

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE  
GUYANA v. VENEZUELA  
HEARING ON JURISDICTION

*The Circumstances Leading to the Conclusion of the 1966 Geneva Agreement*

Professor Payam Akhavan

30 June 2020

*Introduction*

1. Mr. President, distinguished members of the Court. I am honoured to appear on behalf of Guyana in this proceeding on jurisdiction. I will be addressing the circumstances leading to the conclusion of the 1966 Geneva Agreement to resolve the controversy over the frontier between Venezuela and British Guiana (the “Geneva Agreement”). It is Article IV, paragraph 2, of that Agreement, in combination with the 30 January 2018 decision of the UN Secretary-General, which establishes the Court’s jurisdiction.
2. The history of the controversy demonstrates that the dispute between the Parties was, and remains, about the legal validity and binding force of the 1899 Arbitral Award. Beginning in 1962, Venezuela claimed that the Award was null and void, whereas the United Kingdom and Guyana have maintained that it is valid and fully binding and effective. The Parties held “clearly opposite views”<sup>1</sup> on the validity of the 1899 Award, and that was the dispute dividing them. As Mr. Reichler will explain, the object and purpose of the Geneva Agreement was to obtain a final and binding resolution of that dispute.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Obligations concerning Negotiations relating to Cessation of the Nuclear Arms Race and to Nuclear Disarmament (Marshall Islands v. United Kingdom)*, Preliminary Objections, Judgment, ICJ Reports 2016, p. 833.

3. My speech will consist of three parts. *First*, I will provide an overview of the 1899 Award that established the boundary between British Guiana and Venezuela. *Second*, I will address Venezuela's contention beginning in 1962 that the 1899 Award is null and void; this was the basis for its repudiation of the boundary and its claim to almost three-quarters of Guyana's territory. *Third*, I will address the Parties' exchanges between 1963 and 1965 to resolve the controversy, leading to their meeting at Geneva in February 1966, which resulted in the Agreement that Mr. Reichler will address in detail.

#### *The 1899 Arbitral Award*

4. The territory of present-day Guyana comprises the Dutch settlements of Berbice, Demerara, and Essequibo, established in the early seventeenth century. These settlements were recognized by Spain in the 1648 Treaty of Münster, forming part of the Peace of Westphalia that ended the Thirty Years War. In 1814, the Netherlands ceded these territories to Great Britain; in 1831, they were consolidated into the colony of British Guiana.
5. Upon Venezuela's independence in 1810, the boundary had not yet been determined. By 1840 however, with the discovery of gold in the Upper Cuyuni River, Venezuela had proposed the conclusion of a treaty, claiming the Essequibo River as its boundary with British Guiana. For its part, Great Britain's claim extended to the prized mouth of the Orinoco River.
6. By 1895, the boundary dispute had escalated into a diplomatic crisis between Britain and the United States. The "Monroe Doctrine" strongly opposed "British expansion in the Americas".<sup>2</sup> By 1897, under threat of war with the United States,

---

<sup>2</sup> *Letter* from the Permanent Representative of Venezuela to the Secretary-General of the United Nations (14 Feb. 1962), reprinted in U.N. General Assembly, Fourth Committee, 16th Session, *Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 of the Charter*, U.N. Doc A/C.4/536 (15 Feb. 1962), MG, Vol. II, Annex 17, para. 8.

Britain agreed to arbitration to resolve the boundary dispute. It was, in the words of one historian, “one of the most momentous episodes in the history of Anglo-American relations in general and of Anglo-American rivalries in Latin America in particular.”<sup>3</sup> This was a notable instance of peaceful dispute settlement in an historical period when recourse to war was “a continuation of politics by other means.”<sup>4</sup>

7. The Washington Treaty Between Great Britain and the United States of Venezuela was concluded on 2 February 1897. The Preamble set out its object and purpose as “an amicable settlement of ... the boundary between the Colony of British Guiana and the United States of Venezuela”. Article I provided for the creation of an Arbitral Tribunal, and Article III defined its jurisdiction to “determine the boundary line between the Colony of British Guiana and the United States of Venezuela”. [SLIDE 1 ON] Article XIII further stipulated that:

The High Contracting Parties engage to consider the result of the proceeds of the Tribunal of Arbitration as a full, perfect, and final settlement of all the questions referred to the Arbitrators. [SLIDE 1 OFF]

