

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 22nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BOYA (Benin)

later: Mr. VARELA QUIRÓS (Costa Rica)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (continued)

(a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

(b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 89: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

(a) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

(b) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES, (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 91: QUESTION OF EAST TIMOR: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 93: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES BY THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

(a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

/...

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.4/34/SR.22
15 November 1979
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

CONTENTS (continued)

(b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 94: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 95: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (continued) (A/34/23/Add.3-5, 7 and 8, A/34/65, A/34/66, A/34/98, A/34/103, A/34/109, A/34/276, A/34/282, A/34/308, A/34/312, A/34/342, A/34/343, A/34/420, A/34/421, A/34/427, A/34/439, A/34/483; A/C.4/34/6, 8 and 11, A/C.4/34/L.2/Rev.1, L.5, L.6, L.7, L.9, L.10, L.11, L.12, L.14)

- (a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)
- (b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 89: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued) (A/34/23/Add.9, A/34/554)

- (a) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)
- (b) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 91: QUESTION OF EAST TIMOR: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued) (A/34/23/Add.3, A/34/311, A/C.4/34/3/Add.1-5, A/C.4/34/5 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.4/34/8, A/C.4/34/L.3/Rev.1)

AGENDA ITEM 93: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES BY THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE UNITED NATIONS (continued) (A/34/23 (Part V), A/34/208 and Add.1-3)

- (a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)
- (b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued) (A/34/3/Add.28, A/34/357, A/34/389)

AGENDA ITEM 94: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

/...

AGENDA ITEM 95: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
(continued) (A/34/572)

1. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should adopt the draft proposals relating to various Territories under consideration. He drew the Committee's attention to the statement of the administrative and financial implications of those draft proposals submitted by the Secretary-General in document A/C.4/34/L.12.

Question of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands (A/C.4/34/L.5)

2. The draft consensus was adopted.

Question of Tokelau (A/C.4/34/L.6)

3. The draft consensus was adopted.

Question of St. Helena (A/C.4/34/L.7)

4. The draft consensus was adopted.

Question of Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Montserrat and Turks and Caicos Islands (A/C.4/34/L.10)

5. The CHAIRMAN announced that Haiti and India had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.10.

6. The draft resolution was adopted.

Question of American Samoa (A/C.4/34/L.9)

7. The CHAIRMAN announced that Grenada and Haiti had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.9.

8. The draft resolution was adopted.

Question of the British Virgin Islands (A/C.4/34/L.11)

9. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Bahamas, Grenada, Haiti, Sierra Leone and the United Republic of Tanzania had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.11.

10. The draft resolution was adopted.

General debate (continued)

11. Miss VALERE (Trinidad and Tobago) welcomed the accession to independence of several former colonial Territories in the Caribbean and the Pacific. In the

(Miss Valere, Trinidad and Tobago)

Caribbean, however, several Territories had not yet been able to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination. Her delegation was very much aware of their difficulties and considered that each Territory's progress towards independence had to be considered in the light of its specific needs and circumstances. Some of the Territories administered by the United Kingdom, for example, wished to develop their economies before embarking on the road to political independence. Their wishes and aspirations should be respected.

12. She stressed, however, that the onus was on the administering Power, in accordance with Article 73 of the Charter, to promote the political, social and economic development of those Territories. She therefore urged the various administering Powers to renew their efforts to that end, and to take further measures to accelerate the development process in those Territories, while taking care to safeguard the rights and interests of the peoples of the Territories at all times.

13. Through the Caribbean Economic Community and Common Market (CARICOM) and the Caribbean Development Bank, which financed various projects relating to the development of the infrastructure of both self-governing and Non-Self-Governing Territories in the region, Trinidad and Tobago was contributing to the economic development of those Territories and sought to promote regional integration and co-operation.

14. Noting that visiting missions to several Territories had been planned, she stressed the usefulness of such missions in enabling the Special Committee to obtain first-hand information on conditions in the Territories, and in enabling the inhabitants to become aware of the possibilities open to them concerning their future political status.

15. The refusal to allow the people of Western Sahara to exercise their right to self-determination was exacerbating tension in the region. The international community had a duty to do its utmost to enable the people of that Territory to achieve their legitimate aspirations for independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). Her delegation welcomed the peace treaty concluded between Mauritania and the Frente POLISARIO and supported the decision adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU in Monrovia and subsequently endorsed by the non-aligned countries in Havana, under which the Saharan people would be allowed to determine their own future by means of a referendum.

