

the conflict in a spirit of good neighbourliness. Honduras had never sought to eliminate Belize but had always supported and guaranteed the freedom of the oppressed people of Belize, with whom it had very strong ties.

60. Miss FRANÇOIS (Mauritius), speaking in exercise of the right of reply in connexion with the statement by the representative of Guatemala at the 2163rd meeting, said that the text of the draft resolution submitted by her delegation (A/C.4/L.1101), which would have the General Assembly call upon Guatemala to desist from all actions which might threaten the territorial integrity and national unity of Belize, had prompted the representative of Guatemala to assert that the delegation of Mauritius had obtained its information from the United Kingdom. Without wishing to give undue importance to that assertion, she wished to point out that her delegation's position was based on the decisions taken by the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting, held at Kingston earlier in 1975, and the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held recently at Lima, as well as on official United Nations documents. Draft resolution A/C.4/L.1011 was based on factual accounts of events reported widely in the world press, including the Latin American press. The Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the United Nations wished the Committee to know that he had never discussed the situation in Belize with the United Kingdom delegation, nor had he read anything on that subject emanating from the information services of the United Kingdom Government.

61. Her delegation therefore categorically rejected the insinuations of the representative of Guatemala, which should be treated with the scorn that they deserved. The Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the United Nations had consulted no delegation whatsoever before submitting the draft resolution, which her delegation was sure would receive overwhelming support.

62. Mr. SKINNER KLÉE (Guatemala), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, noted that in discussing Guatemala's territorial dispute with Belize, the majority of delegations had been making solemn pronouncements more appropriate to a court of law. His delegation rejected the way in which the General Assembly and its Committees arrogated to themselves powers belonging to another kind of organ. On the other hand, his delegation was always ready to consider proposals that were reasonable, logical and appropriate to the situation.

63. He thanked the representative of Mauritius for her reply. Obviously, the Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the United Nations had consulted no one when preparing his draft resolution.

64. The CHAIRMAN announced that Uganda had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1096, and that Dahomey had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1101.

*The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.*

## 2166th meeting

Thursday, 13 November 1975, at 10.55 a.m.

*Chairman:* Mrs. Famah JOKA-BANGURA (Sierra Leone).

A/C.4/SR.2166

### AGENDA ITEMS 23, 86, 91 AND 12, 92, AND 93\*

Agenda item 23 (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (*continued*) (A/10023 (part II), A/10023/Add.4 and 5, A/10023/Add.6 (part I), A/10023/Add.7, A/10023/Add.8 (parts I-III), A/10082, A/10091, A/10095, A/10097, A/10101-S/11707, A/10104, A/10175, A/10269, A/10300, A/10326-S/11862, A/10337-S/11872, A/C.4/783, A/C.4/786, A/C.4/787 and Add.1-4, A/C.4/789, A/C.4/794-800, A/C.4/L.1094, A/C.4/L.1096, A/C.4/L.1101-1103)

Agenda item 86 (*continued*)\*\*  
(A/10023/Add.9, A/10307)

\* For the title of each item, see "Agenda" on page xi.

\*\* Resumed from the 2162nd meeting.

Agenda items 91 and 12 (*continued*)\* (A/10003 (chapter VI), A/10023 (part V), A/10080 and Add.1-4, A/10319, A/C.4/L.1095)

Agenda item 92 (*continued*)\* (A/10331)

Agenda item 93 (*continued*)\* (A/10329)

### GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)\*

1. Mr. RICHARDSON (United Kingdom), referring to the future of the Territories still dependent on the United Kingdom, which were dealt with under agenda item 23, said that his country stood for the principle of self-determination and, should the majority of the people so wish, the

\* Resumed from the 2162nd meeting.

independence of those Territories. During the past year there had been a number of important developments with regard to the Non-Self-Governing Territories still dependent on the United Kingdom.

2. Massive strides had been made towards the independence of the Seychelles. A constitutional conference had been held in London from 14 to 27 March 1975 at which delegations from the two Seychelles parties had been present. Agreement had been reached on many of the principles and details of an independence constitution, although there were still certain differences of opinion between the two political parties concerning the system of elections and the composition of the legislature. It had subsequently been agreed that an electoral review commission should be appointed in order to help to resolve those differences of opinion, after which the constitutional conference would be reconvened, probably in January 1976. At that conference the aim would be to determine the remaining provisions of the constitution. Thus, subject to the approval of Parliament, the Seychelles would be able to proceed to independence not later than 30 June 1976. At the conference in March, the leaders of the two parties in the Seychelles had agreed to form a coalition Government. The United Kingdom Government had welcomed that development, which had come into effect on 2 June 1975. In order to facilitate the formation of that Government, it had been agreed to enlarge the Legislative Assembly of the Seychelles. He was glad to report that the coalition Government was working smoothly. The Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom to the United Nations had already, in a letter dated 4 October 1975 (A/C.4/789), drawn attention to the appointment of Mr. James Mancham as Prime Minister of the Seychelles and head of the Territory's coalition Government. His delegation fully associated itself with the resolution adopted by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples on 21 August 1975 (see A/10023/Add.6 (part I), chap. XIV, para. 10), in which his Government was asked to take all the necessary steps to assist the people of the Seychelles in their efforts to achieve self-determination and independence. The United Kingdom maintained a programme of assistance to the Territory to prepare the way for independence. In the financial year 1974/1975, his Government had made available a grant of £4,250,000 to the Territory and, in the past four years, it had made available a total sum of £15 million. The Territory was not at present in receipt of budgetary support for its current expenditure, but it would receive such support from 1976 to 1979.

