this paper is the fact that the United Nations sponsored Plebiscite Treaty and subsequent United Nations Resolution 1608 of April 21, 1961, which demanded that contracting parties honor the results of the said plebiscite.

The plebiscite was to decide the fate of the British Cameroons--the one part, Northern Cameroons that voted to join Nigeria as part of the Nigerian Federation, and the Southern Cameroons, which voted to join Cameroun in the loose Cameroon Federation. But ever since, the fate of the British Cameroons and the UN Resolution 1608 has been in violation by Cameroun, France, Britain and the United Nations itself now for forty years. This paper is written on with the assumption that the international legal instruments that created and paved the way for the Kamerun Federation amount to an international treaty, and that these instruments have collectively been violated by

all parties, with the exception to the British Southern Cameroons. The British Southern Cameroons has invoked international law to reinstate its sovereignty, citing "a material breach of Treaty."

The Doctrine of Pacta Sunt Servanda:

In international law, the doctrine of *Pacta Sunt Servanda* (see Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, Article 26) is the guarding angel of all treaties, agreements, declarations and conventions. It demands that all parties who contract them respect all such embodiments of treaties. In other words, all treaties are binding upon the contractors, unless they were mere "gentleman's agreement." This same guarding angel can become a premise where we can begin understanding why parties involved in the 1961 United Nations-sponsored Plebiscite have not honored the treaty, and then use our deductions to make a solid case for the total independence of British Southern Cameroons in the name of the Republic of Ambazonia, now and as peacefully as possible before it is too late.

To understand the deceit that is characteristic of the illusion of Cameroun as a unitary state or as a Federation that never was, we ought to understand the said UN Resolution properly. Looking at the treaty (my use of treaty instead of stated resolutions and pacts is because it is more encompassing, given the string of international legal instruments involved in building the framework for the UN Plebiscite of February 11, 1961), we observe the following:

- 1) Cameroun, a Trust Territory in equal status with the British Southern Cameroons, voted against the Resolution;
- 2) France, the colonial master and administering authority of the French Cameroun equally voted against the Resolution;
- 3) All of French Speaking West Africa and Equatorial Africa, with the exception of Mali, voted against the resolution;
- 4) Cameroun was decolonized separately from the British Cameroons when it effectively gained independence on January 1, 1960, and so began exercising its right as a nation with a seat at the UN without Southern Cameroons or Northern Cameroons having attained the same status.

The United Nations Sponsored Plebiscite of February 11, 1961, was organized to determine the constitutional future of the British Cameroons--British Southern Cameroons and British Northern Cameroons, and in fulfillment of the provisions of the League of Nations and hence United Nations concerning Trust Territories. These territories had to, like other colonial and other peoples without representation, be led to the attainment of either "Self-Government" or "independence," in fulfillment of the aspirations and wishes of the peoples (see also the General Assembly Declaration Granting Self-Government or independence to Colonial and Other Peoples of 1960. This Declaration was a final pledge by various leaders of nations to liberate humanity from the malpractice of colonialism (decolonization). What is important here is the fact that the right to self-determination became equated with other inalienable rights, including the right to exercise sovereignty.

Concerning the Trust Territories of the British Southern Cameroons and Northern Cameroons, the inalienable rights of the masses were protected in that they were given the free will, though with limited choices, to determine their future based in some part, on their affiliations with the neighboring territories and the historic evolution of the African peoples as a whole. However, a proper examination of the plebiscite arrangements would reveal just why the contracting parties failed to carry through with the resolution, and so in the end, have created more problems for the peoples of British Southern Cameroons than decolonize the territory. In this regard, the plebiscite was arranged in violation of the instruments that constitute international law, from the League through to the declaration granting self-government or independence.

