that occasion, Great Britain had not consolidated its title to them by fulfilling the minor obligation imposed by the compensation clause in that Convention.

43. For those reasons, Uruguay would vote for draft resolution A/C.4/L.1094, of which it was a sponsor, and draft resolution A/C.4/L.1102, and regretted that it could not vote for draft resolution A/C.4/L.1096.

44. Mr. SKINNER KLEE (Guatemala), speaking on a point of order, expressed his dissatisfaction with the short-comings of the interpretation into English of the statements made in Spanish at the current and preceding meetings.

45. The CHAIRMAN said that the point raised by the representative of Guatemala would be drawn to the attention of the Secretariat.

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/C.4/784/Add.2, A/C.4/L.1097-1100)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS *(continued)*

46. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to documents A/C.4/L.1099 and A/C.4/L.1100 which set out the administrative and financial implications of draft resolutions A/C.4/L.1097 and A/C.4/L.1098, respectively.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

2165th meeting

Tuesday, 11 November 1975, at 3.20 p.m.

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

A/C.4/SR.2165

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/C.4/784/Add.2, A/C.4/L.1097-1100)

HEARING OF PETITIONERS *(concluded)**

1. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that, in connexion with the request for a hearing (A/C.4/784/Add.2) received from the South West Africa National Union (SWANU), it had been agreed that a representative of SWANU should be invited to make a statement in connexion with the Committee's consideration of draft resolutions on the question of Namibia. She therefore called upon Mr. Kasume, of SWANU, to address the Committee.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. David V. Kasume, representative of the South West Africa National Union, took a place at the Committee table.

2. Mr. KASUME (South West Africa National Union) expressed gratitude for the assistance given by the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and by the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia and his staff to the cause of the Namibian people and for the support shown by sympathetic delegations.

3. Since September 1974, South Africa had been attempting to disguise the true nature of its intentions towards Namibia while engaging in a campaign of terror against the Namibian people. The Vice-President and the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of SWANU and other members of the movement had recently been the victims of acts of terrorism, but the illegal South African administration had taken no action against the perpetrators, who were known tribal hooligans of one of the so-called true and authentic leaders.

4. South Africa had claimed that it was ready to withdraw from Namibia if the people of the country so desired, and that it was taking steps to allow the people to decide their own future without outside interference. There was no doubt, however, that South Africa was not only illegally occupying Namibia, but also interfering with the democratic political activities of Namibians. The Chairman of the Namibia National Convention (NNC) and his colleagues had recently been arrested by the Special Branch of the South African police, their only crime being their expressed opposition to *apartheid* and to the so-called constitutional conference currently being held at Windhoek. They had not been charged, and after a few weeks of solitary confinement they had been released without apology for wrongful detention. While such atrocious acts were being perpetrated, some delegations were stating in the United Nations that South Africa was genuinely looking for a peaceful solution to the problem of Namibia.

5. SWANU and NNC had always realized that South Africa was trying to divert attention from its true intentions, which were to create another situation similar to that in Southern Rhodesia, with political and economic power in the hands of the white minority settlers and their willing

* Resumed from the 2156th meeting.

stooges and opportunists, and to provide propaganda for its Western supporters. The South African régime calculated that such a "solution" would check international condemnation of its illegal occupation and allow it to continue to control the destiny of Namibia. From the outset, SWANU and NNC had condemned that mockery of democracy and self-determination. They had exposed it as a trick whereby South Africa was hoping to secure a mandate from the so-called true and authentic representatives of the Namibian people, who were in reality nothing but stooges and opportunists. SWANU and NNC had consistently rejected any "solution" aimed at dividing, weakening and further subjugating Namibia and its people. Moreover, they had repeatedly affirmed their commitment to the basic principles of national unity and territorial integrity.

6. There were those who, because of their interest in uranium and other raw materials, would ask what SWANU proposed to do to bring about a solution. In reply, he reiterated its position, which was that South Africa must recognize and state publicly the right of all the Namibian people, both at home and abroad, to self-determination and independence; that South Africa must accept that the territorial integrity of Namibia, including the port of Walvis Bay, was absolute and inviolable and that South Africa must accept that the nationalist movements that currently constituted NNC were indispensable to any solution to the Namibian problem. Without the acceptance of those basic principles, SWANU would not participate in any dialogue or exercise in détente.