16. Similarly, the international community could not continue to ignore the suffering endured by the people of East Timor. Constructive measures should be taken, without delay, to find a just and lasting solution to that question.

17. Mr. DUNFEY (United States of America) said that, in accordance with its obligations under Article 73 e of the United Nations Charter, his Government regularly transmitted information to the Special Committee on the evolution of the situation in American Samoa, Guam and the United States Virgin Islands and had invited it to send visiting missions to those Territories.

18. In American Samoa the Second Future Political Status Study Commission, established in 1978, had concluded after considering the various possible options that it was best for the time being for American Samoa to retain its existing

/...

(Mr. Dunfey, United States)

political status and to continue to be administered by the United States, with some modifications. However, it had not ruled out the possibility that the Territory might accede to independence or form a union with, for example, Samoa or Hawaii if the situation changed. The Commission had recommended that a third commission should be established within a few years to re-examine the political status of the Territory. President Carter had recently signed into law a bill permitting the election in 1980 of an American Samoan to serve in the United States Congress, where Guam and the United States Virgin Islands were already represented.

19. In the Virgin Islands, where successive constitutional conventions had tried to draft a Constitution, the people of the Territory had rejected the draft produced by the Third Constitutional Convention. The United States nevertheless believed that the people of the Virgin Islands themselves would be able to develop a document which would meet their true aspirations.

20. Although it was aware of the need to solve the immediate problems of the peoples of American Samoa and the United States Virgin Islands, his Government was also concerned about the long-range objectives of those Territories. It was thus reassessing its relationship with those Territories in various spheres, and for that purpose a task force had visited each of the Territories in order to seek the views of local officials; his delegation hoped to be able to report to the Fourth Committee on the results of that work at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

21. The United States was proud of the progress achieved towards greater self-government, in the Territories it administered, in an atmosphere of freedom and democracy, and it reaffirmed its support for the provisions of Article 73 of the United Nations Charter and for the principle of the right to self-determination of the peoples of the Territories which it administered.

22. Mr. KOBINA SEKYI (Ghana) said it was regrettable that questions like those of Western Sahara, Belize and East Timor continued to appear on the Committee's agenda, particularly as the problems of those Territories derived not from the machinations of racist régimes, as in southern Africa, but from the actions of countries which themselves had been victims of alien domination and were known for their adherence to the principles of non-alignment. Ghana, which had always supported the principle of the right to self-determination of peoples set forth in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), considered that that right must be freely exercised. All peoples naturally aspired to be masters of their own fate and to choose their own political status, without having that choice dictated by external forces. Those were the indispensable prerequisites for achieving genuine self-determination.

23. Those requirements were met in neither East Timor nor Western Sahara. The military occupation of Western Sahara by Morocco and Mauritania, whose territorial claims had been rejected by the International Court of Justice, was illegal and contrary to the United Nations Charter. The sixteenth session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU held at Monrovia, and the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana, had confirmed the right to self-determination of the Saharan people, and OAU had decided to

(Mr. Kobina Sekyi, Ghana)

establish a special committee to work out the modalities for the organization of a referendum with the co-operation of the United Nations. His delegation was co-sponsoring a draft resolution under which the General Assembly would welcome that decision and call upon all the parties, including Morocco, to co-operate in its implementation. The Government of Mauritania deserved a tribute for having rectified past errors and withdrawn from the conflict. His delegation urged the Government of Morocco to follow that admirable example by relinquishing its claims and respecting the territorial integrity of Western Sahara. On 24 August 1979 his Government had officially recognized the Government set up by the Frente Popular para la Liberación de Saguia el Hamra y Rio de Oro (Frente POLISARIO) as the only legitimate government of Western Sahara, and it believed that the Frente POLISARIO must participate on an equal footing with the other parties in all negotiations which were initiated in order to find a solution to the problem.

24. East Timor, in common with Western Sahara, had also been occupied by a neighbouring country. The international community could under no circumstances accept that occupation as a fait accompli. The resistance of the people of Timor under the leadership of the Frente Revolucionária de Timor Leste Independente (FRETILIN), which had been confirmed by many witnesses, made it impossible to talk of a fait accompli and for its part, as a non-aligned country, Ghana could not accept or recognize a situation brought about by the use of force. It hoped that the Indonesian Government would take all the necessary steps, including the withdrawal of its forces from the Territory, to enable East Timor to accede finally to self-determination and to establish relations of mutual co-operation with Indonesia. Meanwhile, in view of the tragic situation of large numbers of Timorese civilians, his Government urged the Indonesian authorities to permit the provision of humanitarian assistance to the population through UNICEF, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the International Red Cross and similar agencies.