Decolonization Difficulties and the Violations of International Law:

Firstly, and in accordance with the Covenant of the League, the United Nations Charter and the aspirations of humanity in time scheduled preferences; the Plebiscite was in violation of both the Covenant and the Charter. The League Covenant had warned that no clauses of the Mandate System, which was later to become the Trusteeship, should be violated by any nation or group of nations. It warned, and it was according to such warning that Namibia was freed from the illegal grip or attempts at annexation by South Africa (See ICJ Advisory Opinion on Namibia), when South Africa was threatened with sanctions and or expulsion from the United Nations should it annex Namibia. Concerning Namibia, the Court had warned that "a material breach" of treaty (see Article 60 of Vienna Convention, 1969/1980) occurred in relation for the mandate for Namibia (South West Africa), regarded as an international Treaty, and that South Africa had repudiated the treaty (R. Shabtai, 1985, Breach of Treaty). On Namibia, the General Assembly noted:

Open Quote: "The Resolution in question is therefore to be viewed as the exercise of the right to terminate a relationship in case of a deliberate and persistent violation of obligations which destroy the very objective and purpose for that relationship."(ICJ Report, 1971, p.16 at 47, Para. 94-95). *Close Quote.*

More specifically, the Charter went further to uphold and safeguard the warnings of the Covenant when in Article 76 (b) as in part in 73 (b) when it stated that the basis objective of the Trusteeship System was:

Open Quote: (b) to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of trust territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of its peoples concerned, and as may be provided by the terms of each trusteeship agreement. Close quote.

Concerning the British Southern Cameroons, others, especially historians of French Cameroun who have re-written and distorted the history of British Southern Cameroons, have argued that when we consult UN Article 76, we should not only read portions of 76b, but also read the entire article. In doing so, they argue, we will understand properly why Cameroun had to use all means possible to accommodate Southern Cameroons. But even when we do so, (76a stresses that the trusteeship agreements should conform to Article 1 of the UN Charter, and (c) encourages respect

for human rights which would encourage interdependence, while (d) stresses equal treatment without prejudice!), the case of the British Southern Cameroons against Cameroun recolonization and the failure of the entire Trusteeship System to stand to the task assigned them becomes even stronger, as nothing in the forty years of Camerounization (an ill-attempt by a former French Colony, Cameroun, to assimilate the people of British Southern Cameroons by tormenting them in order to force them to forget their Anglo-Saxon orientation) has been out to promote love, unity or respect for human rights, let alone, self-government or independence. The conclusion of this first instance of violation of the Covenant of the League and the Charter of the United Nations suggests that the UN had no mandate to organize the said plebiscite.

Secondly, the United Nations failed to take into consideration the facts of the history of the territories that once constituted German Kamerun. For instance, if we went as far back as 1916 when the Anglo-French Treaty divided the Kamerun after the joint defeat of Germany by the Anglo-French-Belgium trio, we observe that the treaty not only came under fire when the League still recognized portions and all of the territory as separate entities not constituting or accorded the same rights as former colonies of these colonial masters. By so doing, German Kamerun was effectively, though as separate territories, placed under the Mandate System! What this means is that when we apply decolonization to the territories that once constituted Kamerun, we ought to have decolonized them as a unit not as separate entities. If we had to ask foolish question of "either" "or," and only to the British Cameroons, we were effectively giving legitimacy to French Breach of the Mandate System and Trusteeship Laws by taking portions of German Kamerun and uniting them at their will, with French Equatorial African territories.

Effectively, the selective application of the principles of decolonization were bias--against all Kamerun and against the British Cameroons especially, and are in themselves a cause of the troubles of the present aspirations of the peoples of British Southern Cameroons and their demands for total independence. The mistake the UN made was that German Kamerun was never decolonized as a single entity, (even if we were to put aside the highly skewed argument that the Franco-German treaty which ceded portions of the German West Africa territory of Western Sahara (to Morocco) and in East Africa to the French in exchange for those France reunited with Equatorial Africa had collapsed, because the French defeated the Germans in World War I). This argument does not hold well with international law for the simple reason that those conquered territories of World War I did not effectively become part of the original empire of the conquering nations. Conquest was already being effectively resisted as a legal means of acquiring rights or title to territory, as can be seen by the fact that these territories were considered "Mandated" or eventually as "Trust Territories"!

Thirdly, the United Nations failed to give the people of British Cameroons a third option--that of total independence from either Nigeria or Cameroun. This was a mistake since a trust territory could not have attained either "self-government" or "independence" by joining another trust territory or another independent nation: Independence ought to be independence, no less and no more.

