

**United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records



**104th
PLENARY MEETING**

*Friday, 17 December 1976,
at 3.25 p.m.*

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 117: One hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Amphictyonic Congress of Panama (<i>concluded</i>)	1541
Agenda item 25: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: 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 (<i>concluded</i>)	1548
Agenda item 85: Question of Namibia: (a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples; (b) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia; (c) United Nations Fund for Namibia: report of the Secretary-General Report of the Fourth Committee	1567
Agenda item 86: Question of Southern Rhodesia: 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 Report of the Fourth Committee	1568

President: Mr. Hamilton Shirley AMERASINGHE
(Sri Lanka).

In the absence of the President, Mr. Lang (Nicaragua), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 117

**One hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the
Amphictyonic Congress of Panama (*concluded*)**

1. Mr. DA COSTA LOBO (Portugal): It is with genuine enthusiasm that the delegation of Portugal is participating in this session in order to pay special homage to Simón Bolívar and to commemorate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Amphictyonic Congress of Panama, sponsored by the great Latin American patriot and idealist.
2. Convened in 1824, the Congress met two years later in the city of Panama on the isthmus, which, in terms of the ideal dreamed of by Bolívar, was to be for Latin America what the isthmus of Corinth had been for the Greek states in ancient times.
3. The conception was grandiose and perhaps far in advance of the times. The principal objective of the Congress was, as was made explicit in the letter of

convocation, to establish an assembly that should serve as a council in great conflicts, as a point of contact among the Latin American States in common danger, as a loyal interpreter of public treaties when difficulties arose and as a conciliator of differences between members.

4. That Congress led to the adoption of the Treaty of Perpetual Union, League and Confederation,¹ whereby the signatory States were to form an alliance for the purpose of preserving their sovereignty and independence against foreign aggression. A continental army was to be formed with the contingents furnished by the signatory States, while simultaneously an assembly of plenipotentiaries was to meet at regular intervals and serve as an organ of the confederation, regulating the relations among member States as well as with the outside world. The adoption of such a treaty, including several rules well in advance of its times, represented in itself a great achievement. But, in our view, the importance of the Amphictyonic Congress of Panama resides mainly in the ideals it embodies, in the vision it demonstrates and in the durability of its impact.

5. In this celebration of the Congress of Panama it is probably appropriate to recall that approximately 10 years earlier another important Congress took place, in a different region of the world. I am referring to the Congress of Vienna, of 1815. The tasks of that Congress were certainly of great magnitude, and the rank of its participants was undoubtedly very impressive. But if I try to draw a comparison between the two events, I would suggest that the Congress of Panama was focused more on the distant future. This is probably the reason why, throughout the ensuing decades, right into the present century, it has remained the symbol of America's aspirations to independence. And it may also explain the existence of so many affinities between the basic principles that inspired the Congress of Panama, and the principles that came to be embodied first in the Covenant of the League of Nations and then in the Charter of the United Nations.

6. For us in Portugal, a country with so many close links with Latin America—links that are particularly close in the case of Brazil—the emergence over the last century and a half of a prosperous Latin America is a matter of special interest. I am happy to be able to state that those links not only have a very solid historical and cultural basis but are viewed in the present day with particular interest and given especial emphasis. In this respect I would like to recall that, since the coming to office of our first Constitutional Government, which took place last July, the first Head of State who paid an official visit to Portugal was the

¹ For the text, see *International Conferences of American States, 1889-1928*, James Brown, ed. (New York, Oxford University Press, 1931).

President of Venezuela. And the first official visit of our own Prime Minister, Mr. Mário Soares, to a foreign country, a visit that is taking place at this very moment, was to Brazil.

7. These two events, in a symbolic way, demonstrate the great significance of our relations with the countries of Latin America.

8. Portugal sincerely joins in paying a tribute to the ideal behind the Amphictyonic Congress of Panama, and to the architect of that Congress, Simón Bolívar.

9. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): This year, that of the one hundred fiftieth anniversary of the Amphictyonic Congress of Panama, the King of Spain, His Majesty Juan Carlos I, visited the Dominican Republic, Colombia and Venezuela, and in Caracas paid a tribute before the remains of Simón Bolívar on 15 October last. On that occasion, standing before the tomb of the Liberator, His Majesty said:

“It is with profound emotion that I make this offering here as a symbol of Spain’s respect for Simón Bolívar, an eminent leader of our people. Both the conquerors and the liberators of America are yours and ours; they belong to us all, because their names are inscribed in a history which is also that of all of us, and from which no chapter can be erased.

“Today, at the end of a century and a half, now that the suffering and the bloodshed that separated us have been forgotten and the ideals and even the disappointments of Simón Bolívar have been consecrated, we are left to share the legacy of his great hope for a community: the ideal of the unity of all Hispanic peoples, to which I pay homage with profound reverence”.

10. This commemoration of the Panama Congress cannot but arouse in Spain and among Spaniards a particularly sincere and heartfelt response. The passage of time enables us now to view that event and the efforts and struggles which preceded and followed it in their historical perspective, a perspective in which the essence of those events is revealed and they appear in their most transcendent form and take on the greatest significance for humanity. Thus we can stand united and consider ourselves in solidarity with that titanic endeavour, recalling that Bolívar was a student in Spain and married a Spanish woman, who went with him when he returned to his land; and that years after when his ideals had matured, he embarked upon his political activity by opposing the attempt to extend to American soil the authority of a monarch imposed on Spain by the Napoleonic invader, and instead proclaimed the legitimate Spanish monarch in exile, Fernando VII.

11. But apart from its historical aspect, the very content of the Bolivarian ideal was, in its time, more Hispanic in the broad sense than was nineteenth-century Spain, since it responded to a vision of community and universality that was a worthy successor to that which inspired Spain in the heyday of its expansion. For many years now, the ties between Spain and the sister republics of America have ceased to be tainted by the concept of anachronistic dependency or of a resentment born of past political and

military struggles. Sovereign equality and the common ideals of justice, culture and progress are now the links which, together with our common language, now and in the future, will keep us united.

12. Politically, the logical consequence of this unalterable principle is the doctrine, undoubtedly elaborated by Latin American writers, which might be called the principle of non-discrimination, based on the unreserved acceptance of political pluralism as an attitude that would further Iberian-American integration.