25. On the question of Belize, Ghana's position remained unaltered. The accession of the people of Belize to independence, to which the administering Power was not opposed, had for some years been blocked by claims of a legal character put forward by Guatemala arising from the alleged non-fulfilment by the United Kingdom of obligations under a bilateral agreement concluded in the previous century. Ghana considered that the dispute between Guatemala and the United Kingdom should be settled by negotiations between the two countries and should not prevent the people of Belize, who had never been party to the bilateral agreement, from exercising freely their right to self-determination and acceding rapidly to independence. In that respect, Ghana stressed that it was for the General Assembly and not for administering Powers to decide when their obligations under Article 73 of the Charter came to an end.

26. With regard to the implementation by the specialized agencies of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, Ghana found it deplorable that certain bodies, particularly the financial institutions of the United Nations, were assisting the apartheid régime under the pretext that they operated under charters which left them no other course of action, when certain

/...

(Mr. Kobina Sekyi, Ghana)

conditions were fulfilled. Thus the assistance which IMF had given to South Africa in 1976 had been very much greater than the assistance it had provided to the rest of Africa under much more stringent conditions. The financial and other resources of the United Nations agencies could not be used both to attack and to defend apartheid. No specialized agency, and still less any subsidiary body, should be permitted to act in a manner contrary to the objectives of the United Nations. the provisions of Article 48, paragraph 2, and of Article 2, paragraph 5, of the Charter implicitly prohibited Member States from assisting the apartheid régime, either directly or through a specialized agency. His delegation was therefore ready to co-sponsor a draft resolution which, inter alia, called upon the financial agencies of the United Nations to refrain from providing any assistance to the apartheid system.

27. Mr. DABBASHI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that his country was particularly interested in the question of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories and of countries which had recently become independent because it had itself suffered greatly under colonial occupation on the part of fascist Italy. It was indisputable that the colonialist and imperialist countries had deliberately left the peoples of the Territories under their domination in a state of ignorance because a literate and educated population would inevitably have aspired to independence. Even when the colonial Powers offered study and training facilities to those peoples, they imposed on them their own cultural and political framework. That was the reason why there was such a large exodus from Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa of students who refused to take lessons from the racist Powers or to be drafted into the armed forces of those countries and thus have to fight their brothers in the national liberation movements. They preferred to emigrate to neighbouring countries which, unfortunately, lacked sufficient educational facilities to provide for all of them.

28. The United Nations thus had an important role to play in relation to study and training facilities for the inhabitants of those Territories. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, for its part, hoped that the resources mobilized to help them, particularly in the form of scholarships for students from South Africa and Zimbabwe, would double in 1980. Greater study and training facilities should be offered to the inhabitants of those territories and their abilities must be developed so as to bring about an improvement in their standard of living, increase their national awareness and help them to administer their territories once they became independent.

29. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya was only too familiar with the repercussions of colonialism at the cultural and social levels. It was therefore particularly anxious to help the colonized peoples by offering them study and training scholarships through their national liberation movements or through international organizations. It was in that spirit that it had accepted over 2,000 foreign students, many of whom were from southern Africa. Furthermore, in 1979 it had contributed \$60,000 to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and \$20,000 to the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa, as indicated in the Secretary-General's report (A/34/571). Lastly, it had offered 20 scholarships for students from southern Africa for the academic year 1979-1980.

/...

(Mr. Dabbashi, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

30. Despite the encouraging efforts mentioned in the Secretary-General's report, it had to be recognized that the available funds and equipment were still insufficient. In the case of scholarships, for example, although the number of renewals of scholarships was satisfactory and in 1978-1979 60 per cent of scholarship holders had attended establishments in countries of Africa and Asia, the number of new scholarships offered was still insufficient. Thus the Programme had shortcomings and certain Member States were not complying with General Assembly resolutions on the matter. His country, for its part, was glad to confirm that the contribution of \$15,000 to the Programme which it had announced would be sent to the Secretary-General within the next few days.

31. The States Members of the United Nations which had themselves been persecuted in the past had a duty to help their brothers who were currently in the same situation. At the current session, the General Assembly should call upon the Member States which had not yet done so to contribute to the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for southern Africa, urge that contributions to the Programme should be doubled in 1980 and call upon the administering Powers to fulfil their responsibilities vis-à-vis the indigenous populations of the Territories concerned in respect of education. That was the very least which could be asked from the wealthy countries.