3. In the Solomon Islands, too, considerable progress had been made. In July, an amendment to the Constitution had increased the maximum number of local Ministers from six to eight and had enabled a local Minister to assume responsibility for the finance portfolio. The Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom to the United Nations, in a letter dated 23 May 1975 (A/10023/Add.7, chap. XXI, annex II), had reported on the constitutional talks on the future of the Solomon Islands held in London on 19 and 20 May. If everything went according to plan, the internal self-government order for the Solomon Islands would shortly be considered by Parliament and would be brought into operation after 10 December on a date to be

appointed by the Governor. During the first half of the coming year, a constitutional committee would be making its recommendations to the Government and the Legislative Assembly of the Solomon Islands on the future constitution of the Territory, after which the United Kingdom Government proposed to call a conference in London to draw up an independence constitution and to fix the date for independence, which in principle should follow within 12 to 18 months. His delegation believed that there should be a general election in the Territory, at which the issue of independence should be considered. In the economic field, the National Development Plan for the period 1975-1979 was under way, and the United Kingdom Government would continue to provide assistance to the Territory; currently its aid was running at a rate of some £5 million a year.

4. With regard to the Gilbert and Ellice Islands, the Committee had already been informed, in document A/C.4/786, that as from 1 October 1975 there would be two separate dependent Territories and that the name of the Ellice Islands had been changed to Tuvalu. A ministerial system of government had already been introduced in Tuvalu. In the following year, the administration of Tuvalu would be transferred to the new capital in Funafuti. Both Territories would continue to progress towards the full exercise of self-determination. Their economic resources were limited, but it was encouraging that the two Territories had agreed to maintain a number of common services. A full-scale analysis of the economic potential of both Territories was under way. The United Kingdom Government had committed £4.5 million for development assistance in the years 1973-1976.

5. With regard to the Condominium of the New Hebrides, a joint communiqué had been signed on 11 July 1975 between the Governments of the United Kingdom and France, which had been circulated as document A/10175. It contained information relating to new measures taken concerning the Condominium. It should be pointed out that, subsequently, on 16 August 1975, municipal elections had been held at Port Vila and Santo and that 80 per cent of those entitled to vote had done so. Further details on the reforms adopted and their implementation had been set out in a letter dated 18 November 1974 from the representatives of France and the United Kingdom addressed to the Secretary-General.<sup>1</sup> Elections for the representative Assembly had also just been held in the Condominium, on the basis of universal suffrage, and the results would be known about 20 November.

6. The United Kingdom Government had advised the Government of the British Virgin Islands that it was ready to introduce a number of changes in the present Constitution, some of which would involve a reduction in the powers of the Governor. Elections had been held in September. The new Government had considered it desirable to take the opportunity of the general election to have a full public discussion of constitutional matters. The United Kingdom still awaited the new Government's proposals but believed that it would be possible to arrive at early decisions on constitutional progress. The United Kingdom Government was also contributing economically to the development of the Territory.

<sup>1</sup> Document A/9861, dated 19 November 1974.

7. Constitutional arrangements for the Turks and Caicos Islands were still under discussion. That Territory, too, received budgetary and development assistance. Its economic resources were very slender. His delegation was amazed to read in chapter V of the Special Committee's report, containing the conclusions of Sub-Committee I as adopted by the Special Committee (see A/10023 (part III), para. 6), that there was a direct relationship between the activities of foreign economic interests and the perpetuation of colonialism and that foreign monopolies had frustrated all efforts to achieve self-determination and independence. The facts were the very opposite: it was precisely because there was so little private investment in the Islands that employment was limited and, consequently, there was heavy dependence on United Kingdom grant-in-aid to support local services.

8. The conclusions of Sub-Committee I on the Cayman Islands were even more extraordinary. In that report it was alleged that not even a small percentage of the profits of financial institutions was used for the economic development of the Territory, and that the islanders were employed to do unskilled jobs at ridiculously low wages. His delegation doubted whether those who had prepared the relevant working paper had really done their homework. Actually, the wages paid in the Cayman Islands were among the highest in the Caribbean, and the Government of the Cayman Islands obtained substantial revenue both directly and indirectly. The natural resources of the Cayman Islands were very limited. Far from there being a rush to leave the Territory because of its alleged grinding poverty, immigration was increasing and was beginning to cause some problems. It should also be pointed out that the indigenous people participated at all levels in the administration of the Territory.

9. With regard to Bermuda, his delegation was in broad agreement with the conclusions and recommendations of Sub-Committee II, which had been adopted by the Special Committee and reproduced in chapter XXV of its report (see A/10023/Add.8 (part I), para. 9). The Government of Bermuda had been in control of its own economic and financial affairs for a number of years. The differing views of the two main political parties on the question of independence would doubtless be tested in the general elections to be held in the following year.

10. On the subject of Montserrat, the relevant conclusions of the Visiting Mission of the Special Committee appeared in the annex to chapter XXVIII of the Special Committee's report (A/10023/Add.8 (part II)). He wished to reiterate the gratitude of his Government and its appreciation of the work of the Visiting Mission. There had been some new developments since its visit to the Territory. The Government of Montserrat had accepted the proposals of the physical planning staff provided by the United Nations for the development of the island and had completed its plans for agricultural development, which were currently under urgent consideration by the United Kingdom Government. The United Kingdom had also provided the Government of Montserrat with an agreed figure for the following year's budgetary deficit, so as to assist the Territory in its forward planning. In the political field, it should be stressed that a local politician was currently presiding over the Legislative Assembly. All those developments reflected the recommen-

dations of the Visiting Mission. The Government of Montserrat was making determined efforts to overcome the difficulties it faced, and the United Kingdom would continue to assist it to the best of its ability. Montserrat's problems were in many ways typical of those of other small Non-Self-Governing Territories administered by the United Kingdom.