13. Spain has also welcomed enthusiastically the idea put forward on 12 December last in Cartagena by Mr. Alfonso López Michelsen, President of the Republic of Colombia, of a community of Hispanic peoples, a doctrine which reflects the Bolivarian ideal and which has evoked an enthusiastic response in various Latin American countries. It may be premature to speculate whether such a community can or should be established within an institutional framework, but what we can say right now is that its constituent elements already exist, and we can foresee a rapid development of these ideals, in both the cultural and the economic fields, as well as in that of the technical and financial co-operation that already exists on both the bilateral and the multilateral levels between Spain and the other countries which are invited to join it.

14. The draft resolution which 27 countries of the American continent have submitted to the General Assembly in connexion with the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Amphictyonic Congress, and which is contained in document A/31/L.23/Rev.2, commemorates in a universal forum the most significant event in the process of Latin American independence and pays a tribute to the ideals of the Liberator, which are no less valid because they were not fully realized in their historical context. I believe it necessary to say that Spain will vote in favour of this draft resolution, thereby associating itself with the tribute paid to Simón Bolívar and to the proclamation in favour of union signed in Panama, which anticipated the ideals and objectives of the United Nations. Inasmuch as the draft resolution, in its operative paragraph 3, expresses the hope of the General Assembly that the ideals of Bolívar will inspire the establishment of a more just international order, thus attaining the triple objective of peace, economic and social progress and the promotion of human rights and freedom for individuals, as well as for peoples, the draft resolution fully reflects the Spanish Government’s purposes for international action.

15. To conclude, on this solemn occasion, Spain greets the sister Republics of America and joins with them in professing the ideals which have inspired the initiative with which the General Assembly is dealing today.

16. Mr. VINCI (Italy): I have asked to be allowed to speak simply because I felt that the representative of Italy could not keep silent on this special occasion, but should say a few words.

17. The General Assembly is in fact solemnly commemorating today the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Amphictyonic Congress of Panama. That was an historic event which carried great moral and political weight

and, being dear to the Latin Americans, it is dear to my countrymen. It was indeed one of the first examples in modern history of a bold attempt to bring together, as is so well stated in the resolution we have just adopted, "free and brotherly countries united by common ideals".

18. The world-wide vision of Simón Bolívar and his concept of uniting in an effort for peace and progress those American countries which a short time before were engaged in an armed and victorious struggle for their independence, anticipated in many ways the principles and purposes enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations signed in San Francisco in 1945.

19. Bolívar advocated, and the Panama Congress debated, the ideals of equality, peaceful settlement of disputes, maintenance of peace and security, respect for the dignity and value of man. Those are the same ideals from which we take inspiration in our work here; they reflect the same set of values which we are strenuously trying to implement; in short, they are the very essence of the United Nations, which can look at Simón Bolívar as a precursor.

20. The fact that these targets—I refer to the Treaty of Perpetual Union, League and Confederation—were not attained at that time shows how long it takes before the most noble ideas can come true. Nobody can be more aware of this than we at the United Nations, where we are all witnesses and actors in pursuing ideals which spring from the same spiritual sources.

21. My country, which has been linked to Latin America since its birth, has kept alive this original fraternal association throughout all the centuries that followed, taking an active part in the events which have shaped the new nations of the subcontinent.

22. I shall confine myself to recalling that Giuseppe Garibaldi fought for the independence of the Latin American peoples, in defence of that great ideal of freedom, for which he was called "the knight of humankind". That great leader of what we would call today liberation movements on two continents also earned the name "hero of the two worlds". The presence in Latin America of millions of citizens of Italian origin has added a new indestructible link to the old ones.

23. In short, Latin America is a region to which Italy is bound by a common heritage, a huge network of mutual interests and a broad sharing of the same values. This common physical, moral and cultural heritage is nowadays the backbone and the main inspiration of the practical activities carried out by the Italian-Latin American Institute, which was created by an agreement signed in 1966 by Italy and the 20 Latin American countries.

24. I had the great fortune, when celebrating Columbus Day one year before in 1965, of personally introducing, on the instructions of my then Foreign Minister, Amintore Fanfani—who was also President of the twentieth session of the General Assembly the first draft statute of that organization. Looking back at that luncheon, held in this very building and attended by the representatives of all the countries of the American continent and of Spain, I am moved today by the thought that we were somehow acting

under the inspiration of the great man we are commemorating today: Simón Bolívar, the Liberator.

25. The Italian-Latin American Institute, which is a unique example of its kind, has in 10 years grown up, brought up to date its operations and is now acting also as a bridge between Latin America and the European Community, promoting meetings and exchanges of ideas on the development of stronger economic and technical relations between the two areas. On 14 July 1976 the Institute solemnly celebrated in Rome the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Amphictyonic Congress of Panama, just as we are now doing here in New York.

26. I can only conclude by paying a deep and respectful tribute, on behalf of my Government and people, on this solemn anniversary to the ideals that led Simón Bolívar to bring together the Latin American countries as the crowning performance of his patriotism and as a far-sighted initiative announcing a new era.

27. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): There can be no greater honour for me than to address the General Assembly at a meeting presided by the representative of Nicaragua, who here reflects another glory of America—Rubén Darío.

28. The traveller visiting the entire continent and the capitals of the countries of Latin America will note that there are numberless monuments erected in honour of Simón Bolívar. But though marble or bronze may serve the creation of a great artist and also indicate an everlasting loyalty to his memory, it is acts such as these which constitute and perpetuate the true glory of the Liberator and his true immortality.

29. Glory is in fact not the statue which is built once and for all and which may in time become merely a landmark in the midst of the urban chaos of a modern city. Glory is not the monument, but the living and fertile memory of men, a memory which is no mere recollection, the reflection of a silhouette in the mirror of imagination. Glory is memory transformed into inspiration and reflected in action, a spur to effort, a guide to conduct, the sum of aspirations, a pointer to the future and to concrete reality.