8. Pursuant to Article II, the Tribunal comprised five eminent jurists, namely: two British judges, the Lord Chief Justice of England and a Lord Justice of Appeal of the English High Court; two American judges, the Chief Justice and another Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States; and, as President chosen by the four arbitrators, the renowned Russian jurist, Fyodor de Martens. Among his contributions to international law, in 1899 alone Professor de Martens chaired the Hague Peace Conference, which established the Permanent Court of Arbitration; introduced the so-called “Martens Clause” into the 1899 Hague Convention on the Laws and Customs of War; and delivered the Arbitral Award that resolved the boundary dispute between British Guiana and Venezuela.

---

<sup>3</sup> R.A. Humphreys (1967), “Anglo-American Rivalries and the Venezuela Crisis of 1895”, Presidential Address to the Royal Historical Society, 10 December 1966, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 17: pp. 131-164.

<sup>4</sup> Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, Michael Howard and Peter Paret, eds. and trans., Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976, Revised 1984.

9. The Tribunal over which Professor de Martens presided held 54 meetings. The parties presented a massive volume of documents on *effectivités*, covering three-hundred years of Spanish, Dutch and British rule in the disputed territories. On 3 October 1899, after extensive deliberations, the Tribunal established the boundary in a unanimous Award.

10. The result was widely hailed as a “victory for Venezuela”.<sup>5</sup> The Venezuelan Minister in London described it to his Minister of Foreign Affairs in these words:

Greatly indeed did justice shine forth when in the determination of the frontier we were given the exclusive dominion over the Orinoco which was the principal aim which we sought to achieve through arbitration.<sup>6</sup>

11. The following year, in 1900, Britain and Venezuela established a Joint Commission to undertake the physical demarcation of the boundary. By 1905, after years of arduous work, the boundary was demarcated with pillars and geographic features, stretching 825 kilometres from the Caribbean coast to the tri-junction point with Brazil in the Amazon basin. [SLIDE 2 ON] The Commission produced an Official Boundary Map “with the clear specification of the Boundary line according with the Arbitral Award of Paris”. This map appears at Tab 2 of the Judges’ Folder. [SLIDE 2 OFF] The 1905 Map was exceptionally accurate. It followed 15,440 points from the monument at Punta Playa in the north to the top of Mount Roraima in the south.<sup>7</sup> Those points are confirmed by modern satellite imagery.

---

<sup>5</sup> *Statement* made by the Representative of the United Kingdom at the 349th meeting of the Special Political Committee on 13 November 1962, *reprinted in* U.N. General Assembly, Special Political Committee, 17th Session, *Question of Boundaries between Venezuela and the Territory of British Guiana*, U.N. Doc A/SPC/72 (13 Nov. 1962), MG, Vol. II, Annex 24, p. 9.

<sup>6</sup> Letter from the Venezuelan Ambassador to the United Kingdom to the Venezuelan Minister of Foreign Affairs (7 Oct. 1899). MG, Vol. II, Annex 3 (second page).

<sup>7</sup> *Mapa Integrado de América del Sur* – Integrated Map of South America of the Panamerican Institute of Geography and History, available at:

<https://www.ipgh.org/mapa-integrado-panamericano.html>

12. In the years that followed, the 1899 Award was fully respected by both Parties. In 1932, a tripartite agreement confirmed the point of convergence of the boundaries of Venezuela, Brazil and British Guiana, concluded by exchanges of notes among the three neighbouring States.<sup>8</sup> In 1944, Venezuela re-confirmed that the boundary was a “*chose jugée*”,<sup>9</sup> and that it had “accepted the verdict of the arbitration for which we have so persistently asked.”<sup>10</sup>

*Venezuela’s Contention of Nullity in 1962*

13. The boundary stood uncontested for more than sixty years. Then, in 1962, during the decolonization period, while Guyana was moving toward its independence, Venezuela suddenly repudiated the 1899 Award.<sup>11</sup>

14. On 14 December 1960, the UN had adopted Resolution 1514 – the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. A year later, on 18 December 1961, the Premier of British Guiana, Dr. Cheddi Jagan, petitioned the Special Political and Decolonization Committee of the General Assembly – the Fourth Committee – to bring about “the immediate political independence of his country.”<sup>12</sup> On 15 January 1962, the United Kingdom informed the Committee that

---

<sup>8</sup> Republic of Venezuela, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Public Treaties and International Agreements, Vol. V (1933- 1936)* (1945), p. 548. MG, Vol. II, Annex 12.