11. Mr. CAMPBELL (Australia), referring to agenda item 23, said that, since the completion of the report of the Visiting Mission to the Cocos (Keeling) Islands in 1974,<sup>2</sup> there had been further developments which he wished to outline to the Committee. Australia had upgraded the level of its government representation in the Islands by creating a new position of Administrator, to which a senior Australian public service officer, Mr. R. J. Lindford, had been appointed, and the special Minister of State responsible for the Cocos (Keeling) Islands had stressed that that step represented a substantial upgrading. The Minister had also said that the Australian Government was committed to a comprehensive programme of change which would eventually lead to the self-determination of the people of the Territory. The unique socio-economic structure of the community made that task very difficult and it was necessary to have an official of senior status on the Islands, who could consult on a day-to-day basis with the community and with the current proprietor of the estate, Mr. Clunies-Ross. The necessary administrative action had been taken to confirm the Administrator's responsibilities as the agent of Government in the Territory to the exclusion of Mr. Clunies-Ross.

12. Mr. Clunies-Ross had informed the Australian Government that, if it continued to pursue its current policies he would not be prepared to continue to live on Cocos, since his position would be untenable; that his presence on Cocos had already caused the islanders some difficulties; that his departure from Cocos would remove some of the islanders' reluctance to accept changes; that a form of local Government could be established for the community, and that the Government should finance the acquisition of his Cocos operations. The Australian Government had been interested in those proposals, but it had soon become clear that Mr. Clunies-Ross was not after all prepared to co-operate with the Government and did not wish to transfer his estate except for an exorbitant sum. In the circumstances, and since the situation in the Cocos Islands was not satisfactory, because the indigenous people were being denied their human rights, the Australian Government had resolved to act firmly and to introduce changes without further delay. Accordingly, on 10 September, the Government had tabled in Parliament the Lands Acquisition Ordinance 1975 in order to establish a basis for the acquisition of the Territory on just terms, either by agreement or by compulsion. The Australian Government had also appointed an Interim Advisory Council to hold consultations with the community and to advise the Administrator. The Council would be replaced by a fully elected council as soon as the necessary arrangements could be made. The Australian Government considered that the establishment of the Advisory Council was an important step towards greater participation of the people of the Territory in the discussion of matters of

<sup>2</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 23, chap. XX, annex.

concern to them. Other steps had also been taken with a view to restricting the powers of Mr. Clunies-Ross.

13. According to the assessment provided by Senator McClelland, public opinion in the Territory was divided into three sections of similar size: one group was dissatisfied with Mr. Clunies-Ross and the current situation; another supported him and opposed any Government intervention; and another was waiting to see how matters developed. He emphasized that the Australian Government was very anxious for the people of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands to be able to exercise their right to self-determination in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

14. Mr. LASSE (Trinidad and Tobago), referring to the question of small Territories dealt with under agenda item 23, said that his delegation considered that all peoples in dependent Territories had the right to self-determination and independence, as was stated in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV); that the United Nations should not apply a single formula in considering the question of small Territories, since each Territory presented a unique situation; and that the United Nations should be given an opportunity for on-the-spot observations, in view of the testimony afforded by visiting missions.

15. Turning to the situation in the Cocos (Keeling) Islands, he said that the people of the Islands were relatively isolated from the rest of the world and did not have the opportunity to compare their situation with that of other peoples or to appreciate or understand the dynamics of self-determination, let alone independence.

16. His delegation considered that the crux of the problem in the Cocos (Keeling) Islands was the need to separate the community from the Clunies-Ross estate. The Visiting Mission sent to the Islands by the United Nations in August 1974 had recommended that steps should be taken as soon as possible to put an end to the interdependence of the community and the Clunies-Ross estate. The Government of Australia, as the administering Power, had co-operated fully with the Mission and had assured it that it would try to bring about some major changes in order to establish the separate identity of the community.

17. Mr. Clunies-Ross had visited Canberra at the invitation of the Australian Government and had agreed to introduce some changes. However, on returning to the Cocos (Keeling) Islands he had said that the community did not agree with the proposed changes. It was quite clear that Mr. Clunies-Ross would not accept any lessening of his control over the lives and property of the 500 inhabitants of Cocos; he intended to maintain the *status quo*, since he continued to dominate the Council of Headmen of the Island, which was effectively appointed by him.

18. His delegation welcomed the appointment of an Administrator for the Cocos (Keeling) Islands and the establishment of an Interim Advisory Council on the Islands, and it was convinced of the genuineness and sincerity of the administering Power. It was to be hoped that Mr. Clunies-Ross would comply with the new Australian laws designed to ensure justice and equity on the Islands.

## AGENDA ITEM 23

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (*continued*) (A/10023 (part II), A/10023/Add.4 and 5, A/10023/Add.6 (part I), A/10023/Add.7, A/10023/Add.8 (parts I-III), A/10082, A/10091, A/10095, A/10097, A/10101-S/11707, A/10104, A/10175, A/10269, A/10300, A/10326-S/11862, A/10337-S/11872, A/C.4/783, A/C.4/786, A/C.4/787 and Add.1-4, A/C.4/789, A/C.4/794-800, A/C.4/L.1094, A/C.4/L.1096, A/C.4/L.1101-1103)

### QUESTION OF BELIZE (*continued*)

19. Mr. SHIAKA (Zambia), speaking on the question of Belize, said that the presence at the United Nations of a delegation from Belize, led by the Premier and including the Leader of the Opposition, was sufficient reason to convince the world of the unanimity of purpose of the people of Belize.

20. His delegation considered the designs of Guatemala on Belize to be unfortunate, unbecoming and unjustifiable. If the United Nations accepted the unjust claims of Guatemala it would be tantamount to acquiescing in the colonial scheme of a Member State, and such acceptance would constitute a departure from the principles and purposes of the United Nations and a reversal of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

21. Zambia resolutely rejected colonialism and could not agree to the substitution of one colonial Power for another. It believed in total decolonization and stood for the right of all peoples and countries to self-determination and independence. Consequently, Zambia had long identified itself with the just aspirations of the people of Belize, and would continue to do so. Guatemala was aware of the views of the majority of States Members of the United Nations. At the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting, held at Kingston from 29 April to 6 May 1975, and the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Lima from 25 to 30 August 1975, strong support had been expressed for the cause of the people of Belize.