7. Instead of accepting those reasonable conditions, the South African administration was attempting to crush the vanguard of popular resistance and promote elements that would support it in its plans for "bantustanization". The accompanying personal harassment and large-scale coercion of the nationalists demonstrated the extent to which South Africa was prepared to go in imposing its "bantustan" solution in Namibia.

8. On the question of national unity and territorial integrity, there were certain principles that SWANU could not abandon. It rejected all measures designed to divide the Namibian people or to deprive them of their right to self-determination. Although it was willing to seek a solution, it would not sacrifice the democratic rights of the Namibian people for temporary gains.

9. The movement to unite Namibia had suffered a setback, since the overwhelming majority of the Namibian people had been unjustifiably denied a role in the activities of the United Nations, although, by its own resolutions, the Organization had assumed a special responsibility towards them. Divisive resolutions had been adopted without any regard for their consequences for the over-all struggle of the people of Namibia. The South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) had been elevated to a position where nobody could question its claim to have exclusive rights over other groups and individuals. Whenever SWANU tried to draw attention to those apparent inequities, the divisive resolutions were quoted to block any just solution to an obviously unjust situation. Various resolutions of OAU had been used to camouflage the reality of the Namibian situation and the dangers that those divisive resolutions represented for the nationalist movements and for the role of the United Nations as a future transitional Government. The Namibian people were likely to be alienated by such resolutions and might come to reject the United Nations. SWAPO did not represent SWANU and could speak only for its own members. Without the protection of those divisive resolutions, SWAPO would be forced to admit that it was not the authentic representative of the Namibian people.

10. It was not always essential to involve OAU in Namibian affairs, although SWANU had always appreciated the efforts of OAU to liberate the African continent form the vestiges of imperialism and colonialism. The laudable position of OAU had been summed up in the resolution adopted by the Council of Ministers of OAU at its nineteenth session, held at Rabat in June 1972, which had reaffirmed that the administration of Namibia was the direct responsibility of the United Nations and that such a responsibility included the obligation to support, promote and protect the rights of the people of Namibia as well as the national unity and territorial integrity of the Territory, in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions.

11. Unlike SWAPO, both OAU and SWANU had been trying to promote national unity. The United Nations, and the Fourth Committee in particular, seemed to care little about the efforts of the Namibian people to achieve national unity, which was inseparable from the exercise of their right to self-determination and independence. In a statement to the Fourth Committee at the twenty-ninth session (2110th meeting), the President of SWANU, who was also Foreign Secretary of NNC, had appealed for support for the efforts to achieve national unity and ensure territorial integrity. Yet, no reference to that appeal had been included either in the resolution emerging from those debates or in the draft resolutions currently before the Committee (A/C.4/L.1097 and A/C.4/L.1098). On the other hand, SWAPO, the only group in NNC that was opposed to meaningful united action, was being hailed as the national liberation movement of Namibia and the authentic representative of the Namibian people.

12. Press reports indicated that South Africa was using Namibia as a base for the invasion of Angola. SWANU categorically condemned such aggression and called upon the international community to do the same. It also called upon all those who regarded themselves as friends of Angola to desist from dividing the people of that country.

13. In conclusion, he wished to express the gratitude of SWANU to the peoples and Governments of Denmark, the Netherlands and the Ivory Coast for the positive stand they had taken on the question of the national unity of the Namibian people.

Mr. Kasume withdrew.

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS
(continued)

14. The CHAIRMAN announced that Jamaica had become a sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.4/L.1097 and A/C.4/L.1098.

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/Add.4 and 5, A/10023/Add.6 (part I), A/10023/Add.7, A/10023/Add.8 (parts II and 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.4/794-799, A/C.4/L.1094, A/C.4/L.1096, A/C.4/L.1101, A/C.4/L.1102)

QUESTION OF BELIZE *(continued)*

15. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (Barbados) expressed his delegation's satisfaction with the various chapters of the 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. Barbados had noted with pleasure the progress made by the Special Committee and by the administering Powers, the United Kingdom in particular, in promoting the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

16. In the Caribbean area, colonialism still persisted, partly because certain colonies found it convenient to retain their links with the United Kingdom. The case of Belize, however, was different. The passionate national preoccupation of the people of that Territory was independence. The question of Belize therefore deserved serious consideration, since the fate of the Belizeans depended on the clarity and conviction of the arguments expressed within the United Nations.