30. Hence the singular significance of these meetings of the General Assembly at which we are commemorating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Amphictyonic Congress of Panama, convened by Bolívar in 1824 and held in Panama two years later, from 22 June to 16 July 1826. In truth, the purpose that unites us here is not to be found in the sentimental liturgy of ritual commemorations, but in the visionary programme of action of an assembly of peoples seeking, with firm determination and the spirit of Bolívar, the road which leads to the goal of their national aspirations.

31. Indeed, this is no simple commemorative act, but an instant's pause, a moment for reflection in a long march that was planned in a palace in Lima and that began in tropical Panama one day in June in 1826; a march towards the effective union of a group of countries linked by common origins and sharing a cultural tradition, which together with the peoples of other regions of the world,

organized their social life in harmony with the principles of peace, justice and international co-operation.

32. The hour and the occasion are not propitious for a detailed analysis of the protocols of the isthmus. But it is fitting to point out here the striking fact that in them we find a historical antecedent for all modern international organizations, for the Covenant of the League of Nations of Geneva and for the Charter of the United Nations. Indeed, Bolívar did not seek solidarity merely within the American continent; his ultimate aim was to build peace among all the nations with a view to their common progress and well-being, a peace that would have as its foundation international justice and as its standard the freedom and dignity of man. In truth, the Amphictyonic Congress of 1826 was not only something that happened on the American continent; it was an event of universal dimensions, which, as Mariano J. Drago said, "though disdained in its time, has acquired the value of a model".

33. At this time I should like to present some brief thoughts on the human phenomenon that Bolívar represents and which is highlighted in the protocols of the isthmus, because they embody not only the needs and realities of nineteenth-century America, but also and above all the aspirations and exigencies of the future.

34. The talent of the Liberator in this case was to consecrate for ever by his words and deeds the fortunate coming together of the man and the historical circumstance. What, then, does genius consist of? Perhaps we should say that genius is the ability to perceive the significance of circumstances, of a historical moment, and more particularly to assess with penetrating intuition what future need is contained in that moment, that historical circumstance, at which will only later be revealed to common men but which the man of genius discovers, buried under the appearances of the moment and implicit in them. And thus when Bolívar conceived of and convoked the Congress of Panama, he responded not only to the circumstances created by the success of the fight for political freedom in Latin America, but also to the needs of the future. That is to say, to the future generations, those of our world today.

35. The Amphictyonic meeting in Panama was the crowning of the glorious campaigns of the united army of liberation and of many other memorable exploits of the liberators in various parts of America. But the triumph of the sword, Bolívar thought, must be consolidated by law, by an institutional framework, that would govern both the domestic affairs of nations and the international relations between them. He also realized that, given the omnipresent threat presented by the great Powers of the time and by those of the future, as well as the internal dangers, the Latin American peoples must remain united, behind the bulwark of a solemn covenant which would constitute, as he said, when he convened the Amphictyonic Congress, "a system of guarantees which, in peace and in war, will be the shield of our new destiny". And with a true understanding of the significance of place, the most modern of all his ideas, he indicated that Panama was to be "the venue for an Assembly which would serve as an advisory body in major conflicts, a point of contact in times of common dangers, a faithful interpreter of public treaties when difficulties arose, and finally a place to reconcile our differences".

36. Bolívar chose Panama with a calculated strategic and geopolitical design. In a splendid page of history concerning the convening of that Congress, which my country will never forget, Bolívar wrote:

"It seems that, if the whole world should have to choose its capital, the Isthmus of Panamá, located as it is in the center of the globe, with Asia on one side and Africa and Europe on the other, would be the site chosen for this grand design. . . .

" . . .

" . . . A hundred centuries hence, posterity, searching for the origin of our public law and recalling the compacts that solidified its destiny, will finger with respect the protocols of the Isthmus. In them will be found the plan of the first alliances that will have marked the beginning of our relations with the universe. What, then, will be the Isthmus of Corinth compared with that of Panamá? "2

Thus he made the future the present.

37. Bolívar was fully aware of all present and future dangers. In contrast to the so-called Monroe Doctrine which, not to mention the doctrine that Washington was already beginning to follow in its own interests, opposed the future colonization of the territories of America, but which from the advocacy of "An America for the Americans" degenerated into that of an "America for the North Americans", the doctrine of Bolívar, as embodied in the Treaty of Permanent Union, League and Confederation of 1826, opposed any foreign domination, past, present or future.

38. Speaking out against the nations of Europe which had imposed the yoke of slavery in other parts of the world, Bolívar, with a clear vision of the third world of the future, already in 1813 was proposing that all those parts of the world establish a balance between themselves and Europe so as to end the predominance of the latter. He called this, as he said, "the balance of the universe, which must be taken into account in the calculations of Latin American policy".

39. As Indalecio Liévano Aguirre has said:

"Thus Bolívar insisted on making the Panama League a standard bearer for the poor peoples of the world, because he was aware that only in so far as those peoples took the initiative and acquired a relative awareness of their common destiny, would it be possible to prevent vast political and social transformations that were taking place at the time from leading to the mere replacement of the feudal imperialism of the traditional monarchies by an Anglo-Saxon economic imperialism, whose victim would inevitably be Spanish America".

40. Latané, in his *History of American Foreign Policy*, later confirmed the Liberator's fears, particularly regarding

2 Simón Bolívar, Lima, 7 December 1824. For the text, see *Selected Writings of Bolívar*, vol. II, Vicente Lecuna, comp., Harold A. Bierck, Jr., ed. (New York, The Colonial Press, Inc., 1951), pp. 458-459.

interoceanic communication. The historian arrived at the conclusion that:

“The weakness of the Spanish American states, whose territories embraced the available routes, and their recognized inability either to construct or protect a canal made what might otherwise have been merely a question of domestic economy one of grave international import.”³

41. It is well to recall that Bolívar, in his Angostura statement, pointed out errors, evils and obstacles which still persist and which we must combat. In that famous parliamentary address he denounced oppression, poverty, the scourge of epidemics and illiteracy. It has since become obvious that each step forward taken by our nations has followed the footsteps of Bolívar and the course set by his thinking.