22. He paid particular tribute to the Caribbean countries of Guyana, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, Barbados, Grenada and the Bahamas, which had championed the cause of Belize in all appropriate forums.

23. Zambia was a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1096, which, among other things, called on the United Kingdom and Guatemala to pursue their negotiations in order to resolve their differences of opinion concerning the future of Belize. Those negotiations should serve the purpose of fulfilling the legitimate aspirations of the people of Belize, and not the purpose of accommodating the claims of Guatemala over Belize in any way.

24. Mr. AL-SAID (Oman) said that, as far as the question of Belize was concerned, it should be pointed out, first of all, that the Convention of 1859 between Guatemala and the United Kingdom had been designed, in part, to define

the boundaries of Belize over which Guatemala was not to exercise any jurisdiction. Secondly, there seemed, historically speaking, to have been no moment at which Belize had been occupied by or administratively dependent on Guatemala. Thirdly, the fact that the section of the Convention of 1859 concerning the construction of a communications link between Belize and Guatemala had not been ratified did not justify the confrontation that had occurred.

25. Self-determination did not consist in changing from a state of non-independence under one people to the same state under another people.

26. His delegation considered that Belize had achieved complete internal self-government since 1964 and, in accordance with the decolonization policy of the United Kingdom, was supposed to be heading for total independence. However, the confrontation taking place in the area would prolong the state of partial independence in which the Territory found itself. It was not often that the parties in a conflict could solve such problems independently. That clearly called for the intervention of the United Nations. Talks between the parties concerned should therefore be resumed, with more active participation by the United Nations in all negotiations.

#### AGENDA ITEM 87

Question of Namibia (*continued*) (A/9998-S/11598, A/10023/Add.3, A/10024 (vols. I and II), A/10050-S/11638, A/10229, A/10353, A/C.4/L.1097-1100)

#### CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (*continued*)

27. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolutions A/C.4/L.1097 and A/C.4/L.1098 and announced that the Comoros had joined the sponsors of both draft resolutions.

28. Mr. CAMPBELL (Australia), explaining his vote before the voting, said that he had received instructions to vote in favour of the two draft resolutions on Namibia. However, he wished to clarify a number of points, particularly with respect to paragraph 13 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097. His delegation felt that the severance of economic relations with South Africa that concerned Namibia needed careful study, since it was not clear what the possible effects of the cessation of such trade might be on the African population of Namibia. Moreover, to have any effect, such a trade embargo would need to be observed by the major trading partners of South Africa, of which Australia was not one. His delegation would be prepared to join in a trade boycott provided that it was observed by South Africa's major trading partners, and it felt that, in accordance with the Charter, such calls for the imposition of sanctions should emanate from the Security Council rather than from the General Assembly. Australia's policy was to allow normal economic relations between Australia and Namibia with absolutely no governmental involvement or promotion.

29. Mr. HAYASHI (Japan), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation would vote for

draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097, since it supported the basic objectives, the fundamental principles and most of the action programmes called for in that draft resolution. However, his delegation's affirmative vote should not be construed as full acceptance of all the provisions and wording of the draft resolution.

30. With regard to use of the words "by all means" in paragraph 4, he reiterated that the Government of Japan had consistently taken the position that all international disputes must be settled by peaceful means. As for paragraph 9, his delegation's affirmative vote did not mean that it approved of all the conclusions and recommendations contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia (A/10024 (vols. I and II)).

31. Regarding paragraphs 13, 15 and 16, he assured the Committee that Japan's limited trade with Namibia was in no way an attempt to collaborate in the exploitation of Namibia's natural resources or to help consolidate the continued illegal presence of South Africa in the Territory. It was hard for the Government of Japan, in the existing circumstances, to implement fully all the provisions, but it would co-operate to ensure the implementation of the provisions which it considered practical and possible to comply with. On the subject of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1098, he said Japan had contributed to the United Nations Fund for Namibia and would continue to do so. Consequently, his delegation would vote for the draft resolution.

32. Mr. FAGIOLO (Italy), explaining his vote before the vote, said that his delegation, while appreciating the reasons behind draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097, felt obliged to express some reservations concerning that document. With regard to paragraphs 10, 15 and 22 relating to decrees for the protection of the natural resources of Namibia, his delegation considered that decrees adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia could not be considered an adequate legal basis for concrete action, and that any measure based on such decrees might not be put into effect. Nor did it agree with the words "by all means", in paragraph 4, since Italy considered that the goals of the Namibian people should be attained by peaceful means.

33. Although Italy appreciated the role played by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) in Namibia's struggle for independence, it did not believe that that liberation movement should be viewed as the sole representative of the Namibian people, since the representatives of another liberation movement claiming the right to speak on behalf of the Namibian people, the South West Africa National Union (SWANU), had appeared in the Fourth Committee at the preceding meeting. It was for the Namibian people themselves to decide who their authentic representatives were. Consequently, his delegation could not accept paragraph 3; nor could it accept the implications of the thirteenth preambular paragraph or of paragraphs 22 and 23.

34. For those reasons, his delegation had decided to abstain from voting on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097, while at the same time reaffirming Italy's support for the Namibian people and the belief that they would soon achieve self-determination and independence.



35. Ms. MOYLAN (Ireland), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that, although the Irish Government was gravely concerned about the situation caused by South Africa's illegal presence in Namibia and was convinced that a solution must be found which would allow the Namibian people to exercise their right to self-determination, she wished to express a number of major reservations concerning the texts of draft resolutions A/C.4/L.1097 and A/C.4/L.1098.

36. With regard, first of all, to paragraphs 10, 15 and 22 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097, she thought that the measures to be adopted should be implementable and realistic, and she did not think that the issue of decrees by the United Nations Council for Namibia or their adoption or development by the General Assembly was either an appropriate or an effective procedure in view of the great difficulties in the way of their implementation.