32. Mr. SETLOBOKO (Lesotho) said that every Territory, regardless of its size or the size of its population, should achieve independence and self-determination and that any attempt to impose colonialism must be vigorously opposed. It was for that reason that Lesotho had given its unqualified support to the peoples of Belize and Western Sahara and considered that the claims of Guatemala and Morocco were unfounded and contrary to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

33. There was no longer any question of defining the status of Western Sahara, which Lesotho considered was already a sovereign country; instead, the foreign occupation and aggression by its northern neighbour must be brought to an end. On the question of Belize, any solution which did not enjoy the support of the people of that Territory would be unacceptable. It was therefore to be hoped that the United Kingdom would continue to safeguard the vital interests of the people of Belize and that it would reach a settlement with Guatemala which took those interests into account; it was unacceptable that the people of Belize should be held hostage indefinitely. Thus the United Nations should prepare the way for the independence of Belize by establishing a precise timetable for it.

34. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that 1980 would mark the 20th anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which had proved to be an active political and moral instrument in the struggle of the colonial peoples to accede to independence and exercise their right to self-determination. By now the former colonial empires had collapsed and nearly all the newly independent countries were Members of the United Nations and were participating in the struggle against racism, apartheid and colonialism.

/...

(Mr. Kharlamov, USSR)

35. Nevertheless, millions of peoples in the world were still in a situation of domination. The decolonization process was being obstructed by the forces of racism, and although the Special Committee of 24, the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Special Committee against Apartheid and the General Assembly had adopted important resolutions, the peoples of Namibia, Zimbabwe, South Africa and of the small Territories of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans had to continue their struggle.

36. On the basis of the documents submitted on the item and the statements made in the Committee, it seemed that the main obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration was indeed the self-interest of the Western colonialist, racist and imperialist Powers. Those powers were not fulfilling their obligation under the United Nations Charter to help the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories to advance in the economic and social fields and gain their independence. The argument sometimes advanced in the West that those peoples would prefer to maintain the status quo was inadmissible. All the peoples of the world had the right to independence and it was inconceivable that they should wish to renounce that right.

37. The question of the illegal installation of military bases by the colonial Powers in the Non-Self-Governing Territories had frequently been raised in the United Nations. Yet it had to be recognized that those bases were being maintained and even expanded in various parts of the world, particularly in Guam, Micronesia, Bermuda, the Caribbean and the Indian Ocean. Far from contributing to the development of those Territories, as was maintained in some quarters, the presence of those military bases was hindering their accession to independence. Indeed, it was hardly possible to talk of economic development in Guam, for example, when a third of the Territory was used for military installations. According to the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, all military activities in the colonial Territories were illegal and it was the peoples of those Territories, and not the colonial Powers, who had exclusive sovereignty. The resolutions concerning decolonization made frequent mention of the options offered to those Territories. In reality, however, the only possibilities offered were those that were in the interests of the administering Powers, which wanted to use the Territories for military purposes. Thus, in times of peace, the Western Powers were establishing and developing military bases in Guam, Samoa and Micronesia thousands of kilometres from their own countries.

38. His delegation had already had occasion to refer several times to the difficult situation in Micronesia, where, after 30 years of trusteeship, the administering Authority continued to claim that it was preparing the inhabitants for independence. Independence was unfortunately still remote and, according to many documents and the testimony of the Micronesians themselves, the Territory remained in a state of economic and cultural underdevelopment. His Government had always maintained that the question of Micronesia was part of the question of decolonization, that the Territory should be allowed to accede to independence in accordance with the recommendations of the Special Committee of 24, and that all illegitimate military activities there should cease. In fact, any change in the status of a Trust Territory could be decided upon only by the Security Council.

/...

(Mr. Kharlamov, USSR)

39. Namibia and South Africa, too, were hotbeds of colonialism and racism which represented a threat to the peace and security not only of the neighbouring countries but of the entire world. As in the past, the Soviet Union stood in solidarity with all those peoples; it would help them to free themselves by opposing those who tried to impose their hegemony on other countries. The Soviet Union had no need of spheres of influence in other continents. On the contrary, it aided national liberation movements in a disinterested way and combatted racism and colonialism everywhere in order to deepen détente and normalize international relations.

40. Mr. DOO KINGUE (Assistant Administrator of UNDP and Director, Regional Bureau for Africa) reported on several measures which UNDP had taken since the thirty-third session of the General Assembly with a view to assisting African peoples still suffering under colonialism and apartheid in southern Africa.