42. Progress and the rise of our peoples towards higher forms of social and political life is no easy matter. The way is bitter and tortuous and beset by innumerable difficulties, many of them created by ourselves—when they are not the work of tenacious foreign interests. But this progress is constant, even if it has not been unbroken. Let us take, for example, the unity and solidarity of Latin America. The fratricidal wars that have taken place from time to time in the past were nearly always instigated by foreigners who wished to prevent the attainment of that unity. Notwithstanding all obstacles, however, the ideal of unification and solidarity has gained ground, and the will towards unification has been apparent throughout the continent, from the days of Bolívar, San Martín, O’Higgins, Tiradentes, Juárez, Valle, Martí, Morazán and many others to more recent times—as when the famous Reforma University of Córdoba, in Argentina, proclaimed the need to create a United States of Latin America. It was also apparent in the campaign for Latin American unity carried out throughout the entire continent by Manuel Ugarte. More recently still, the process of unification has gathered new impetus with the establishment of the Latin American Economic System at the Panama Convention of 1975, whereby the countries of Central America, the Caribbean and South America united their efforts to overcome all remaining obstacles.

43. Latin American unity has never been envisaged with the intention to harm any country or group of countries. Our ideal is harmony and mutual respect for systems, ideologies and interests. We demand only that the nature of our past relations with countries that have achieved scientific and technological supremacy be changed, for these anachronistic relations are in fact a barrier to the establishment of an atmosphere of harmony and confidence that would enable the Western Hemisphere to set up that community of friendly nations to which Simón Bolívar referred.

44. Today in this hall—and for this we are grateful—we recall that Simón Bolívar on many occasions referred to the need to open a canal in Panama, so as to shorten distances in the world. What is more, the Liberator always had in mind the ideas of Humboldt on this matter, and he made efforts in that direction by granting a concession to Baron

de Thierry—which failed in 1826 for lack of capital. Furthermore, under his auspices as President he called upon the British engineer Lloyd and the Swede Captain Falmark to carry out an on-the-spot study between 1827 and 1829, and they concluded that it was feasible to build a railway and even a canal between Chagres and Panama, which was almost the same route as was later developed by Frenchmen and North Americans.

45. Panama, which was fortunate in enjoying a privileged place in the thinking of the Liberator, is today the point at which Latin American efforts are concentrated for the creation of a new order in international relations. Panama’s struggle to secure its sovereign rights over its entire territory has from the outset had the support of the vast majority of the countries of the world and, of course, particularly of our Latin American brothers.

46. The fact is that one of the main themes which the countries of the third world proclaim and defend is the principle of the sovereign equality and respect for the territorial integrity as well as the personality of States.

47. The tribute which the United Nations is paying today to the genius of Bolívar and to the Amphictyonic Congress is gratifying to my country not only because of what it represents institutionally for the integration process of Latin America but also because it endorses the national legitimacy of the Panamanian State.

48. We are not a nation invented in this century through the desire for expansion of the United States, although some historically disoriented minds have endeavoured to present Panama as a canal converted into a country or a country invented for a canal.

49. Such an idea results from ignorance of the facts. The historical truth is that the isthmus was the first land of the entire continent which was discovered and inhabited by the Spaniards. Justo Arosemena said:

“The Spanish colony which in the times of Nicuesa was called Castilla del Oro and later was known as Darien, and which in our days is generally called the isthmus of Panama, because of its then isolated situation and because it was the first colony of the continent was for a long time directly governed by the metropolis.”

50. The city of Panama is the oldest capital in continental America, having been founded almost a century before the first British colony was established in Jamestown, Virginia, in 1607, and more than a century before the establishment of the Plymouth colony in 1620 by the Pilgrims and the colony of Massachusetts Bay in 1630 by the Puritans.

51. On 28 November 1821, before the collapse of Spanish power in Puerto Cabello and in Pichincha, and before Bolívar and Sucre had crowned their glorious careers on the battlefields of Junín and Ayacucho, the isthmus of Panama proclaimed its independence from Spain without foreign assistance. This was recognized by Bolívar himself, who declared to the eminent Panamanian, José de Fábrega:

“I cannot find words to express the feelings of joy and admiration I felt on knowing that Panama, the centre of

³ John Holladay Latané and David W. Wainhouse, *A History of American Foreign Policy*, 2nd rev. (New York, The Odyssey Press, 1940), p. 306.

the universe, has been reborn by its own efforts and is free through its own action”.

52. The genius of Caracas added: “The independence of Panama is the most glorious monument which any American province can offer to history”.

53. And the Liberator declared: “Everything is resumed in this: justice, generosity, national policy and interest.”

54. The Amphictyonic Congress of Panama was held when the isthmus had been spontaneously incorporated in the Greater Colombia of Bolívar, who had been motivated by the desire to form a Federal State of the Great Republic similar to New Grenada, Venezuela and Ecuador.

55. We might say that today's commemoration has a fourfold significance. In addition to the celebration of the one hundred fiftieth anniversary of the Continental Congress of 1826, by a significant historical coincidence of anticolonialist events today, 17 December, we commemorate the one hundred forty-sixth anniversary of the death of the Liberator, which occurred in Santa Marta on 17 December 1830; it is also the one hundred eightieth anniversary of the famous farewell message of President George Washington, published on 17 December 1796; and we commemorate the one hundred fifty-seventh anniversary of the constitution of Greater Colombia, of 17 December 1819, when the Angostura Congress considered that fundamental charter which Bolívar drafted for this purpose, a task which was later to be completed at the Cúcuta Congress, which prepared the final constitution for Greater Colombia.

56. The visionary precedent of the Constitution of Greater Colombia, to which we all pay a reverent tribute today, makes obvious the need for an effective union of our peoples. This does not arise from a purely intellectual political theory; it is a need determined by the very conditions of the world of today. We have in fact reached the planetary stage in the history of the world, as is constantly proved in this General Assembly of the United Nations. While in the past, and in the not-too-distant past, the great actors on the historical scene were nations, considered individually—and, in a way, the nineteenth century constituted the apotheosis of nationalism—today the actors on the historical scene, the *dramatis personae*, are large human blocs.

57. In that sense, those who maintain that the nation-State, with the exception of certain macro-States, is too small for the modern economies are right. Bolívar anticipated the development of international relations by 150 years when he conceived of the organization of Latin American States as a nation of republics.