THE UNITED NATIONS RESOLUTION 1608 OF APRIL 21, 1961:

This resolution was approved to put effect to the plebiscite results, which made Northern Cameroons part of the Nigerian Federation and would have made Southern Cameroons part of the Cameroon Federation. While Nigeria did not have any difficulties implementing this resolution, Cameroun did for the reasons we already advanced at the beginning of this essay. Cameroun and all of French Africa, with the exception of Mali, voted against the United Nations Resolution 1608. Paragraph 5 of the resolution demanded that the contracting parties, that is Cameroun, Southern Cameroons, Britain and France should convene urgent talks, which would be supervised by the United Nations Trusteeship Council, to ensure that an agreement of the Cameroon Federation was reached before the termination of the Trusteeship of the Southern Cameroons.

Secondly, Cameroun had problems implementing the Resolution because an alien state was being injected into the French Empire. Southern Cameroons was Anglo-Saxon and Cameroun was Napoleonic or Gaullist. This means that they both had differences in legal, educational, and linguistic matters besides many others, which even the running of Federation sanctioned by the UN was close to being an impossibility unless both states safeguarded their individual sovereignties. Such arguments may equally be advanced by Cameroun in defense of its ways of attempting to make Southern Cameroons part of its territorial jurisdiction, but this will not hold well with legal arguments because they hold more for reasons to have given Southern Cameroons separate independence regardless of any other arguments to the contrary. However, several factors have contributed to making the implementation of UN Resolution 1608 totally impossible.

Difficulties in Implementing 1608:

- 1) The United Nations representatives (of the Trusteeship Council) were absent at Foumban Constitutional Talks to formalize the Cameroon Federation.
- 2) The Administering authority, the British, were equally absent at Foumban Constitutional Talks, leaving the British Southern Cameroons at the mercy of French Technical Advisers and Cameroun crude politicians.
- 3) French Technical advisers, eager to maintain treaties signed with Cameroun at independence which rendered Cameroun's independent null and void (since France controlled Cameroun, defense, economy, currency, imports and exports, etc.), did all they could to ensure that the French policy of assimilation became the goal of the Cameroun politicians since an effective Federation would have given Ten deputies of the Southern Cameroons (West Cameroon) powers that would have automatically made Cameroun a democratic Federation and so difficult for the French to push around with their treaties. Besides, an effective Federation would have meant effect abrogation of those treaties since the succeeding State (Cameroon Federation) had to debated and renegotiated those agreements signed by the previous two states (Cameroun and Southern Cameroons).
- 4) The Ahidjo Foncha Accord at Foumban that adjourned the Constitutional talks was equally violated since Ahidjo did not honor it. Ahidjo and the Southern Cameroons

delegation had agreed that amendments were to be made on the Cameroun Constitution, which will effectively serve the Federation purpose, and that Ahidjo's government shall send the draft to the Southern Cameroons House of Assembly and the Cameroun National Assembly for deliberations that could lead to the adoption of the Federal Constitution. This did not happen because Ahidjo, shortly after, issued a Presidential Decree, which made the Constitution of Cameroun the law of the so-called Federation. This immediately gave birth to the Southern Cameroons resistance, which has now materialized in the Republic of Ambazonia, following Biya's great blunder, which returned the Federal or unity system to the Cameroun Identity at independence with a similar Presidential decree in January 1984.

The Law of Treaties:

An understanding of what international law has to say on matters of breach of treaty can be easily found by examining the Vienna Convention on the law of Treaties, done at Vienna on May 23, 1969 and entered into force on January 27, 1980. It is important that we examine relevant portions of this legal instrument so as to have a better grasp of the conclusions that may arise from them. Since disputes of sovereignty are very common in escalating into armed conflicts, it is especially important that we understand the provisions of the Vienna Convention as they apply to the situation in the Cameroons and why, besides demanding a peaceful separation, it is equally important that Ambazonia continues to demand that Cameroun honor the terms of the Plebiscite Treaty.

Definition of Important Legal Terms:

The Vienna Convention defines a treaty as "an agreement concluded between States in written form and governed by international law, whether embodied in a single instrument or in two or more related instruments and whatever its particular designation." [Article 1, (a)]. The Convention defines ratification or acceptance, or approval, or accession--in relation to the international act so named as a situation whereby a state establishes on the international plane its consent to be bound by a treaty.