37. She also had reservations about the words "in all its forms" in the thirteenth preambular paragraph and "by all means" in paragraph 4, since her delegation believed that the Namibians' efforts to achieve self-determination and independence should be pursued by peaceful means. Furthermore, with regard to the seventh preambular paragraph and paragraph 2, she expressed reservations concerning the endorsement by the General Assembly of the provisions of the Dar es Salaam Declaration adopted by OAU at the ninth extraordinary session of its Council of Ministers in April 1975, which were not in keeping with the aim of achieving independence by peaceful means.

38. Her delegation was fully aware of the important role played by SWAPO in the process of independence for Namibia. However, any final decision as to who should represent the people of Namibia should be made only by the Namibian people themselves. Consequently, her delegation could not support the wording of paragraph 3 and could not accept all the implications of the thirteenth preambular paragraph or of paragraphs 22 and 23. Furthermore, it considered that the references in the eleventh preambular paragraph were a matter for the Security Council.

39. In spite of those reservations and the absence of a clear spirit of conciliation and compromise in the draft resolutions, her delegation had decided to vote for both drafts.

40. Mr. SKINNER KLEE (Guatemala), explaining his vote before the vote, said that his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.4/L.1097 and A/C.4/L.1098.

41. He wished to make it clear that his delegation's position was in line with the one it had always adopted on the question of Namibia and was not incompatible with its position on the question of Belize. The two questions were different in character. The Namibian question was quite clear and the draft resolutions approached the subject in an appropriate manner.

42. Mr. DE LATAILLADE (France), explaining his vote before the vote, said that his delegation had already drawn attention at the 2154th meeting to its repeated efforts to

convince South Africa of the need to meet the legitimate aspirations of the people of Namibia. In accordance with that position, it would not vote against draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097, whose general objectives were the same as those of France on the matter, particularly where the holding of free elections, referred to in paragraph 8, was concerned.

43. However, his delegation had some significant reservations concerning the text of the draft in question. In the first place, the situation in Namibia, although very serious, did not justify application of the measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter, as was implied in the twelfth preambular paragraph. Furthermore, there was not sufficient proof of the statement made in paragraph 3.

44. His delegation could not support recourse to violence and therefore had difficulties with regard to paragraph 4. The legal value of the Decree on the Natural Resources of Namibia was questionable. Lastly, for reasons directly linked to those expressed concerning paragraph 3, his delegation could not agree to some of the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution described in document A/C.4/L.1099.

45. On the other hand, despite certain reservations, his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1098. France had made a voluntary contribution of \$20,000 to the United Nations Fund for Namibia for 1975 and, in that regard, wished to stress the difference between allocations charged to the regular budget of the United Nations and voluntary contributions of Member States.

46. Mr. KOVALENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explaining his vote before the vote, said that his delegation, in accordance with its well-known position on the question of Namibia, would support draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097, which accurately reflected the opinion of the majority of those who had spoken in the general debate on the item, and in particular the need to take effective action to put an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa.

47. His delegation had repeatedly advocated the rational, efficient and economic use of the funds paid into the regular budget of the United Nations. It hoped that, in applying the provisions of the draft resolution under consideration, the Secretary-General and the Council for Namibia would apply that criterion in the administration of expenses, without prejudice to the implementation of the relevant programmes.

48. His delegation felt that the radio programmes for Namibia should be financed by voluntary contributions and not from the regular budget. It did not agree with the text of paragraph 21 and felt that the financial implications of setting up the radio transmitter requested in that paragraph should be carefully studied, taking into account the recommendations made by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions in 1974 in connexion with the draft resolution subsequently adopted as General Assembly resolution 3295 (XXIX),<sup>3</sup> which had not been reflected in draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, Supplement No. 8, document A/9608/Add.15.

49. Mr. ARAIM (Iraq), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097, drew the Committee's attention to paragraph 21 of the draft and paragraph 3 (k) of the Secretary-General's statement of its administrative and financial implications (A/C.4/L.1099). He said it was assumed that the Secretary-General would proceed to set up the radio transmitter once he had the agreement of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, and that he would do so in co-operation and consultation with the United Nations Council for Namibia. Furthermore, the sponsors felt that the Secretary-General should inform the Council on the matter and that it was not necessary to refer the question to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session.

50. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097.

*At the request of the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Belgium, Canada, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Italy, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

*Draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097 was adopted by 114 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.*

51. The CHAIRMAN said that, if she did not hear to the contrary, she would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.4/L.1098 without objection.

*The draft resolution was adopted.*

52. Mr. KAMANA (Zambia) recalled that, at the 2148th meeting, during the general debate on the question of Namibia, the Norwegian delegation had suggested that the

Commission on Human Rights be asked to conduct an inquiry into all violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms occurring in Namibia while it was illegally occupied by South Africa.

53. His delegation understood that the objectives underlying that proposal were to bring additional pressure to bear on South Africa and to inform people everywhere about the situation. Norway believed that the inquiry might be a useful supplement to ongoing United Nations actions in the political field and that it should therefore be undertaken in close co-operation with the United Nations Council for Namibia and SWAPO.

54. The discussions and unofficial consultations that had ensued revealed that the Norwegian proposal would raise a number of problems if implemented just then, and Norway recognized that fact.

55. He wished to thank the Norwegian delegation for the co-operation and understanding it had shown in the matter and to assure the Committee that the United Nations Council for Namibia would keep the Norwegian proposal in mind as it continued its work in 1976 and would reflect on it further if developments indicated that an inquiry of the kind proposed would be of value.

56. Mrs. MARCUS (Denmark), speaking in explanation of vote, said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097, because it considered that it was essential to give maximum impetus to the endeavours to bring about a solution to the Namibia problem. Denmark had serious reservations, however, concerning several elements of the draft.