<sup>9</sup> Government of United Kingdom, Foreign Office, Minute by C.N. Brading, No. FO 371/38814 (3 Oct. 1944). MG, Vol. II, Annex 10.

<sup>10</sup> Speech by the Venezuelan Ambassador to the United States to the Pan-American Society of the United States (1944), p. 1. MG, Vol. II, Annex 9.

<sup>11</sup> *Statement* made by the Representative of Venezuela at the 1302nd meeting of the Fourth Committee on 22 February 1962, *reprinted in* U.N. General Assembly, Fourth Committee, 16th Session, *Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 of the Charter*, U.N. Doc A/C.4/540 (22 Feb. 1962), para. 49. MG, Vol. II, Annex 19.

<sup>12</sup> U.N. General Assembly, Fourth Committee, 16th Session, 1252nd Meeting, *Agenda item 39: Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 of the Charter*, U.N. Doc A/C.4/SR.1252 (18 Dec. 1961), MG, Vol. II, Annex 14.

it was willing to hold a constitutional conference on the independence of British Guiana.<sup>13</sup>

15. On the same day, Venezuela conveyed to the United States its intention to demand a revision of the 1899 Award “so that Venezuela might realize the recovery of its territory”.<sup>14</sup> This new policy, Venezuela noted, “was based on the fact that ... British Guiana’s independence had been introduced ... unexpectedly ... and had been immediately supported by the communist ... countries”.<sup>15</sup> Contemporaneous diplomatic despatches confirm that Venezuelan President Betancourt was concerned about British Guiana becoming a “Cuba on the South American Continent”; he had a plan to create a “*cordon sanitaire*” by persuading the United Kingdom to cede a major “slice of British Guiana ... to Venezuela” prior to independence.<sup>16</sup> It was Venezuela’s view that “the possibility of achieving a revision [of the boundary] is better while British Guiana is still a colony”.<sup>17</sup>

16. On 14 February 1962, Venezuela wrote to the UN Fourth Committee. Contrary to its unequivocal conduct during the previous six decades, it referred to a “long-standing dispute” on “demarcation of the frontier”.<sup>18</sup> It claimed for the first time that it could not recognize the 1899 Award because it was allegedly an Anglo-Russian “political transaction carried out behind Venezuela’s back”, by the Russian President of the Tribunal, acting in collusion with the two British arbitrators.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Letter from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom to the United Nations to the Secretary-General of the United Nations (15 Jan. 1962), reprinted in U.N. General Assembly, Fourth Committee, 16th Session, *Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 of the Charter*, U.N. Doc A/C.4/520 (16 Jan. 1962), MG, Vol. II, Annex 15.

<sup>14</sup> U.S. Department of State, *Memorandum of Conversation*, No. 741D.00/1-1562 (15 Jan. 1962), MG, Vol. II, Annex 16.

<sup>15</sup> Id.

<sup>16</sup> *Foreign Service Despatch* from C. Allan Stewart, U.S. Ambassador to Venezuela, to the U.S. Department of State (15 May 1962), MG, Vol. II, Annex 21.

<sup>17</sup> U.S. Department of State, *Memorandum of Conversation*, No. 741D.00/1-1562 (15 Jan. 1962), MG, Vol. II, Annex 16.

<sup>18</sup> Letter from the Permanent Representative of Venezuela to the Secretary-General of the United Nations (14 Feb. 1962), reprinted in U.N. General Assembly, Fourth Committee, 16th Session, *Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 of the Charter*, U.N. Doc A/C.4/536 (15 Feb. 1962), MG, Vol. II, Annex 17.

<sup>19</sup> Id., paras. 16-17.