The TWO ALTERNATIVES & UN RESOLUTION 1608 (xv) GAO

UNTIL THE PHILOSOPHY WHICH HOLDS ONE NATION SUPERIOR (CAMEROUN) AND ANOTHER INFERIOR (AMBAZONIA) - SUBJECTED TO ANOTHER (FRANCE), IS FINALLY, AND PERMANENTLY, UTTERLY DESTROYED, EVERYWHERE IS WAR!
Paraphrased from Bob Marley's "War" song.

Mr. Ian Macleod, Secretary of the Colonies for the United Kingdom narrates the content of "THE TWO ALTERNATIVES" which UN RES 1608 [xv] was supposed to implement.

Quote begins pg. 14:

"The Secretary of State had noted that the Premier [Foncha] of the Southern Cameroons had ascertained from the President of the Cameroun Republic that a Federal form of constitution would be acceptable. The following interpretation was proposed as being consistent with the second question, it being understood that the association of the United Nations with the post plebiscite conference mentioned in the

text below would be subject to its agreement:

--[A vote for attaining independence by joining the Republic of Cameroun would mean that by an early date to be decided by the United Nations after consultation with the Governments of the Southern Cameroons and the Cameroun Republic and the United Kingdom as Administering Authority, the Southern Cameroons and the Cameroun Republic would unite as a Federal United Cameroun Republic. The arrangements would be worked out after the plebiscite by a conference consisting of representatives' delegations of EQUAL STATUS from the Republic and the Southern Cameroons, the United Nations and the United Kingdom would also be associated with this conference].

[---- last sentence omitted----]

unquote!

The aforementioned conference has never been held, yet Cameroun Republic and their government go about boasting and filing falsified claims to the international community how she exercises sovereignty over Bakassi and over all of Ambazonia, subjugates the latter's masses to all forms of torture in attempting to force them into submission to Cameroun rule, which they consistently continue to resist as peacefully as possible from 1961 till date!

UNITED NATIONS RESOLUTION 1608 (xv) APRIL 21, 1961 APPROVING THE RESULTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS SPONSORED PLEBISCITE OF FEBRAURY 11, 1961 IN "AMBAZONIA VERSUS CAMEROUN" AT THE HAGUE-ICJ AND GENEVA-UNHRC (1994-2003) (6 PAGES)

--Extract begins ----

Resolution 1608 (xv) as submitted by the Fourth Committee, A/4737, and as amended orally by Guinea and Liberia, adopted by the General Assembly on 21 April 1961, meeting 994, by roll-call vote of 64 to 23, with 10 abstentions, as follows:

In favour:

Note: These are countries that believed that the union of the two Cameroons under a Federal system of two equal states would be a good thing!

Afghanistan, Austria, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian SSR, Union of South Africa, USSR, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Against:

Note: These are countries that were against such a union citing the violation of the Trusteeship agreement, and noting that there shall be future political (constitutional), socio-cultural and economic problems!

Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Cambodia, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Dahomey, France,

Gabon, Greece, Israel, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Niger, Paraguay, Senegal, Upper Volta, Uruguay.

Abstentions:

Columbia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Italy, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Togo.

“THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY,

“Recalling its resolution 1350 (XIII) of 13 March 1959 concerning the future of the Trust Territory of the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration in which the General Assembly recommended, inter alia, that the Administering Authority take steps, in consultation with the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner for the Cameroons under United Kingdom Administration, to organize, under the supervision of the United Nations, separate plebiscites in the Northern and Southern parts of the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration, in order to ascertain the wishes of the inhabitants of the territory concerning their future, and that the plebiscite in the Northern Cameroons be held about the middle of November 1959 on the basis of the two questions set out in paragraph 2 of the said Resolution,

“Recalling its resolution 1352 (XIV) of 16 October 1959 whereby it decided, inter alia, that a plebiscite in the Southern Cameroons would be held between 30 September 1960 and March 1961, on the basis of the two questions set in paragraph 2 of the said resolution,

“Recalling further its resolution 1473 (XIV) of 12 December 1959 in which the General Assembly, having considered the results of the plebiscite in the Northern part of the Cameroons under United Kingdom Administration, recommended the organization by the Administering Authority, in consultation with the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner, of a further plebiscite to be held in the Northern Cameroons under United Nations supervision between 30 September 1960 and March 1961, on the basis of the two questions defined in paragraph 3 of the said resolution,