58. Thus we see that it is the large human blocs to which I have just referred, the blocs that are striving to create the new political entity, which will in time be the regional State envisaged by the Liberator. An example of this new political grouping is to be found in the regional groups of the United Nations: the African group, the Asian group, the Arab group, the group of Western European and other States, the Eastern European group, the Latin American group. Each of those groups has similar or at least

concordant characteristics—either of language, of culture or of religion—which cement and sustain the material basis of joint or corresponding interests among them.

59. We have already entered the stage of what could be called the higher forms of nationalism. At this stage of the history of the world, Bolívar's idea of the unity of Latin America takes on its full vigour and currency.

60. We are not speaking of an imaginary notion. Unity already exists in the very infrastructure of the Latin American countries. But, in relation to that unity, to the collective personality of Latin America, we must bear in mind, as Leopoldo Zea said, that “Iberian America must follow its own course, just as the modern peoples have done, and it must build in accordance with its own circumstances”. In that respect, he added:

“Bolívar admired the modern nations, the great Western nations; but, at the same time, he knew that in order to deal with them it was necessary, above all, to become strong so as to be able to meet them on a footing of equality and not as nations willing to submit to a new form of subordination”.

61. The convening of the Amphictyonic Congress, which Ludwig called the “most daring and most promising” idea of the Liberator, gave rise, from the moment the invitations were sent out, to a confrontation between Bolivarism and Monroism—a confrontation that has marked a large part of hemispheric relations.

62. President Adams of the United States described the Panama Congress as a great human undertaking. He said that its purpose was to better man's condition. He added that it was similar to the idea that led to the Declaration of Independence of the United States.

63. Secretary of State Henry Clay, for his part, stated in his instructions to the United States delegation that:

“The holding of a Congress in Panama, in which the diplomatic representatives of the independent nations of America will participate, will represent a new era in human relations. That fact in itself—whatever may be the results of the Congress—cannot fail to be noted by present and future generations of the civilized world”.

Clay continued his instructions to the United States delegation by saying—and perhaps his style was somewhat ornate—that: “Each one of the States must govern itself freely and in accordance with its own interests”. He concluded in this way:

“We therefore reject any attempt to establish an amphictyonic congress that would arrogate to itself the authority to decide on disputes between the various American States or to determine their behaviour”.

64. Clay's instructions rejected any formulas for offensive or defensive alliances by the United States with the new Hispanic American States. The debates to which the Panama Congress gave rise in the United States Congress at that time not only gave historic relevance to the Panama Congress but served to determine the thrust of the so-called

Monroe Doctrine—that is, the expression of a unilateral policy of the United States, summed up in the slogan “America for the Americans”. Thus, Daniel Webster said in the United States Congress that

“The Monroe Declaration does not oblige us, in any event, to take up arms when there is any indication of hostile feelings on the part of the European Powers towards South America—unless military operations are carried out in our immediate vicinity”.

65. Clay rejected also the compromise idea advocated by Canning that peace should be exchanged for trade concessions or indemnities. The instructions stated:

“Therefore, any idea of granting trade privileges in perpetuity to any foreign nation must be rejected, because such a concession is incompatible with our present absolute independence and would consequently, in fact if not formally, reduce us to the former status of a colony”.

66. Clay's thesis in opposition to concessions in perpetuity because they implicitly are typical of the colonial status, anticipated by 150 years the Tack-Kissinger agreement under which Panama and the United States agreed to do away with the notion that concession for the Panama Canal was granted in perpetuity by negotiating a new treaty concerning the Canal—a negotiation which is still in process—by which the painful colonial situation that has persisted in the heart of Panamanian territory would be eliminated.

67. Hence, it is of the utmost importance to my country that, as part of the tribute paid to the Liberator on the occasion of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Amphictyonic Congress of Panama, the General Assembly of the United Nations should, in accordance with operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution presented by the entire Latin American group [A/31/L.23/Rev.2], formulate

“... the wish for a successful outcome of the negotiations for the conclusion of a new treaty on the Panama Canal, which will eliminate the causes of conflict between the Republic of Panama and the United States of America, in accordance with the Declaration of Principles, signed by the parties concerned on 7 February 1974, where it is stated that the Panamanian territory of which the Panama Canal is a part shall be returned promptly to the jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama and that the Republic of Panama ‘will assume total responsibility for the operation of the Canal upon the termination of the treaty’”.

68. The delegation of Panama regards the positive attitude of the United States delegation during the present debate, as manifested by its active support of this draft resolution, as a gesture of friendship and co-operation, to which we attach its full value.

69. We regard as a favourable factor for good relations among the States of the Hemisphere the statements in favour of a prompt solution to the question of the Panama Canal that have been made by Mr. Cyrus Vance, who will replace Mr. Henry Kissinger at the Department of State on

20 January 1977. Those statements have been published in *Newsweek* magazine, in its issue of 13 December 1976.

70. In expressing our pleasure at all this we believe the time is ripe to reiterate the position of the Government of President Demetrio Lakas and Chief of State General Omar Torrijos to the effect that

“The so-called Panama Canal Zone, 10 miles wide and 50 miles long, which cuts through and severs the Panamanian Isthmus in its central part, making of the Republic of Panama a divided nation, is today an anachronistic colonial enclave for which there is no justification and which is destined to disappear giving place to a State of Panama restored to full territorial integrity and promoting relations of peace and friendship in the region”.

Mr. Amerasinghe (Sri Lanka) took the Chair.

71. On behalf of my country I wish to express my gratitude for the inclusion of mention of the Panamanian problem in this draft resolution in honour of Bolívar. Panama's weapons in the struggle to recover its rights are moral laws and legal arguments which, as now, world public opinion is helping us to wield with growing effectiveness. Panama is therefore the battlefield of Bolívar's cause today. Thus nothing is more just than the Panamanian Government's aim of raising in its capital a monument to the unity of Latin America; a monument in which, by a happy decision of the Government of Brazil, which today has the protocols in its archives, the originals of the isthmus protocols will be deposited. I refer to the manuscripts of the acts of the Amphictyonic Congress of 1826.