17. The only “evidence” invoked by Venezuela was a document published posthumously allegedly written in 1944 by Mr. Severo Mallet-Prevost – an American lawyer who had served as junior counsel to Venezuela 45 years earlier in 1899. It was published upon his death in the July 1949 issue of the American Journal of International Law, thirteen years before it was invoked by Venezuela in 1962.<sup>20</sup> The memorandum did not identify, let alone produce, any evidence in support of the Anglo-Russian conspiracy theory.
18. Thus, on 22 February 1962, Venezuela sought to re-open its territorial claim in 1899, before the UN Fourth Committee,<sup>21</sup> based on the Mallet-Prevost memorandum.<sup>22</sup> Venezuela claimed for the first time that it “cannot recognize the validity” of the Award;<sup>23</sup> it called for negotiations to rectify what it portrayed as an “injustice”.<sup>24</sup>
19. The United Kingdom categorically rejected Venezuela’s contention of nullity. A note from the Foreign Office dated 21 February 1962 made clear that “there is no case to answer, because the matter was settled for all time over sixty years ago by international arbitration”.<sup>25</sup> Another note, dated 15 May 1962 reported that the Venezuelan Foreign Minister, Dr. Ignacio Iribarren Borges, had expressed his Government’s determination to press its territorial claim, either before “the United Nations Committees or the International Court” of Justice.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Id., para. 15.

<sup>21</sup> *Statement* made by the Representative of Venezuela at the 1302nd meeting of the Fourth Committee on 22 February 1962, *reprinted in* U.N. General Assembly, Fourth Committee, 16th Session, *Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 of the Charter*, U.N. Doc A/C.4/540 (22 Feb. 1962), MG, Vol. II, Annex 19, para. 33.

<sup>22</sup> Id., paras. 38-47.

<sup>23</sup> Id., para. 48.

<sup>24</sup> Id., para. 53.

<sup>25</sup> *Letter* from J. Cheetham, U.K. Foreign Office, to D. Busk, U.K. Ambassador to Venezuela, No. AV 1081/38 (21 Feb. 1962), MG, Vol. II, Annex 18.

<sup>26</sup> *Letter* from R.H.G. Edmonds, U.K. Foreign Office, to D. Busk, U.K. Ambassador to Venezuela (15 May 1962), MG, Vol. II, Annex 22.

20. On 13 November 1962, following a statement by Dr. Iribarren before the Fourth Committee, pressing Venezuela's contention of nullity, the United Kingdom representative, Mr. Colin Crowe, made a proposal for resolution of the controversy. He stated that while "[t]he British Government does not accept that there is any frontier dispute to discuss", it hoped "that this problem can be finally disposed of now so that British Guiana can move forward [to independence] without any shadow of doubt about its frontiers." In this context, the United Kingdom offered "to discuss with the Venezuelan Government, through diplomatic channels, arrangements for a tripartite Venezuela-British Guiana-United Kingdom examination of the voluminous documentary material relevant to this question". Such a process Mr. Crowe emphasized, would establish that "there is no justification whatsoever for re-opening the frontier question." He made it very clear that this was not "an offer to engage in substantive talks about revision of the frontier" because it had been finally settled by the 1899 Award.<sup>27</sup>

21. Venezuela accepted the British proposal. On 16 November 1962, the Chairman of the Fourth Committee noted the tripartite agreement to "examine the documentary material" on the boundary question "through diplomatic channels". He concluded that there was no need for further debate within the UN.<sup>28</sup>

*The 1963 Joint Communiqué and Tripartite Examination of Venezuela's Contention: 1963-65.*

22. The 'tripartite examination' was conducted by experts appointed by the Parties. The United Kingdom reiterated that its purpose was "not the revision of the frontier"; it

---

<sup>27</sup> *Statement* made by the Representative of the United Kingdom at the 349th meeting of the Special Political Committee on 13 November 1962, *reprinted in* U.N. General Assembly, Special Political Committee, 17th Session, *Question of Boundaries between Venezuela and the Territory of British Guiana*, U.N. Doc A/SPC/72 (13 Nov. 1962), MG, Vol. II, Annex 24, p. 17.