41. In the first place, following the request made by the General Assembly in resolution 33/27, during the 1979 session of the Governing Council, the Administrator of UNDP had convened a meeting attended by representatives of 18 United Nations organizations, OAU and three African liberation movements recognized by OAU. The participants in the meeting had discussed ways of strengthening the existing co-operation between the United Nations agencies and the national liberation movements, and means of improving the programming and implementation of humanitarian assistance to the African liberation movements recognized by OAU. It had, moreover, been agreed that such meetings should be held every year, on the occasion of the session of the Governing Council.

42. Secondly, UNDP was deeply involved in the preparation and management of the Namibia Nationhood Programme, all projects for which had been approved. UNDP had committed \$5.1 million for the execution of eight of those projects, and additional funding of \$2.4 million for the remaining projects had been drawn from the Trust Fund for Namibia.

43. UNDP was also financing the Zimbabwe economic and social survey, for which UNCTAD was the executing agency. An advisory committee for the study had been set up which included representatives of the Patriotic Front, the office of the Secretary-General, the Economic Commission for Africa, UNCTAD and UNDP, and it had held three meetings, in December 1978, April 1979 and June 1979. The survey had been conducted by a team of Zimbabwean and international specialists. By the end of May 1979, 26 reports had been completed covering the main economic and social sectors.

44. It was also anticipated that an interagency workshop would be organized in 1980 to develop, with the co-operation of the Patriotic Front, a kind of Nationhood Programme for Zimbabwe, on the basis of the findings and conclusions of the economic and social survey.

45. Finally, with regard to the financial situation of the programme of assistance to colonial countries and peoples, the total resources available to UNDP for assistance to the liberation movements of southern Africa until the end of 1981

/...

(Mr. Doo Kingue)

amounted to \$17.2 million, of which \$8 million had been spent as of 31 December 1978; the unspent balance for the remaining three years was therefore \$9.2 million. To avoid having to scale down the assistance being provided, the Governing Council had decided to increase by \$7.5 million the allocation for the programme of assistance to colonial countries and peoples, thus bringing the amount of funds available to \$24.7 million.

46. Such developments were indicative of the seriousness with which UNDP viewed its co-operation with OAU and the assistance to be given to African colonial countries and peoples. Like some Member States, UNDP was aware of the need for close monitoring of that co-operation programme. It was therefore in the process of reviewing each of the on-going projects through the system of tripartite reviews it applied to other types of projects financed by UNDP. In fields other than humanitarian assistance to liberation movements, UNDP had participated in the planning and financing of a symposium on problems of African development by the year 2000, held in Monrovia in February 1979 under the auspices of OAU and ECA. The report of that symposium had been very well received by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, which had decided to hold a special session on African development as a follow-up to the Monrovia symposium.

47. Mr. Varela Quiros (Costa Rica) took the Chair.

48. Mr. SIMON (Grenada) said that, in keeping with its revolutionary duty, Grenada was fiercely opposed to colonialism and imperialism and denounced the manoeuvres to annex Western Sahara without regard to the wishes of the people of that Territory, because they violated the Charter of the United Nations and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). It applauded Mauritania's decision to renounce all claims to Western Sahara, and endorsed the initiatives of the Algerian Government which had identified itself with the struggle of the Saharan people under the leadership of the Frente POLISARIO, their sole legitimate representative, to recover their right to independence in accordance with the principle of self-determination.

49. The recent announcement by the United States Government that it would supply military equipment to Morocco amounted to direct intervention to frustrate the process of independence in Western Sahara. Such a move endangered peace and security in the region and violated the Charter of the United Nations and that of the Organization of African Unity.

50. Grenada, which had extended recognition to the Frente POLISARIO as the sole legitimate representative of the Saharan people, had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.2/Rev.1 on the question of Western Sahara.

51. Mr. Boya (Benin) resumed the Chair.

52. Mr. RATANGA (Gabon) said that although the struggle against colonialism in Africa and other regions of the world was entering its final phase, it was more urgent than ever before for the international community, and in particular the

/...

(Mr. Ratanga, Gabon)

specialized agencies and organizations in the United Nations system, to take joint action to help all colonial peoples to exercise their right to self-determination and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). His delegation reaffirmed its wholehearted support for the struggle waged by the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia to achieve their legitimate aspirations, and its constant support for the objectives set out in the Charter of the United Nations with regard to decolonization.

53. Many States condemned Morocco's attitude towards the question of Western Sahara, although neither their interests nor their frontiers were threatened. Yet those same States seemed to ignore the existence of the Madrid Agreement and the reality of the history of Western Sahara, where the process of decolonization had been completed in 1975 with the recovery by Morocco of its legitimate sovereignty over that part of its territory. It was, moreover, surprising that those who had defended the cause of the Saharan people so fervently still hesitated to recognize the Republic which had been proclaimed in that part of Morocco's national territory. Accordingly, while respecting the recommendations made by the Ad Hoc Committee of OAU, his delegation felt in no way bound by them, but maintained its position of principle that the return of Western Sahara to Morocco was perfectly legitimate from a historical and a legal viewpoint.