57. Denmark strongly believed that the goal of members of the Committee would be served most effectively by a search for unity in the Security Council on a vigorous and constructive approach. Efforts must be made to break the unfortunate deadlock reached on the question and to implement the provisions of Security Council resolution 366 (1974). Therefore, although Denmark supported paragraph 11 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097, it must express its reservations with regard to the twelfth preambular paragraph to the extent that the wording alluded to the provisions of chapter VII of the Charter, determining the circumstances under which the Security Council should take action. The Security Council should be free to adopt the methods it deemed most appropriate to attain the independence of Namibia while retaining the unity of the Territory. As her country's Minister for Foreign Affairs had stated at the 2360th plenary meeting, strict observation of the division of competence between the Security Council and the General Assembly laid down in the Charter was important.

58. Had the voting taken place paragraph by paragraph, Denmark would have been unable to support paragraph 4, which was not in accordance with its view that the Namibian problem should be solved by peaceful means, in accordance with the Charter and international law.

59. Furthermore, for legal reasons, Denmark could not comply with the requests in paragraph 15. In her delegation's view, the legal basis of Decree No. 1 for the

Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia remained questionable and some of its provisions seemed to imply the imposition of sanctions, a matter in which the Security Council alone was competent. That consideration also applied to paragraph 13.

60. Denmark would also have been unable to vote in favour of paragraph 18, since in Denmark the information media were not subject to state control. However, the media gave widespread publicity to the problems of Namibia.

61. From those reservations it would be clear that the Danish Government reserved its position on the seventh preambular paragraph and on paragraphs 2 and 9.

62. Despite the reservations she had mentioned, and others concerning minor points in the draft resolution, Denmark had supported it in order to make a contribution to the endeavour to bring about the solution that was required for Namibia—its rapid attainment of independence as a national and territorial entity.

63. Mr. SAARELA (Finland), explaining his vote, said that Finland had voted for draft resolutions A/C.4/L.1097 and A/C.4/L.1098, in keeping with its policy of actively participating in efforts towards the self-determination and independence of the people of Namibia.

64. It had done so even though it had reservations on some provisions of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097. For example, with regard to paragraph 4, his delegation considered that it was the foremost duty of the United Nations to make every effort to bring about a peaceful solution.

65. Mr. VON UTHMANN (Federal Republic of Germany), speaking in explanation of his vote, said he welcomed the contacts with the regional groups established by the officers of the Committee in connexion with draft resolutions A/C.4/L.1097 and A/C.4/L.1098 as representing an encouraging step towards co-operation, on a truly global basis, in matters of decolonization.

66. In the light of that development his delegation regretted all the more having been unable to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097. Its reservations related above all to the twelfth preambular paragraph, which described the situation in Namibia as a threat to international peace, as well as to paragraph 4, in which the Assembly supported the struggle for liberation "by all means", and to paragraph 15 concerning Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.

67. With regard to paragraph 14, which referred to consular representation in Namibia, his delegation reiterated that its Government, which had a consulate in Namibia, was trying to find a solution that would meet the demands both of OAU and the United Nations and serve the long-term interests of the nationals of the Federal Republic of Germany who were living in Namibia. As to the question of free elections in Namibia, called for in paragraph 8, his delegation whole-heartedly supported that idea. That point had also been stressed by the nine members of the European Economic Community in their joint message of 26 August 1975, on the occasion of Namibia Day.

68. The Federal Republic of Germany had gladly joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1098 and reiterated that it would make a substantial contribution to the Institute for Namibia.

69. Mr. STERNEBERG (Netherlands), explaining his delegation's vote, said that the Netherlands had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) because it had considered that the Assembly was entitled to terminate South Africa's Mandate in view of that country's non-compliance with its essential obligations. South Africa must clearly recognize the responsibility of the United Nations Council for Namibia and end all measures of political repression and enable the United Nations Council for Namibia to establish its presence in the Territory with a view to facilitating the transfer of power on the basis of free elections under United Nations supervision.

70. His delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097 but it had some important reservations concerning it. In the case of paragraph 1, it could not currently support resolutions that it had not supported in the past. With regard to paragraphs 2 and 4, it felt that the efforts of the Namibian people to obtain self-determination and independence should be pursued within the framework of the Charter and by peaceful means. It therefore had reservations about the reference to the struggle "by all means" in paragraph 4, and to the struggle "in all its forms" in the thirteenth preambular paragraph. With regard to paragraph 3, it was fully aware of the important role of SWAPO but could not see SWAPO as the only authentic representative of the people of Namibia.

71. Under paragraph 9 the General Assembly would approve the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia (A/10024 (vols. I and II)). His delegation objected to the fact that, in the conclusions in paragraphs 348 to 355 of the report, the isolation of South Africa was regarded as a "positive factor". It also objected to the term "illegal" as applied to the Government in Pretoria. On the other hand it wished to emphasize its appreciation of the wording of paragraphs 19, 25 and 26 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097, regarding the activities to be undertaken on behalf of Namibia by the Council, in its capacity as legal authority for the Territory.

72. Ms. HOLZER (Austria), explaining her vote, said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097 in order to give unequivocal expression to its disapproval of the position of South Africa with regard to Namibia and to voice its conviction that the pressure to compel that country to abide by the decisions of the United Nations must be intensified.

73. Nevertheless the Austrian delegation had reservations on some points in the draft resolution. With regard to the eleventh preambular paragraph it would like to state that, while Austria continued to maintain diplomatic relations with South Africa, it did not do so in so far as South Africa claimed to act, or acted, on behalf of Namibia. In view of that restriction Austria did not accept the view that those relations encouraged South Africa in its defiance of the United Nations and it believed that the discontinuance of all relations with Pretoria would deprive the international community of the possibility of using such channels for



pressure on the South African Government to change its attitude.

74. Secondly, Austria was not convinced that the situation in Namibia, however grave, warranted describing it—as was done in the twelfth preambular paragraph—as “a threat to international peace and security” within the meaning of the Charter.

75. Austria supported any action on the part of the United Nations to solve the question in a peaceful manner. It accordingly objected to the wording of paragraph 4, and especially commended paragraph 8.