72. So let us honour Bolívar with deeds such as this, deeds that show our understanding of Bolívar's cause. Today's tribute to the ideals of the Liberator has been rendered especially glowing by the eloquent statements made by the representative of the Democratic Republic of Yemen; by the representative who spoke on behalf of the Arab League; by Madagascar on behalf of the African group; by Malta on behalf of the group of Western European and other States; by Bulgaria on behalf of the Eastern European group; by Fiji on behalf of the Asian group; by Guyana, as Chairman of the Latin American group; by the Italy of Garibaldi; by our mother country, Spain; by Portugal, a member of the Iberian family; and by the President of this Assembly, Mr. Hamilton Shirley Amerasinghe.

73. On behalf of Venezuela, where the Liberator was born—and I say this at the request of the Ambassador and on behalf of the delegation of Panama—may I tell the spokesmen of the international community that I am most grateful for their important commemorative statements, which we shall always carry with us in our hearts.

74. We trust that the ideals of the Liberator will acquire increasingly specific and concrete form. Overcoming all obstacles and barriers, the world is working towards higher forms of social life, economic justice, dignity and culture. To state that this inevitable process is taking place is not to indulge in optimism. It is something we can observe from day to day. History does not progress harmoniously, without vicissitudes. History is a dialectical process, with its

antitheses, oppositions and victories. But its course has been set since the days of the Amphictyonic Congress of Panama, which we celebrate today. And the genius of Bolívar, his foresight and his accuracy are like an inextinguishable torch that has lit the way for successive generations of Latin Americans.

75. Since it was singled out by the Liberator, my country must pay a lasting tribute to his memory to reaffirm that his thinking and his work continue to influence the world. Therefore from this rostrum, and in conclusion, to quote the Panamanian historian José de la Cruz Herrera, I shall say that the Panamanian delegation has aspired only to emphasize:

“... how much the Republic of Panama owes to that unique man who with a vision at once accurate and just understood and predicted the predominant role of the Isthmus in the destiny of mankind and made of that land the venue of the Assembly which served as the foundation on which to build our regional and international policy, a policy which seeks to eliminate from the world the rule of force and to settle conflicts arising from selfish national aspirations and conflicting and false interpretations of justice”.

AGENDA ITEM 25

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: 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 (concluded)*

76. Mr. BOATEN (Ghana): General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, was adopted exactly 16 years ago. Since its adoption the membership of this Organization has grown from 99 in 1960 to 147 today. This substantial increase in membership indicates the progress we have so far made in our implementation of the Declaration. It should give us some justification for satisfaction. In spite of this substantial gain, however, there is no denying that we have still not completely achieved the objective of the Declaration. Sixteen years after adoption of the Declaration there are still over 12 million people under colonial domination in southern Africa and elsewhere. This Organization and the world community as a whole, it seems, now faces its most difficult hurdle. The question is, have we the will to make the effort required of us to jump over this last hurdle? If we capitulate before the last hurdle we shall not have completed the race and we shall therefore have no reason to congratulate ourselves.

77. My delegation maintains this position because the Declaration to which we are committed defines our task in regard to decolonization and leaves no room for half-measures or partial achievements. In the Declaration this Organization undertook to take immediate steps in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories and all other Territories which had not yet attained independence to transfer all

powers to the peoples of those Territories, without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire without any distinction as to race, creed or colour, in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom. The cardinal guiding consideration for the fulfilment of our commitment is, therefore, the freely expressed will and desire of the people concerned. It would be a rejection of our commitment and an abdication of our responsibility to the world community if somewhere along the line we should allow any other considerations to influence our action. In the view of my delegation, there should be no substitute in terms of our commitment to complete independence and freedom for all peoples that desire such freedom and independence.

78. Two years ago we welcomed the change in Portugal's position on decolonization. It was a change which recognized the realities of today. We all thought then that the last strong sinew of the colonial system had been broken and that we could look forward to accelerated progress towards a world order based on national sovereign equality founded upon the noble principle that all men—of course, including women—were created equal. My apologies to President Lincoln. On the contrary, what do we find?

79. The report of the Special Committee [A/31/23/Rev.1] cannot but give us all an understandable cause for concern and anxiety over events in southern Africa. There, South Africa continues to occupy the Territory of Namibia illegally, in blatant disregard of the decision of the International Court of Justice and in contemptuous rejection of the resolutions and directives of the Security Council and the General Assembly. In defiance of this Organization's express opposition, South Africa has embarked on a course of perpetuating its hold on Namibia through the Balkanization of the Territory into small, weak and economically impoverished entities it calls “bantustans”. By strengthening its military forces in the Territory, it hopes to be able to force the people to submit to its will by indiscriminate murder and imprisonment. By unjust and repressive laws, the people of Namibia are being denied their basic political freedoms and human rights. The sad and regrettable aspect of the drama being enacted in southern Africa is that South Africa has managed to get some Members of this Organization to regard its deception as a genuine effort to co-operate in finding an acceptable solution to a problem of South Africa's own creation.

80. My delegation cannot but regret that, despite our experience of history, human memory should still be so short. Some of us, however, like the elephant, can never forget. We cannot forget that Sir Neville Chamberlain's paper peace with Hitler cost the whole world so much, in both human and material resources; that is a price the human race cannot afford to pay again in the fourth quarter of this century. To my delegation, the so-called Turnhalle constitutional conference constitutes no less a deception of the international community than the “scrap-of-paper peace” with which Hitler lulled Sir Neville Chamberlain, the United Kingdom public and the greater part of the world community into complaisance. To my delegation, the Namibian issue is a simple one. Restated, it is that South Africa is occupying a United Nations Trust Territory illegally. That being the case, the issue demands only one action by South Africa, namely, unconditional withdrawal

* Resumed from the 102nd meeting.

from that Territory, to enable the people of South West Africa freely to determine their own future. The alternative to this is for this Organization to take steps to assume its responsibilities and obligations.

81. While this Organization prevaricates on the Namibian issue, while some of us indulge in ingenious rhetoric to explain away their untenable positions, the plunder of Namibia's economic resources by South Africa and its allies proceeds apace; consolidation of the privileged position of the European Community in the Territory continues, while heavy investments from Western economic interests flow into the Territory incessantly. Somewhere between public pronouncements by some Members of our Organization and their actions, there is certainly a credibility gap. How else can we describe a situation where the same countries, while condemning and denouncing South Africa, continue to supply it with arms to consolidate its strength and to co-operate with it even in the development of nuclear weapons? This obvious inconsistency can be explained only by one of two theories: either that the southern African situation has become a pawn of the ideological cold war we thought was now behind us or else, to borrow Shakespeare's words, that reason has fled to brutish beasts.