54. Nevertheless, no effort should be spared to bring Algeria and Morocco to the negotiating table and to initiate a frank and direct exchange of views, in order to put an end to the futile loss of human life, to avert a conflagration which would in no way serve the interests of the African continent, and thus to restore the friendship and solidarity which had always united the peoples of the region at the most difficult times. The common struggle of Africa should be for development and not for confrontation. A new resolution which ignored that imperative would not resolve the problem, regardless of its content.

55. Mr. SIKAULU (Zambia) said that the question of Western Sahara was one of the most important before the Fourth Committee. The situation in the Territory following its annexation by Morocco constituted a sad chapter in the history of decolonization. It was alarming that an African country had the audacity, on the flimsiest of pretexts, to replace Spain as the colonial Power in Western Sahara.

56. His Government had always been steadfast in support of the struggle of peoples under colonial domination for self-determination, freedom and independence, whether the colonial Power was African or not. For that reason, it wholeheartedly supported the Saharan people who, after fighting against Spanish colonialism, were today obliged to repel Moroccan invaders.

57. In October 1979, Zambia had recognized the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic. Zambia had delayed taking such action in the hope that Morocco would realize its mistake and recognize that there was no alternative but to allow the people of Western Sahara to express their aspirations freely. Morocco had, however, rejected all the efforts of the Organization of African Unity, the movement of non-aligned countries and the United Nations which had advocated a just solution to the problem. Morocco would not even allow the question of the rights of the Saharan people to be raised. If its claim to Western Sahara was genuine and shared by the

/...

(Mr. Sikaulu, Zambia)

people of the Territory, Morocco would have no reason to oppose a referendum. Its refusal to co-operate was clearly motivated by a fear of seeing the claim rejected by the Saharan people.

58. It was revolting that, in the present era, a foreign Power was denying a people its inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence, in order to expand its own territory. Zambia was vehemently opposed to such machinations, whether in Southern Africa or in Western Sahara.

59. Morocco's policy in Western Sahara had caused untold suffering to the people of the Territory. Many had sacrificed their lives in resisting annexation and in fighting to exercise their inalienable rights. Morocco had also created a source of tension in the area as it had relentlessly sought to divert the attention of the international community from the real issue in Western Sahara and had indulged in acts of provocation against those neighbouring States which supported the just cause of the Saharan people.

60. In contrast, Mauritania had demonstrated tremendous courage and extraordinary statesmanship by signing an agreement with the Frente POLISARIO in which it had renounced all its claims to Western Sahara. Instead of following that example, Morocco had occupied the part of the Territory relinquished by Mauritania, thus manifesting its determination to persist in a course which endangered peace and security in the region.

61. Against the background of the situation in Western Sahara and the attitude of Morocco, his delegation had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.2. It considered the draft resolution realistic and mild, and hoped that the Committee would adopt it by an overwhelming majority.

62. Mr. MAPP (Barbados) said that, despite the adoption of General Assembly resolution 33/36, a stalemate had been reached in the attempts to grant the people of Belize independence, since the United Kingdom and Guatemala had not resumed the negotiations which they had begun the previous year.

63. The rejection by Guatemala of the fair and reasonable proposals put forward by the United Kingdom Government in September 1978 was to be deplored, as was its consistent failure to heed the resolutions of the General Assembly. The bad faith shown by the Government of Guatemala could be seen only as an attempt to frustrate the efforts of the Belizean people and the international community to bring Belize to independence, and to guarantee its territorial integrity.

64. As the Minister of External Affairs of Barbados had clearly indicated in the plenary Assembly, Barbados deplored Guatemala's persistent claim to the territory of Belize, in defiance of world opinion and United Nations resolutions and was convinced that the surrender of any part of Belize's territory, however small, would threaten the stability, peace and security of the whole region.

65. The people of Belize were obviously firm in their desire for self-determination and in their commitment to achieving real independence with full territorial sovereignty.

/...

(Mr. Mapp, Barbados)

66. Barbados likewise believed that the administering Power was committed to granting independence to Belize, but was not prepared to guarantee that independence subsequently. That indecisiveness, with the ever-present threat of Guatemalan intervention, had for 15 years prevented the people of Belize from exercising their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter. The Guatemalans were engaging in subversive activities and propaganda campaigns which were in flagrant violation of the principle of non-intervention and threatened peace and security, not only in Central America, but also in the Caribbean and Latin America.