17. Although Guatemala's professions of affection had been resisted by Belize, Guatemala continued to be a persistent suitor to the extent of employing force. The massing of troops by Guatemala on its border with Belize constituted a serious threat to international peace and security in the region. Historical data provided by Guatemala itself indicated that towards the end of the eighteenth century, it was Spain, not Guatemala, which had surrendered the disputed Territory to the United Kingdom. Since Guatemala was at the time a colony of Spain, it had no say in the ultimate disposition of adjacent real estate.

18. Furthermore, the résumé of Guatemala's dispute with Great Britain over the Territory of Belize, published by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Guatemala, indicated that by the time Central America had become independent in 1821, British *de facto* occupation of Belize's present borders was complete. With the signing of the Anglo-Guatemalan boundary Convention in 1859 the *de facto* occupation became *de jure* acquiescence. In 1931, the two Governments, having acknowledged that the Convention in 1859 had never been ratified, had agreed to fix on the ground the terminal points of the frontiers as defined in it.

19. It seemed clear that after years of contention, Guatemala was trying to achieve by moral persuasion what could not be accomplished by treaty obligation, by assuming the role of spiritual heir to the Mayan empire. But, as the Premier of Belize had stated at the 2162nd meeting, if Guatemala were to set itself up as the only legitimate heir to the Mayan empire, it would lay claim to parts of Mexico and Honduras, too.

20. There could be little doubt that the presence of forces on the Guatemalan side of the border was intended as a threat to the foundations upon which Belize was proposing to build its future in the event of a British withdrawal. Article 2 of the Charter of the United Nations called for the peaceful settlement of any dispute which threatened international peace and security. General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) was an affirmation of the right of the people of Belize to complete freedom and independence. It was the contention of his delegation that Guatemala had no claim to the Territory of Belize either in law or in fact, and that to deny and frustrate the legitimate aspirations of the Belizean people was to prolong the unhappy era of gun-boat diplomacy.

21. There were six undisputed facts: first, the inhabitants of Belize were a separate and distinct people; second, the Guatemalan Government had never physically administered the Territory; third, Belize had a parliamentary form of government; fourth, both the Opposition party and the party in power were united in their desire for independence; fifth, Belize had a viable economy; and, sixth, the United Kingdom had consented to satisfy Belize's desire for self-determination and independence.

22. In 1973 the Ambassador of Honduras, speaking in the General Assembly, had challenged the British claim to speak on behalf of Belize, since Belize was supposed to be Honduran territory. He was puzzled by the sudden withdrawal of that claim by Honduras and wished to know whether Honduras still laid claim to any part of Belize or wished to truncate it.

23. Barbados supported Belize in its aspirations to determine its own future without fear of external domination and to proceed to sovereign independence in friendship and co-operation with its neighbours. The day would surely come when Belize would take its rightful place in the United Nations. Guatemala and Belize must, however, live together as good neighbours. All the peoples of the region had the same geophysical and geo-political destiny and, ultimately, fruitful and peaceful collaboration was inevitable. The United Kingdom would eventually leave the area, but Guatemala, Belize, Barbados and the neighbouring nations had no alternative but to remain. It was essential, therefore, to devise a *modus vivendi.*

24. His delegation earnestly hoped that Guatemala, yielding to logic and wisdom, would renounce its unjustifiable claim to Belize and arrive at some accommodation with the United Kingdom. Barbados was sure that both Belize and Guatemala would eventually resolve their difficulties and that the wisdom of mature statesmanship would prevail in a manner consistent with justice.

25. Mr. JACKSON (Guyana) said that the struggle for freedom and independence continued because the post-colonial revolution, which was a phenomenon of the second half of the twentieth century, had not yet run its course. Latin America had not been lacking in freedom fighters, whose memory and contribution were still held in esteem in

Guyana. Yet, while determined to erase the vestiges of traditional colonialism, the international community must be vigilant lest it appeared to be assisting a nascent colonialism seeking to establish itself through a theory of "the rights of succession".

26. It was against such a background and in the light of the fundamental principles universally applied in contemporary international life that the question of Belize should be considered. The first principle, a people's right to self-determination, was established in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The second, that of non-acquisition of territory by force, was a cardinal principle of contemporary international relations. The third and final principle had been proclaimed at the first ordinary session, held at Cairo in July 1964, of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU, whose members had pledged themselves to respect the borders existing on their achievement of national independence. Those principles, which lay at the heart of what the United Nations stood for, were eminently relevant to the situation in Belize.