82. We have come near to achieving the objective we set ourselves in resolution 1514 (XV) on the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted 16 years ago by the General Assembly; yet unless we are willing to make the final effort over the last lap we shall continue to be so near and yet so far from our ultimate goal. We should act now before we leave the people of South West Africa with no option other than armed struggle to achieve their freedom, independence and human dignity.

83. The situation in Zimbabwe is no more encouraging than the tragedy in South West Africa. Here a new situation is fast developing which could have serious consequences not only on the Territory itself but on world peace and security as well. I refer to the so-called pre-emptive attacks against countries bordering Rhodesia now being staged by Ian Smith's minority régime. Mozambique, Botswana and Zambia have been and continue to be subjected to armed attacks by land and air by South African and Rhodesian forces, while Members of this Organization look on. In such circumstances, it is unrealistic to conjecture that these countries will in the near future, if the situation persists, adopt any measures available to them, including seeking the assistance of friendly countries, to safeguard their security?

84. There is yet another development in the Zimbabwean situation which should cause this Organization some concern. I refer to the so-called "protective villages" established by the illegal régime of Ian Smith. These camps, in the view of my delegation, are no more than concentration camps. The report of the Special Committee should leave no one in doubt about this. It is a strange kind of "protection" which employs as its means the torture of pregnant women and the murder of unarmed people, including young boys and girls.

85. It is against this background that we should view the current negotiations in Geneva on the future of Zimbabwe.

As was stated by my delegation in the Fourth Committee, the path of those negotiations is obviously not going to be smooth. In the view of my delegation, optimism concerning the outcome of the negotiations cannot be justified unless it is predicated on the understanding that all issues, including the nature of the interim government to be established, are subject to negotiations. It would be naive to expect the African delegations at the negotiations to accept an interim government which vests control of defence and internal security in the white minority population. Their experience has taught them that Ian Smith is at best an elusive character. Therefore it is no surprise that they should suspect his intentions in the course of any negotiations. No one expects the lessons of the talks on board the H.M.S. *Fearless* in October 1968 and the talks on talks to be lost on the African delegations at the Geneva talks. On the other hand, it is not surprising that, after 11 years of the imposition of an illegal government on a predominantly black majority and a denial to them of political, economic and human rights, the white minority should be apprehensive of what their fate would be under a government controlled by the black majority in Zimbabwe.

86. In the view of my delegation, therefore, an acceptable interim government should do two things: it should dispel the understandable suspicion of the black majority in Zimbabwe while giving some assurance to the white minority. For the achievement of this objective two conditions should prevail, namely, a return to the legal political status of the Territory and the establishment of an interim government that reflects the democratic principles that, we are told, characterize a civilized human society.

87. This leads me to the role that we believe the United Kingdom Government is expected to play and should play, not only in the negotiations now proceeding in Geneva, but also in the processes leading to the full independence and sovereignty of Zimbabwe. We believe that this role is crucial to the success of the Geneva negotiations. We are gratified to note from the statement of the United Kingdom representative that his Government is willing to play such a role. It is our hope that the Smith régime will make it possible for the two conditions I referred to earlier to prevail. Unless this happens, the black majority in Zimbabwe will be left with no choice but to continue the armed struggle till with the blood of their sons and daughters they win back the rights which common decency and their own dignity dictate that they cannot surrender.

88. There have been some developments in recent years in the process of decolonization which give my delegation some cause for concern. Those developments call for a rededication to the principles embodied in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)]. As I said earlier in my statement, our commitment to the process of decolonization cannot admit of any application of a double standard. Those that have benefited from this Organization's commitment to the cause of decolonization cannot and should not deny the same benefits to others. The principle of self-determination and the freely expressed wishes and desires of non-self-governing peoples remain to us the most essential elements of the decolonization process. We cannot accept as valid any special pleading by any country that infringes on these cardinal principles. We

do not deny the right of any people to become part of an already existing State. The decision to do so should, however, manifestly be taken by the people themselves and of their own free will and accord.

89. My delegation has noted with satisfaction the efforts being made by some administering Powers in preparing the Territories under their administration for independence. We wish, in particular, to record our appreciation for the co-operation that the Special Committee has received from the Governments of Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in its work. I take this opportunity to appeal to other administering Powers which have not yet found it possible to do so to endeavour to assist the Committee in the discharge of its responsibilities.

90. The Special Committee, in its reports on specific territories, deprecated the existence of military bases in certain Non-Self-Governing Territories and has recommended the dismantling of those installations. It has been maintained by some administering Powers that that demand constitutes an unwarranted interference in their internal affairs, on the grounds that the Territories concerned are their colonies whose security is their responsibility. Such arguments are not new to this Organization, but, as in the past, they can hardly be considered tenable. We consider the concern expressed by the Special Committee to be justified.

91. We have reached a crucial stage in the decolonization process. The last few yards of a race have often proved the most difficult to run, and it is no surprise that our energy has already started to show signs of running out. However true this may be, we should not flag in our determination to complete the noble task that was started some 16 years ago. We owe a duty to generations yet unborn to contribute to the creation of a peaceful and secure world. Colonialism or any form of domination of one group of people by another group of people is incompatible with such a world.

92. In conclusion, I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate Western Samoa on its admission to membership in this Organization. It is a fitting occasion to do so at a time when we are assessing the progress that we have made with regard to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. I have no doubt that Western Samoa brings to the Organization a great deal of experience and the rich culture of the Polynesian people.

93. Mr. TRAORE (Mali) (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly can be justly proud of not adjourning its thirty-first session before having admitted the People's Republic of Angola to membership in the United Nations.

94. The tremendous sacrifices made over many years by the Angolan people in its heroic struggle against Portuguese reaction and its resounding victory over those who tried to pre-empt its independence have once again borne witness to the vanity of the use of force against the unshakable will of peoples to be free. This is also an encouragement to the international Organization, which henceforth should redouble its vigilance and its efforts so as to ensure the

triumph of the principles of the Charter and its resolutions on decolonization.