67. It was therefore imperative for the international community to condemn such machinations and persuade Guatemala to renounce its policy of expansion, to recognize that the people of Belize, despite the threat to their Territory, were resolved to march towards independence, and to emulate the position taken by Mexico which realized that basic human rights were more important than territorial claims inherited from the colonial past.

68. Mr. CASTILLO ARRIOLA (Guatemala) observed that each instance of decolonization was sui generis. Belize was legally part of Guatemala and its population was largely Guatemalan in origin.

69. The Special Committee of 24 had rightly decided to consider the question of Belize at its next session. An international legal dispute over Belize was currently the subject of negotiations between the United Kingdom and Guatemala. No decision on self-determination and independence for Belize could be taken until that dispute had been settled. Guatemala was ready to bring those talks to fruition and was gratified that the United Kingdom Government was similarly inclined.

70. Referring to the 1978 Memorandum of Understanding signed by Mr. David Owen, then United Kingdom Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, Mr. George Price, Premier of Belize, and Mr. Dean Lindo, Leader of the Opposition, (A/34/23/Add.7, chap. XXIX, annex, para.8) he said that the Fourth Committee should take account of Belize's decision "to put the issue of the Anglo-Guatemalan dispute above party politics and to treat the search for a solution as a national objective". Guatemala, having advocated such a policy for some years, heartily approved of that decision.

71. After quoting paragraph (f) of the Memorandum of Understanding, he stressed that only the present Government of Belize, which was increasingly unpopular, continued to call for unilateral independence. In February 1978 the opposition party had called for a moratorium on independence, and had even advocated a referendum before independence was granted.

72. It was of primary importance to distinguish the question of self-determination from the question of a Member State's territorial integrity having been threatened by a colonial Power immeasurably more powerful than a small country such as Guatemala.

/...

(Mr. Castillo Arriola, Guatemala)

73. He thought that the legal nature of the Anglo-Guatemalan dispute should be reflected in any negotiated settlement of the question of Belize. The Guatemalan people would then be able to ratify any such settlement, in accordance with their Consitution, under which Belize was part of Guatemala and any measures affecting that Territory had to conform with the national interest. Those attitudes lay behind his Government's quest for a just settlement which would preserve Guatemala's interests whilst safeguarding the interests of the Belizean people.

74. Reviewing the past status of Belize, he recalled that Guatemala had exercised total sovereignty over that Territory between 1821, when it had become independent from Spain, and 1859, when an arbitrary Treaty between Guatemala and the United Kingdom had been signed, granting the United Kingdom rights in perpetuity over the Territory. That Treaty had no legal validity, since in 1938 the United Kingdom had unilaterally declared that it was not bound by the obligations which it had entered into in exchange for the Territory. In 1946, Guatemala's legislative chamber had ratified the abrogation of the 1859 Treaty, whilst the Constituent Assembly had reaffirmed, in the Constitution of the Republic, that the Territory of Belize was part of the nation's common heritage and had recommended the Government to take all necessary steps to regain it.

75. Such was the legal status of Belize before the United Nations had been founded; and United Nations instruments and decisions could not be applied retroactively or be invoked for a Territory which, as an integral part of a Member State - Guatemala, was occupied by a great Power - the United Kingdom. In accordance with its constitutional mandate, the Guatemalan Government had taken new steps aimed at incorporating Belize in the territory of Guatemala by proposing different forms of settlement to the United Kingdom.

76. More than two years earlier, the United Kingdom and Guatemala had begun a new series of direct negotiations, aimed at finding a just and honourable solution for all the parties involved. He observed that certain Governments which were not parties to the dispute had exerted political pressure in favour of partial interests, and had attempted to have resolutions adopted by the United Nations which were not strictly in accordance with the provisions of the Charter and the Organization's other norms. It was deplorable that those Governments, while proclaiming the right of countries formerly under colonial régimes to self-determination, independence and sovereignty within inviolable frontiers, ignored the claims made by Guatemala, a former colony which included Belize in its territory.

77. He was pleased to note that the United Kingdom was as committed as Guatemala to continuing to seek a negotiated settlement. At times, the negotiations had reached a stalemate, as had occurred a few months earlier. However, that stalemate would be broken as soon as the situation improved, when the new Belizean Government had been formed following the elections to be held in the Territory at the end of November.