27. The people of Belize desired from the international community a clear affirmation of their right to accede, in accordance with their freely expressed wishes, to full political independence in a climate free from the fear of territorial aggrandizement. That goal had been partly realized because the people of Belize, through their chosen representatives, participated as equals in formal institutions such as the Caribbean Community and the Caribbean Free Trade Area (CARIFTA). Guyana conducted its relations with Belize as if the latter were truly and fully independent and his delegation hoped that within Latin America, beyond the framework of the English-speaking Caribbean, relations with Belize could be developed on the basis of sovereign equality and mutual respect. Latin America must vigorously defend those precepts as it sought to make common cause with the rest of the third world and with other progressive forces.

28. In addressing the Committee at its 2162nd meeting, the Premier of Belize had made a statement that was as clearly one of aspiration as it was one of fear. The people of Belize wanted independence and the administering Power was prepared to act in strict compliance with their wishes. Yet that objective continued to elude them because a neighbouring country, Guatemala, whose people had exercised their own right to self-determination many years before, persisted in sustaining and promoting an untenable claim to their territory. The people of Belize had a very real fear of absorption. If the arguments adduced in support of Guatemala's claim were stripped of their legal irrelevancies and if the existing situation were viewed with historical hindsight, the question inevitably arose whether such an image of the past should inhibit the vision of the future. The essential historical experience of the Americas, in particular the Caribbean region, was that it had been an arena for contending and warring European imperialistic forces. It was therefore contradictory–and, indeed, tragic–that a Latin American State should now seek to behave as an inheritor of such ignominious rivalries. The nations of Latin America were intensely involved in the search for real solutions to the real problems that afflicted them and Belize also wished to participate fully and equally in that collective endeavour. The Minister for External Relations of Guatemala, speaking at the 2372nd Plenary meeting, had envisioned a mutual gravitation of interests of the people of Belize and the people of Guatemala and had referred to the major efforts of the Central American States to achieve that kind of integration through a gradual and progressive process, while endeavouring to develop the region to the full and to overcome nationalistic quarrels that created ill will among sister nations. The freedom and independence of Belize was a *sine qua non* for the achievement of that objective. The Government and people of Guyana stood firm in their commitment to ensure that the people of Belize were able to take their rightful place among the community of sovereign States.

29. Mr. MAGETO (Kenya) said that all peoples had the right freely to determine their political destiny and freely to pursue their economic, social and cultural development, as proclaimed in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). Kenya fully supported the principle of self-determination and independence for the people of Belize and hoped that the Committee would adopt a draft resolution affirming the territorial integrity of Belize and the right of the people to self-determination and independence. Kenya was firmly committed to supporting the efforts of the colonized people until they regained their full independence.

30. The Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting, held at Kingston, from 29 April to May 1975, had declared that the Heads of Government offered their full support for the aspirations of the people of Belize for early independence and had called on all parties to take the necessary action for a speedy solution of the problem, which could be endorsed by the international community through the United Nations, in accordance with the principle of self-determination. Furthermore, the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Lima from 25 to 30 August 1975, had expressed its unconditional support for the people of Belize, whose aspirations for independence continued to be frustrated by territorial claims. Kenya's position on the question of territorial claims based on colonial crimes was well known: it requested and supported the sovereignty of a people, and the sovereignty of Belize lay with those who live there.

31. Kenya was a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1096, because it recognized that a negotiated settlement, which fully respected the inalienable rights of the Belizean people, was the best possible solution to the problem. It called on all States which respected the principles of self-determination of peoples to support that draft resolution.

32. Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas) said that the issues raised with respect to Guatemala's disputed territorial claim to Belize were secondary to the call for self-determination and independence. Belize, one of the few remaining colonial Territories, had indicated that it was not satisfied with the *status quo*. Independence for a country meant an opportunity to establish goals and to set a course of development of its own choosing. There was no justification for discussions regarding the "readiness" of a country for independence, and the people of Belize, like the people of any other country, should be allowed to determine their own destiny.

33. Belize had been a self-governing Territory for more than 11 years and the most recent effort of the Belizeans to bring their cause to the attention of the international community by requesting to be heard by the Fourth Committee was a further indication of their serious desire to become a sovereign nation. The representative of Guatemala had stated at the 2162nd meeting that his country did not oppose independence for Belize, yet the Premier of Belize had stated at the same meeting that the one barrier to his country becoming a free nation was fear of domination and subservience under foreign rule. It was interesting to note that in all the propaganda on the matter that his delegation had seen and heard, little mention had been made of the people, of the Belizeans and Guatemalans, or of their concerns and desires.