“Having examined the report of the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner concerning the two plebiscites held in the Northern and the Southern Cameroons in February 1961 and the report of the Trusteeship Council thereon,

Having heard the petitioners,

“1. Expresses its high appreciation of the work of the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner for the Cameroons under United Kingdom Administration and his staff;

“2. Endorses the results of the plebiscite that:

“(a) The people of Northern Cameroons have by a majority, decided to achieve independence by joining the independent Federation of Nigeria;

“(b) The people of the Southern Cameroons have similarly decided to achieve independence by joining the independent Republic of Cameroun;

“3. Considers that, the people of the two parts of the Trust Territory having freely and secretly expressed their wishes with regards to their respective futures in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1352 (XIV) and 1473 (XIV), the decisions made by them through democratic processes should be immediately implemented;

“4. Decides that, the plebiscites having been taken separately with differing results, the Trusteeship Agreement of 13 December 1946 concerning the Cameroons under United Kingdom Administration shall

be terminated, in accordance with Article 76b of the Charter of the United Nations and in agreement with the Administering Authority, in the following manner:

“(a) With Respect to the Northern Cameroons, on 1 June 1961, upon its joining the Federation of Nigeria as a separate province of the Northern Region of Nigeria;

“(b) With respect to the Southern Cameroons, on 1 October 1961, upon it’s joining the Republic of Cameroun;

“5. Invites the Administering Authority, the Government of the Southern Cameroons and the Republic of Cameroun to initiate urgent discussions with a view to finalizing, before October 1, the arrangements by which the agreed and declared policies of the parties concerned will be implemented.”

ORAL HEARINGS:

General Assembly 15th Session (First and Second Parts).

Fourth Committee, Meetings 1004, 1010, 1012, 1066, 1086, 1096, 1097, 1098, 1105, 1108, 1120, 1127-1130, 1139, 1140, 1142, 1147.

-A/C.4/445 and Add.1-3, A/C.4/469 and Add.1-8.

Requests for Hearings.

-A/C.4/448. Note by Secretary General.

-A/C.4/490. Additional statement by Namaso Mbile, Cameroons People’s National Convention, Kumba Division, on Southern Cameroons.

-A/C.4/495. Statement by S.T. Muna, Minister of Commerce and Industries, Southern Cameroons.

-A/C.4/96. Additional Statement by Mayi Matip, Chairman of Union des Populations du Cameroun Parliamentary group.

APPRAISAL: by Justice M. Mbuh [2001] (Re-edited 05.03.2003) JUST WHY IS UN RESOLUTION 1608 SO CENTRAL TO THE DISPUTE BETWEEN THE TWO CAMEROONS [AMBAZONIA (British Southern Cameroons) AND CAMEROUN]?

1. The nations that voted in favour of the resolution might have had “unity as strength” as their guiding principle. But when we take a look at the said resolution, we have every reason to feel and believe that British Southern Cameroonians have been maltreated by both Cameroun and the United nations. From the said Resolution, we can make the following deductions:

2. A nation cannot become “independent by joining” another, especially if it is denied a seat at the World Organization. The case of the Republics that were part of USSR but had separate seats at the UN (and voted herein) is a glaring pointer! This condition secures the right of the parties to regain their sovereignty without necessarily having to pull much string, in case of material breach of treaty.

From (1) above, it is clear that the Trusteeship Agreement was already under violation, since “by joining” does not lead “to either self-government or independence” (76b)/(Declaration Granting Independence ...)!

3. That Cameroun was among nations that opposed the Resolution and given that Cameroun has violated the Federation Treaty, besides the above Resolution demanding its implementation--both constitute gross evidence that Cameroun authority were not interested to have either a federation or unity of any sort with British Southern Cameroons. Thus Cameroun should not resist Ambazonian moves to form a separate Republic, which would fulfil Article 76b of the UN Charter and secure/protect the rights of her citizens.

4. France by virtue of its fears that Anglo-Saxon culture would 'pollute' and prevent them from exercising continuous neo-colonialism on its former colonies equally opposed the said resolution.