<sup>28</sup> U.N. General Assembly, Special Political Committee, 17th Session, 350th Meeting, *Agenda item 88: Question of boundaries between Venezuela and the territory of British Guiana*, U.N. Doc A/SPC/SR.350 (16 Nov. 1962), MG, Vol. II, Annex 25.

was intended only “to dispel any doubt” by Venezuela “about the validity or propriety of the arbitral award”.<sup>29</sup>

23. Between 30 July and 11 September 1963, the Venezuelan experts conducted an exhaustive examination of British documents in London. Subsequently, in November 1963, at the request of the Venezuelan Foreign Minister, Dr. Iribarren, meetings were held with the British Foreign Secretary in London to review progress. The Ministers issued a Joint Communiqué. They declared that the next step would be for Sir Geoffrey Meade, the expert acting on behalf of both British Guiana and the United Kingdom, to visit Caracas to examine documentary material available in the Venezuelan Archives.<sup>30</sup>

24. In December 1963, Sir Geoffrey travelled to Caracas to examine materials produced by the Venezuelan Government.<sup>31</sup> A British Memorandum dated 25 February 1964 observed that “the Venezuelan authorities have been unable to supply a single shred of evidence” to support their contention of nullity.<sup>32</sup>

25. The tripartite examination was concluded on 3 August 1965 with the exchange of the experts’ reports. The United Kingdom and British Guiana held that there was no evidence whatsoever to justify Venezuela’s contention of nullity; but Venezuela continued to insist that the Award was null and void.

26. Irrespective of this process, by 1965, Venezuela began to issue official maps [SLIDE 3 ON] depicting so-called “Guayana Esequiba” as the *Zona en*

---

<sup>29</sup> United Kingdom, Department of External Affairs, *Memorandum: Venezuelan Claim to British Guiana Territory*, No. CP(64)82 (25 Feb. 1964), para. 3. MG, Vol. II, Annex 26, para. 1; *Statement* made by the Representative of the United Kingdom at the 349th meeting of the Special Political Committee on 13 November 1962, *reprinted in* U.N. General Assembly, Special Political Committee, 17th Session, *Question of Boundaries between Venezuela and the Territory of British Guiana*, U.N. Doc A/SPC/72 (13 Nov. 1962), p. 17. MG, Vol. II, Annex 24.

<sup>30</sup> United Kingdom, Department of External Affairs, *Memorandum: Venezuelan Claim to British Guiana Territory*, No. CP(64)82 (25 Feb. 1964), para. 3. MG, Vol. II, Annex 26, p. 1.

<sup>31</sup> United Kingdom, Department of External Affairs, *Memorandum: Venezuelan Claim to British Guiana Territory*, No. CP(64)82 (25 Feb. 1964), para. 3. MG, Vol. II, Annex 26, paras. 2 - 4.

<sup>32</sup> United Kingdom, Department of External Affairs, *Memorandum: Venezuelan Claim to British Guiana Territory*, No. CP(64)82 (25 Feb. 1964), para. 3. MG, Vol. II, Annex 26 para. 9.

*Reclamación*; territory to be “reclaimed” from British Guiana. One such map is in Tab 3 of the Judges’ Folder. Venezuela maintains that claim to this day. [SLIDE 3 OFF]

27. The sketch map at Tab 4 of the Judges Folder [SLIDE 4 ON] demonstrates that Venezuela’s claim constitutes more than 70% of Guyana’s territory. [SLIDE 4 OFF]

*The London Meeting: 9-10 December 1965*

28. By November 1965, it was decided at the British Guiana Constitutional Conference that the date of independence would be 26 May 1966. The need to affirm the 1899 boundary became more urgent. The Guyanese feared that with the British departure, the Venezuelan military might invade and occupy the Essequibo region. It was agreed, therefore, that British troops would remain for some time to protect the new State’s territorial integrity.<sup>33</sup>

29. In this context, between 9 and 10 December 1965, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom and Venezuela met at the Foreign Office in London, in the presence of the Prime Minister of British Guiana, Mr. Forbes Burnham. The meeting was in “continuation at Ministerial level of governmental conversations concerning the controversy ... in accordance with the Joint Communiqué of 7 November 1963.”<sup>34</sup> The first Agenda item was an “[e]xchange of views on the experts’ report on the examination of documents and discussions of the consequences resulting therefrom”. The second Agenda item was “[t]o seek satisfactory solutions for the practical settlement of the controversy which has

---

<sup>33</sup> Memorial, para 2.15; United Kingdom, Research Department, *Venezuela-Guyana Frontier Dispute*, Nos. DS(L)692, RRN 040/360/1 (10 May 1976), para. 23. MG, Vol. II, Annex 48.