34. His delegation did not believe that any country would subject itself to a new form of colonialism after freeing itself to some degree from foreign rule. It would be unwise for the people of Belize to change their culture, customs and heritage in order to try to be assimilated into an alien system, and it would be dangerous for them to make their economic survival subject to the decisions of another Government without having a major voice in the decision-making process. His delegation believed that there was a real risk that the Belizean people might be subjected to the control of a more powerful nation, which would like to be a friendly neighbour, but on its own terms.

35. His delegation had sponsored draft resolution A/C.4/L.1096 because it firmly believed in the principle that all peoples had the right to self-determination and because it was opposed to the domination of peoples anywhere against their will. The Belizean people wanted to survive free from fear of invasion and physical, social, economic and cultural enslavement. It was for that reason that they had appealed to the United Nations for help. While the adoption of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1096 would be of some help, the Belizeans would still be in the same predicament, or even worse, as long as they had no communication with their neighbours, with whom they had to live. It was therefore mandatory, for peace and stability in the region, that the avenues of negotiation should remain open. The situation between Belize and Guatemala had not reached a state of overt hostility, and that meant that tragic occurrences could be averted by sensible, frank and honest discussions. His delegation therefore appealed to the countries of the region and people everywhere to direct their efforts to that end. The international community had a moral obligation to see that fair play and justice were done.

36. Mr. GUTIERREZ (Bolivia) said that his delegation's sponsorship of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1094, which took account of the interests of the people of Belize, had been motivated by considerations of continental solidarity and by the belief that the settlement of international disputes should be based on respect for legal norms and the principles of equity and justice.

37. The countries of Latin America, bound by a spirit of mutual solidarity, must defend each other's causes, avoiding divisions and intrigues. His country's defence of Guatemala in its dispute over Belize went beyond questions of trade and ideologies. He hoped the spirit of Latin American solidarity would prevail. The dispute should also be seen against the background of the solidarity of the States members of the Group of 77 and of the non-aligned movement. It was necessary to uphold the principle of territorial integrity in keeping with the United Nations Charter.

38. Referring to the historical background to the dispute, he said that the Territory currently known as Belize had originally served as a haven for pirates enjoying British protection. Later conquered by Great Britain, it had subsequently been restored to Spanish rule while Great Britain had retained treaty rights to exploit the timber resources of the Territory. However, such a concession clearly did not give Great Britain sovereign rights over the land.

39. Guatemala was currently facing a problem arising from its weakness vis-à-vis a great Power similar to that encountered by Bolivia, when a dispute over part of its territory, which was used for the production of fertilizers, had led to the loss of territory on the Pacific coast.

40. Early in the nineteenth century, Great Britain had assumed treaty obligations to restore to Spain most of the former Spanish territories that it had taken. There were those who denied certain territorial claims to Belize on the grounds that it had been exploited for many years by Great Britain, but the principle of prescription should not apply when a claim was interrupted, as it had been in the case of Belize by treaties concluded between Spain and Great Britain.

41. Guatemala, as the weaker State, had been unable to resist Great Britain indefinitely and, in 1859, it had capitulated by signing a boundary Convention with the United Kingdom acknowledging the latter's claim. The United Kingdom had failed, however, to implement a provision of that Convention concerning the construction of a road linking the two countries and Guatemala had accordingly declared the Convention to have been abrogated, and had sought arbitration of the dispute in an effort to avoid a confrontation between the two parties.

42. The first question to be resolved, prior to that of self-determination for the people of Belize, was the question of sovereignty over Belize. Attempts to invoke the principle of self-determination—which Guatemala did not oppose—were merely an evasive manoeuvre to avoid recourse to bilateral negotiations or arbitration.

43. In conclusion, he wished to reaffirm his country's great respect for the United Kingdom with which it enjoyed close relations. However, out of solidarity with the fraternal countries of Latin America, Bolivia felt obliged to defend Guatemala's claim. At the same time his delegation was sincerely convinced that the road to lasting peace lay in dialogue and mutual understanding.

44. Mr. PAVIĆEVIĆ (Yugoslavia) reaffirmed his delegation's conviction that the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the elimination of the remnants of colonialism and racism constituted the only way to establish more equitable international relations and to strengthen world peace and security.