76. As it had pointed out in the general debate on the item (2153rd meeting), the Austrian delegation was ready to support all legally sound and practical measures to prevent further exploitation of the natural resources of Namibia to the detriment of the Namibian people. It had, however, serious reservations regarding Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, referred to in paragraphs 10, 15 and 22.

77. Her delegation also believed that the United Nations should refrain from recognizing any particular political group, however large its support, as the sole or authentic representative of the Namibian people, before the people of Namibia were given a chance to express their will in free and democratic elections.

78. Mrs. SKOTTSBERG-ÅHMAN (Sweden), speaking in explanation of her vote, said that the Swedish delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097 as a reaffirmation of its firm support for the righteous cause of the Namibian people and in support of the basic stand of the United Nations on the subject.

79. That did not mean that it agreed with each individual provision of the draft. For example, there was no need to reiterate Sweden's traditional position on the point covered in paragraph 4.

80. As for paragraph 18, she wished to assure the Committee that the Swedish news media gave ample coverage to the racial and colonial oppression in southern Africa. However, they did that by their own decision, without pressure from the Government.

81. Sweden had always supported the principle of a division of competence between the Security Council and the General Assembly—a division laid down in the Charter itself. It was the prerogative of the Security Council to designate a situation as a threat to international peace and security. In the case of Namibia, her delegation felt that the circumstances justified the application of Article 39 of the Charter, as the Ambassador of Sweden had stated at the 1828th meeting of the Security Council, on 5 June 1975. It had therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution calling for a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa (see A/10024 (vol. I), para. 319), which had not been adopted on account of the negative votes of three permanent Council members. Sweden therefore agreed with the substance of the twelfth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. At the same time it was aware of the fact that such a pronouncement by the General Assembly was

nothing more than an expression of opinion, without any legal force.

82. The same principle of division of competence also had a bearing on Sweden's attitude to the Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia. While Sweden agreed that it was of the utmost importance that those resources should not be depleted before the Namibian people themselves could freely make use of them, it felt that the provisions of the Decree could not be considered legally binding. It therefore could not support paragraph 15, in which all Member States were asked to comply fully with the Decree.

83. In spite of those reservations her delegation had voted for draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097 as a whole, since its position on the principles fundamental to any solution which would do justice to the people of Namibia essentially coincided with the views expressed in the draft.

84. Mr. WU Miao-fa (China), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolutions on Namibia. Nevertheless, his delegation considered it necessary to state that it had always advocated the use of revolutionary dual tactics against the reactionaries' counter-revolutionary dual tactics. Armed struggle was fundamental and must be increased, whether or not there were negotiations, since that was the way in which victory would be achieved.

85. His delegation had some reservations with respect to paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097. The occupation of Namibia by South Africa was illegal and the South African authorities must immediately withdraw their administration from the Territory. Therefore, so long as South Africa continued its illegal occupation, there could be no question of free elections in the Territory, since such action might amount to a disguised legalization of that occupation. It should also be pointed out that in recent years imperialism and colonialism had incited the racist régime of South Africa to resort to every conceivable trick and tactic in an attempt to legalize its illegal presence in Namibia.

86. Paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1098 referred to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund. His delegation considered it necessary to point out that those two organizations had not yet implemented General Assembly resolution 2758 (XXVI) on the expulsion of the so-called representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique and, that they continued to apply a policy of “two Chinas” and to adopt a hostile attitude towards the People's Republic of China. His delegation therefore expressed reservations regarding the reference to those two organizations in the paragraph in question.

87. Ms. WHITE (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, said that the United States had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097 because it objected to the language of a number of preambular and operative paragraphs. In particular, it could not support the twelfth preambular paragraph, which described the situation in Namibia as constituting a threat to international peace and security. If that paragraph had

been the subject of a separate vote, the United States would have voted against it, since it could not agree with such a determination in the current circumstances. It believed that the people of Namibia should be given the opportunity of expressing freely, under United Nations supervision, their own views on the future political and constitutional structure of the Territory. It advocated change in Namibia by peaceful means, and not through armed struggle, which was implicitly condoned in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. In addition, the United States did not regard any one Namibian organization as the sole authentic representative of the people of the Territory, since unfortunately the Namibian people had not yet decided who was their authentic representative. In her delegation's view, the resolution prejudged the outcome of the current political situation in Namibia.

88. Her Government had substantial doubts regarding the legal effectiveness of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia, and reserved judgement on the paragraphs dealing with that Decree.

89. The United States would express its views on the financial implications of the entire draft resolution when the question was raised in the Fifth Committee.<sup>4</sup>

90. Her delegation had participated in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1098 on the United Nations Fund for Namibia. Nevertheless, it continued to have reservations with respect to the allocation to voluntary funds of money from the United Nations regular budget. It would therefore oppose that procedure when the matter was discussed in the Fifth Committee. During the current year, the United States had contributed \$50,000 to the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa. Those funds were specifically earmarked for the use of Namibians.

91. Mr. RICHARDSON (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation regarded the occupation of Namibia by South Africa as unlawful and was in favour of Namibia's early self-determination and independence and of a democratic process of consultation, under some form of United Nations supervision. The ambassadors of the United Kingdom, the United States and France had made a further approach to the South African Government on the subject on 23 October 1975.

92. Nevertheless, his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097 because, first of all, it could not accept the twelfth preambular paragraph, which affirmed that the situation in Namibia constituted a threat to international peace and security. Furthermore, it reiterated that it could not accept the validity of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, referred to in paragraph 15. Moreover, it assumed that the reference to the legitimacy of the struggle of the Namibian people by all means was to be interpreted as meaning peaceful means only, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. His delegation could not accept the appeals

made to Member States to cease trading with South Africa, nor could it accept that the cessation of all trade with Namibia would be to the advantage of the Namibian people. His Government also had reservations regarding the budgetary implications of the proposals contained in paragraphs 20, 21, 22 and 23 of the draft resolution. Finally, his Government could not accept the implication that any particular organization, however important a political grouping it might be, was the sole authentic representative of the people of Namibia in the absence of the desired free and democratic consultation of Namibian opinion.