78. Mr. Rogers, Deputy Premier of Belize, had often stated his position on the question, a position which was inflexible and inappropriate and in no way conducive to reaching a negotiated, peaceful settlement of the dispute between Guatemala and

/...

(Mr. Castillo Arriola, Guatemala)

and the United Kingdom. That dispute was territorial in nature: it was important to recognize Guatemala's essential interests and for both parties to determine Guatemalan boundaries, in a manner which would favour Guatemala's development and provide the department of Petén with access to the sea.

79. The intransigent position outlined by Mr. Rogers contravened the provisions of the above-mentioned memorandum, in which the Government and opposition of Belize had agreed to put the Anglo-Guatemalan dispute above party politics and to consider a solution to that problem as a national objective. That was legitimate, bearing in mind the inviolability of his country's frontiers from the time when the territory had gained independence in 1821. His Government was convinced that, in the absence of a settlement of the territorial dispute, the status of Belize could not be validly altered. Mr. Rogers's accusations that Guatemala was interfering in the affairs of Belize, and particularly in electoral publicity, perhaps derived from his fear of seeing the party he represented lose in the elections.

80. With respect to the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom, his delegation was prepared to consider constructive proposals intended to bring about solutions which were just and equitable for all parties, including the people of Belize.

81. It was in that constructive spirit that his delegation would submit, for consideration by the Fourth Committee, some amendments to the draft resolution put forward by Angola and other countries (A/C.4/34/L.14) in order to ensure that the resolution made an effective contribution to the solution of the problem of Belize.

82. Mr. NEYTCHEV (Bulgaria) said he was pleased to note that in the current year a number of specialized agencies, and in particular UNESCO, FAO and WHO, had increased their efforts to accelerate the process of decolonization and to contribute to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and had achieved certain concrete results in various fields. He regretted, however, that other institutions, and particularly the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund, although in possession of considerable means, had still not taken the necessary steps to help the peoples of the colonial territories in their struggle for self-determination, independence and human dignity and were continuing to withhold their co-operation in the efforts to achieve decolonization.

83. His delegation believed that non-governmental organizations were one of the best channels for promoting the ideals of justice and freedom contained in the Charter and relevant documents of the United Nations. They must therefore be involved closely as possible in the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and they must be encouraged for that purpose to continue their campaign to mobilize public opinion on behalf of the liberation struggle in Zimbabwe, Namibia, and other colonial territories.

84. Introducing draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.13 on the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by

/...

(Mr. Neytchev, Bulgaria)

the specialized agencies and international institutions associated with the United Nations, he noted that the specialized agencies had an essential role to play in the decolonization process. He recalled that the draft resolution concerned had many points in common with that adopted by the Special Committee of 24 on 10 August 1979, which appeared in document A/34/23 (fifth part). The sponsors of the draft resolution had seen fit to reproduce most of that text because, in their view, it contained the conclusions and recommendations which provided the specialized agencies with the necessary guidelines in the field of decolonization.

85. Four main factors had been taken into consideration: the consultations with the representatives of the national liberation movements on the assistance they needed and the help provided by the specialized agencies, the consultations with the representatives of OAU, the consultations with the representatives of the specialized agencies and the consultations with the executive heads of the specialized agencies and with the representatives of the non-governmental organizations.

86. The sponsors had based the draft resolution on the principle that the specialized agencies could play an important role in accelerating the decolonization process and that it was their duty to follow the example of the General Assembly and its main bodies in that field. They were duty-bound to implement, in their respective areas of competence and on the basis of their own resources, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

87. In the preamble the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.13 had thought it worthwhile to include a new paragraph taking account of the relevant provisions of the Final Declaration of the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries held at Havana in September 1979.

88. He drew the Committee's attention particularly to paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, in which the specialized agencies and other United Nations bodies were requested to render as a matter of urgency all possible moral and material assistance to the colonial peoples in Africa struggling for their liberation from colonial rule. It was also important that the organizations which had not yet done so should include in the agenda of the meetings of their principal bodies an item on the progress they had achieved in the implementation of the Declaration and the other relevant resolutions of the United Nations.

89. The aim of the draft resolution was to ensure that the specialized agencies provided assistance to the colonial peoples and their national liberation movements in their noble struggle for freedom, self-determination and independence. The sponsors were firmly of the view that the adoption of the text would mark a new stage in the struggle of the United Nations against colonialism, racial discrimination and apartheid, and for the freedom, self-determination and independence of all the colonial countries and peoples.

90. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Congo and Ghana had become co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.3/Rev.1 concerning East Timor and that Cape Verde, India, Madagascar, Mozambique and Zaire had become co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.13.