5. The Administering Authorities, in this case the United Kingdom did not do its job of ensuring that negotiations were conclusive before the stipulated date. Instead, what transpired was that Britain abandoned the Southern Cameroons at the mercy of French and Cameroun colonizers when it effectively pulled out of the territory one month to the date stipulated for the termination of the UN Trusteeship.

6. The UN equally failed to perform its role as supervisor of the process to decolonize the Southern Cameroons without necessarily compromising its sovereignty.

7. Evidence of the betrayal of Ambazonia (The British Southern Cameroons) by both Britain and the UN Nations is found in the fact that at the Foumban Constitutional talks, both parties were absent. Thus there was never any conclusive deal, which protected the Southern Cameroons from French and Cameroun intrigues.

Three things can be deduced from the above seven points:

1. Ambazonia (Southern Cameroons), even if we assume attained independence, stands clearly as an example of a none-state nation given that it was never given a seat at the UN.

2. By virtue of the fact that the Federation deal was never conclusive, everything that has been done in Cameroun in the name of unity and name-changing-syndrome aimed at colonizing Ambazonia is null and void ab initio, and must be considered not binding on Ambazonia (Southern Cameroons) which has clearly and effectively proven that there were unpardonable discrepancies in the unity process--which has led Cameroun to treat the Southern Cameroon masses as second class citizens and above all, refused to be lawful and accountable to/on the acts of government--acts of continuous aggression. Based on the above analyses, Ambazonia's right to freely exercise its sovereignty can hardly be questioned, let alone denied.

3. The non-implementation of UN Resolution 1608 is glaring proof of a material breach of International Treaty and requires that the World Body actively take part in terminating the now too falsified relationship between Ambazonia and Cameroun before the situation turns into a bloody war of liberation.

AMBAZONIA PEOPLES EMANCIPATION COUNCIL (APEC) demands/suggests that the UN should redress this problem before it escalates into a full-scale war of liberation by granting Adult Membership to Ambazonia in the United Nations for a good start. The time to do so is now!

For more on the rights of Ambazonia as a State with all due rights having denied, see boundary treaties with Cameroun (Anglo-French Treaties of 1916, 1930; League of Nations Treaties endorsing the Anglo-French Treaties of 1916: 1919, 1922; see also Trusteeship Laws of the Trust Territories, UN Resolutions on decolonization, most specifically the General Assembly Declaration Granting Independence to All Colonial Territories and Other Peoples of December 5/12, 1960, the Terms of the "Two Alternatives" Agreement between Cameroun Republic's President Ahmadou Ahidjo and Southern Cameroons (Ambazonia's) Prime Minister John Ngu Foncha, and besides UN Resolution 1608 above, see also International Court of Justice (ICJ) Ruling over the disputed Bakassi Peninsula between Cameroun and Nigeria, in which the ICJ clearly identifies the territory "termed Southern Cameroons" but failed to cross-examine evidence presented by Cameroun claiming sovereignty of the said peninsula by way of the very plebiscite treaty under her glaring violation!

**AMBAZONIA MUST BE FREE THE SOONER AND PEACEFULLY THE BETTER!
STOP THE FLAGRANT AND BLATANT VIOLATION OF INTERNATIONAL TREATIES BY
CAMEROUN; RESTORE THE STATEHOOD OF AMBAZONIA REPUBLIC ("Termed
Southern Cameroons"--ICJ) NOW!**

1. *Ambazonia is a nation and was never a vacuum!*
2. *Ambazonia had a government!*
3. *Ambazonia had and still has a population (6.5 million people)!*
4. *Ambazonia had and still has international boundaries!*
5. *Ambazonia had a parliament and still has a constitution: the southern Cameroons constitutional order-in-council, 1960!*
6. *Ambazonia had and still has international organizations and nations debating on her behalf, to the extent some even admit lies against her--case in point: ICJ Bakassi ruling!*
7. *and most importantly, the democracy imperative for good government: Ambazonians were and still are the most democratic peoples on the African continent with a record of having changed two governments without incident even before the infamous two alternatives and united nations sponsored plebiscite of February 11, 1961, together with their unimplemented un resolution 1608 of April 21, 1961!*

IF THERE IS ANY INTERNATIONAL MORALITY LEFT, THEN USE IT TO FREE AMBAZONIA NOW

*By: Justice Muluh Mbuh,
S.G APEC Washington, DC, USA.*