45. The people of Belize had the right to rid themselves of British colonial domination and to exercise their right to self-determination, independence and territorial integrity. That was why his delegation had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1096, which reaffirmed that right.

46. The Premier of Belize, in his statement at the 2162nd meeting of the Committee, had said that, if the Territory did not gain independence at that time, then it would either continue to live under British colonial rule or be subjected to a new colonial occupation.

47. The United Nations should therefore declare its support for the self-determination, independence and territorial integrity of Belize and the complete withdrawal of the British colonial presence. Welcoming the administering Power's declared readiness to hand over the administration to the people of Belize, he said that the United Nations could not recognize Guatemala's claim: the people of Belize must be permitted to decide their own destiny.

48. His country could not condone any action aimed at impeding the process of decolonization and self-determination, from Belize to Angola, and at preventing colonial peoples, wherever they might be, from realizing their right to self-determination, independence and, in particular, to the territorial integrity of their countries. Furthermore, the non-aligned countries had always considered it their right and their duty to support that process. The Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held recently at Lima, had upheld the right of the people of Belize to self-determination, had expressed unconditional support for the people of Belize whose aspirations for independence continued to be frustrated by territorial claims, and in affirming the territorial integrity of Belize and the right of its people to independence, had agreed to lend support to all efforts directed to those ends.

49. In supporting self-determination for the people of Belize, his delegation also encouraged peaceful efforts by all parties to promote the decolonization of Belize and the development of mutual interests, friendly relations and co-operation among all the countries of the region.

50. His delegation believed that respect for self-determination and non-intervention—traditionally regarded as cardinal principles in Latin America—would also prevail in the case in question, and not just to the advantage of the countries of the region. It would not only benefit the countries still under the colonial yoke, but would also have a much wider impact. The question of the decolonization of peoples, wherever they might be, was not the concern solely of the countries of the region to which they belonged; it was the concern of every member of the international community.

51. His delegation was confident that the Committee would take the right position with respect to the question of Belize and all remaining colonial issues.

52. Mr. BANGURA (Sierra Leone) reiterated his Government's unreserved dedication to the principle of self-determination and independence for colonial Territories and peoples.

53. His delegation was, however, distressed that the long struggle of the people of Belize for independence had not achieved the desired result, and that Belize was still a colony and its self-determination and development remained the prerogative of another State.

54. He referred to the repeated assurances given by the United Kingdom that the people of Belize would be enabled to exercise their right to self-determination and independence. Indeed, Belize had been enjoying internal self-government for over a decade; accordingly, there was no sense in attempting to suppress the wishes of the majority of the people of that country, let alone in annexing the Territory against their will.

55. In his delegation's view, any claims to any part of the territory of Belize by any State, or any refusal by the administering Power to grant it total independence, should be condemned as a denial of the right of the people of Belize to self-determination and independence and a contravention of the letter and spirit of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

56. The Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held several months earlier at Lima, had expressed support for the independence of Belize. His Government continued to lend its unreserved support to the Belizean people's just claim for total independence, in accordance with its view that the process of decolonization was irreversible. It therefore requested the United Nations to take immediate steps to implement General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and to ensure the emergence of Belize from colonial rule and external interference to fully-fledged independence for its people, whose aspirations had been frustrated by circumstances beyond their control.

57. As a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1096, his delegation hoped that it would receive the support of the majority of the members of the Committee.

58. Mr. MARTINEZ ORDOÑEZ (Honduras), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, recalled that the representative of Barbados, during his statement earlier in the meeting, had alleged that, in 1973, the Ambassador of Honduras had implied that Honduras had claims on the Territory of Belize. As the Ambassador of Honduras at that time, he himself could state categorically that at no time in 1973, or at any other time, had he advanced any such idea. Furthermore, by a decision of its own Congress in 1948, Honduras had expressed its full solidarity with the Government of Guatemala. The allegation was somewhat surprising, since the question of Belize had not been discussed in the United Nations for some 20 years, in order to avoid prejudicing the negotiations between Guatemala and the United Kingdom.

59. It should be clear from his statement at the previous meeting that Honduras had no territorial claim to Belize. The State which had a legitimate claim, both historically and legally, to the Territory of Belize and Guatemala would negotiate a satisfactory settlement that would respect both the principle of self-determination for the people of Belize and the laws of Guatemala. In that connexion, he pointed out that he had invited the delegations of countries of the Caribbean region and Central America to seek a solution to

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.