<sup>34</sup> Government of the United Kingdom, *Record of Discussions between the Foreign Secretary, the Venezuelan Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Premier of British Guiana at the Foreign Office on 9 December, 1965*, No. AV 1081/326 (9 Dec. 1965), p. 7. MG, Vol. II, Annex 28

arisen as a result of the Venezuelan contention that the 1899 Award is null and void.”<sup>35</sup>

30. The United Kingdom Foreign Secretary, Mr. Michael Stewart, recalled that Venezuela’s contention “was aimed at the validity of the 1899 Award”. In regard to Agenda Item 1, he enquired if the tripartite examination had satisfied Venezuela that “there was no substance in their allegations concerning the Award’s validity”. The Venezuelan Foreign Minister, Dr. Iribarren, responded that the conclusions of the British experts’ report “were completely unacceptable”; in his view “the only satisfactory solution of the frontier problem with British Guiana lay in the return of the territory which by right belonged to [Venezuela].”<sup>36</sup>
31. Mr. Stewart clarified that Agenda Item 2 on “satisfactory solutions” could only be interpreted “in the narrow context of the controversy over the validity of the 1899 Award”. He recalled that the 13 November 1962 British offer of a tripartite examination had made clear that: “Any consideration of the substantive question of the frontier was out of the question.”
32. Given Britain’s categorical rejection of the contention of nullity, Venezuela was eager to establish an agreed procedure for resolution of the controversy. To this end, Dr. Iribarren proposed a three-stage settlement process; the first would be a Mixed Commission to attempt a bilateral resolution of the dispute; the next would be mediation, and finally, there would be “recourse to international arbitration”.<sup>37</sup>
33. On 10 December 1965, the second day of the London meeting, the Attorney-General of British Guiana, Mr. Shridath Ramphal, began by emphasizing once more that the Agenda “ruled out the question of discussion on the substantive issue of the frontier”; he stated categorically that “British Guiana could not accept that

---

<sup>35</sup> Id.

<sup>36</sup> Id.

<sup>37</sup> Id.

- the 1899 Award was invalid”.<sup>38</sup> Mr. Burnham too made clear that the territorial claim could not be at issue “unless the invalidity of the 1899 Award had first been established.”<sup>39</sup>
34. Faced with this obvious deadlock, Dr. Iribarren once again focused on an agreed procedure for dispute settlement: “Venezuela had come to the conference table” he explained, “not to discuss positions already established ... but ... in full consciousness of the necessity ... to reach a solution of the territorial problem”.<sup>40</sup> He emphasized that: “His own proposal for a mixed commission provided for finding solutions by a series of conciliatory stages, and if necessary by recourse to arbitration by an impartial international body.” “Venezuela’s willingness to submit to an arbitration tribunal”, he added, “represented a great concession on her part.”<sup>41</sup>
35. Mr. President, Venezuela’s Memorandum of 28 November 2019 observes that: “An award is either valid or null; there is no middle ground ... The validity or nullity of an arbitral award is non-negotiable.” Guyana agrees; and that was exactly the position of the Parties at the December 1965 London meeting. One side insisted on the validity and binding force of the 1899 Award while the other claimed that it was null and void.
36. Faced with this impasse, they decided on 10 December 1965 that the “discussions should be continued in Geneva in the week beginning 13 February 1966”.<sup>42</sup> Those discussions produced an agreed procedure for resolution of the dispute, under the 1966 Geneva Agreement, which Mr. Reichler will now address.

---

<sup>38</sup> Id.

<sup>39</sup> Id.

<sup>40</sup> Government of the United Kingdom, *Record of Discussions between the Foreign Secretary, the Venezuelan Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Premier of British Guiana at the Foreign Office on 9 December, 1965*, No. AV 1081/326 (9 Dec. 1965), MG, Vol. II, Annex 28, p 3.

<sup>41</sup> Government of the United Kingdom, *Record of Discussions between the Foreign Secretary, the Venezuelan Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Premier of British Guiana at the Foreign Office on 10 December, 1965*, No. AV 1081/326 (10 Dec. 1965), MG, Vol. II, Annex 28, p. 6.

<sup>42</sup> Id.

37. Mr. President, distinguished Members of the Court, that concludes my presentation.

I thank you for your kind attention and ask that you call on Mr. Reichler.