93. His delegation was pleased to have participated in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1098 on the United Nations Fund for Namibia, and the Institute for Namibia, to both of which his Government had contributed.

94. Mr. WALTER (New Zealand), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had supported the two draft resolutions that had just been adopted. However, it had had some difficulty with certain parts of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097. First of all, in according SWAPO a pre-eminent role among Namibia's liberation movements, paragraph 3 passed a judgement on the other movements, which his delegation could not endorse. While SWAPO was an important political force in the Territory, it was the Namibian people as a whole who must decide the future of their Territory. Secondly, his delegation must reserve for the time being its position on the sections of the draft resolution dealing with Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia. Thirdly, he shared the misgivings expressed by other representatives concerning the inclusion in the draft resolution of phrases and references which might be interpreted as condoning or encouraging the use of armed force to bring about a settlement.

95. Mr. BAUDOUIN (Canada), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation was pleased to participate in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1098 on the United Nations Fund for Namibia.

96. Draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097 contained many provisions which were clearly useful, in particular those advocating positive measures to mobilize world public opinion and to help the people of Namibia to exercise their legitimate political rights. His delegation welcomed the fact that the sponsors of the draft had invited other groups to make observations; however, apart from the addition of paragraph 8, the text was essentially the same as that which had been distributed to the regional groups and no important modification had been made in its provisions to take account of the concerns of a practical nature that delegations of various regional groups had indicated to the sponsors. If the latter had accepted some of the substantive changes proposed, his delegation would undoubtedly have been able to support them in order to reach a consensus.

97. His delegation had some difficulty in accepting the aspects of the draft resolution that implied the possible use of violence or armed struggle and described the situation in Namibia as a threat to international peace and security. It welcomed the addition of paragraph 8 on the holding of free national elections, under the direct supervision and control of the United Nations. In its opinion, it was

<sup>4</sup> See the statement by the United States representative at the 1748th meeting of the Fifth Committee, on 25 November 1975.

important that SWAPO and all political parties and groups that sought to represent the people of Namibia should be able to carry out their campaigns to obtain the unequivocal support of the people of Namibia with a view to preparing independence. His delegation believed that the vast implications of Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia should continue to be the subject of detailed consideration. As that Decree had not yet been discussed by the Security Council, his delegation wished to continue

reserving its position concerning its applicability. Consequently, it had to express reservations with regard to the financial implications involved in paragraph 22. Lastly, since available resources were limited, his delegation considered that, to the greatest extent possible, travel expenditure should be restricted and increased resources allocated to information activities.

*The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.*

## 2167th meeting

Thursday, 13 November 1975, at 3.15 p.m.

Chairman: Mrs. Famah JOKA-BANGURA (Sierra Leone).

A/C.4/SR.2167

### AGENDA ITEM 87

Question of Namibia (*concluded*) (A/9998-S/11598, A/10023/Add.3, A/10024 (vols. I and II), A/10050-S/11638, A/10229, A/10353, A/C.4/L.1097-1100)

#### CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (*concluded*)

1. Mr. BERGH JOHANSEN (Norway) said that his delegation had supported draft resolutions A/C.4/L.1097 and A/C.4/L.1098, concerning Namibia, because it wished to give whole-hearted support to efforts to bring self-determination and independence to that land.
2. His delegation had, however, some doubts about certain provisions of the draft resolution dealing with political matters (A/C.4/L.1097), in particular as to whether the General Assembly should concern itself with matters that could be more appropriately dealt with by the Security Council. Furthermore, his delegation continued to have reservations with regard to the use of the words "by all means" in paragraph 4, since they could be interpreted as condoning the use of armed force; it also reserved its position with regard to Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, which his Government was still considering.
3. In his delegation's view United Nations responsibility for Namibia entailed special obligations. Norway was therefore ready to do its utmost in keeping with the Charter of the United Nations, to promote the speedy attainment of self-determination and independence for the Namibian people.
4. Mr. PAQUl (Dahomey), speaking in explanation of vote, said that, contrary to its practice in previous years with regard to draft resolutions concerning Namibia, Dahomey had not been one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1097. His delegation had, however, voted in favour of the draft resolution, despite its routine character, as a matter of African solidarity and because it agreed with the main thrust of the draft resolution and the Namibian liberation movement had approved it.
5. His delegation had, however, a number of reservations, since, in its view, no matter how vigorous the language used to express the aspirations of the liberation movements whose just cause the United Nations was defending, resolutions lacking in realism were not likely to enable the Namibians to achieve their goal of self-determination and independence at the earliest possible date.
6. During the general debate on the agenda item, at the 2153rd meeting, his delegation had emphasized the need for the General Assembly to find a new approach to the problem of Namibia, since the failure of the methods used so far was evident. In future, the Committee should bear in mind certain facts.
7. First, whatever the energy displayed by the United Nations Council for Namibia and the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, the Council could accomplish useful work only by establishing itself in Namibia and thus playing the effective role, which it had been assigned, of administering the Territory. The only way to change the situation in Namibia, and to implement Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, was for it to be on the spot. Second, the Committee was aware that South Africa was persisting in its refusal to hand Namibia back to the United Nations and that it was doing everything possible to divide the Territory in order to retain its presence there for a very long time to come. Third, the Committee knew that the South African presence in Namibia was the guarantee of foreign economic interests, particularly the interests of the transnational corporations. Fourth, the Committee knew that, whatever it did, under those circumstances, three of the Powers holding the veto in the Security Council would never agree to abandon South Africa to the fate of being subjected to the provisions of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. Fifth, his delegation considered that it was only the countries that were giving unconditional support to South Africa that were in a position to put pressure on it and bring it to reason, as had been proved recently by the press communiqué issued following their joint approach to the South African authorities. Sixth, South Africa had been suspended from participation in the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly and had not been represented at the