95. Article 73 of the Charter, in referring to the political future of the non-self-governing peoples, gave the colonial Powers the sacred trust "to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions"—in other words, as the Charter has always advocated, "to maintain international peace and security".

96. Despite the clarity and binding nature of those provisions, most of the colonial peoples have acceded to national sovereignty only after long and often deadly wars of liberation.

97. In the conflict which pits it against the colonial Powers, the United Nations fortunately chose to remain faithful to its Charter. That attitude, which is due to the determination of the non-self-governing peoples and to the political courage and far-sightedness of those peoples and of all States that prize peace and justice has led the Organization to make a more accurate analysis of the situation in the colonial territories and to adopt steps which are more and more in keeping with the aims and objectives of the Charter on the question of decolonization.

Mr. Illueca (Panama), Vice-President, took the Chair.

98. It was thus that, with the abstention of only the colonial Powers and their allies, resolution 1514 (XV) was adopted on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, on 14 December 1960 during the fifteenth session of the General Assembly, which, for the first time in our Organization's history, brought together a large number of Heads of State and Government.

99. During the ceremonies commemorating the fifteenth anniversary of that historic Declaration, the international community noted with some satisfaction the fact that, between 1960 and 1975, 36 former colonial countries had acceded to independence and that nine of them had voluntarily integrated themselves in, or associated themselves with, independent States.

100. The decolonization process has thus become irreversible, because new States have appeared on the international scene in 1976, and some of them have already taken their lawful places in the United Nations.

101. But that does not mean that colonialism has been overcome, because, as is quite clearly apparent a document published by the Department of Political Affairs, Trusteeship and Decolonization of the United Nations,⁴ 32 countries still appear on the list of Non-Self-Governing or Trust Territories.

102. The physical occupation of a Territory by a foreign Power, furthermore, is not the only manifestation of colonial sway: in recent years we have had abundant proof

⁴ See *Decolonization: a publication of the United Nations Department of Political Affairs, Trusteeship and Decolonization*, vol. II, No. 6 (December 1975), table VII.

of the coalition of certain States Members of our Organization which, whether or not they administer those Territories, have attempted to hold up the independence of colonial peoples or to call into question the hard-won independence of a number of third-world countries.

103. All peoples have an inalienable right to self-determination and independence, without any distinction based on geographical location, demographic composition or the level of economic development of their Territories. 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, in document A/31/23/Rev.1, reminds us of this once again.

104. In adopting resolution 3481 (XXX), requesting the Special Committee on Decolonization: "... to continue to pay particular attention to the small Territories, ... and to recommend to the General Assembly the most suitable steps to be taken to enable the populations of these Territories to exercise their right to self-determination, freedom and independence", the international Organization clearly sought to indicate thereby that it attached the same value to the respect for fundamental human rights, particularly those which relate to freedom.

105. The colonial peoples must be allowed to choose forms of administration or government in accordance with their basic political and social aspirations. The United Nations can help them to achieve this goal only after an objective analysis of the situations prevailing in their respective Territories. The refusal of certain colonial Powers to co-operate with the Special Committee leaves our Organization no alternative but to send visiting missions to those Territories which have not yet become independent so that the United Nations may be informed and guided in the decisions it may be prompted to take to help the populations of those Territories to achieve self-determination.

106. The arguments advanced by the colonial Powers to delay or to refuse political emancipation to peoples of small Territories quite simply show their deliberate attempt to misconstrue or to circumvent the pertinent provisions of the Charter and of resolution 1514 (XV), which set no conditions for the emancipation of peoples. The disturbing situation in these Territories proves that the colonial Powers have failed in their trust to ensure the political, economic and social progress of those Territories, as recommended by the Charter.

107. Those peoples continue to have faith in the emancipatory mission of the United Nations, one of whose priority tasks is to free them from the nightmare of neediness by endowing their economies with structures likely to increase the production of their resources and give them new worth. The problems of small Territories are undoubtedly very complex and specific, but it is not part of the vocation of the United Nations to find solutions that correspond to the circumstances, without at the same time violating the purposes and principles of the Charter in decolonization matters?

108. Every year, the United Nations renews its efforts to bring about a new international order and, as was clearly

stated in the Political Declaration of the Fifth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Colombo from 16 to 19 August 1976 "... Africa ... is the acid test of the success of international efforts towards a new order based on human dignity and human well-being the world over" [see A/31/197, annex I, para. 20].

109. Although the decolonization process has reached its final stage in that continent, it is in the southern part of Africa that the most virulent abscess of colonialism and its various manifestations has taken hold.

110. The situation in Southern Rhodesia and Namibia continues to preoccupy the international community because it remains a direct and permanent threat to international peace and security.

111. Being as it is a colonial Territory in which the black population is submitted to arbitrary rule and to exploitation, Southern Rhodesia is undoubtedly the only colonial country in which, since the end of the Second World War, all conditions have been deliberately created in order to establish there the domination of a white minority. Recently, the international community was informed of the existence of an Anglo-American plan to settle the Rhodesian crisis. Since 28 October 1976, a Conference has been held in Geneva to put an end, once and for all, to the colonial régime in Zimbabwe. While we can only welcome any peace initiative, it is our duty nevertheless to recall that peace can be lasting only when it is just.

112. The Anglo-American plan, the contents of which have not yet been revealed by its authors and to which the Salisbury delegation of white racists likes to refer, can resolve the Rhodesian crisis only to the extent that it is based on the basic aspirations of the Zimbabwe people, and their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, and this necessarily implies the unconditional transfer of power from the racist minority to the black majority through their liberation movements, which are their authentic representatives.

113. The intensification by the nationalists of the armed liberation struggle in Zimbabwe has forced the rebel régime of Ian Smith to sit down at the conference table at Geneva in the hope that the economic sanctions decreed by the United Nations against Southern Rhodesia will be lifted, and that it will thus have additional time and means to perpetuate its domination and its hold over that country.

114. Indeed, did not Ian Smith publicly declare on 24 September 1976 in connexion with Zimbabwe's independence: "To our great regret, however,"--and I wish to stress this--"we were not able to have our views prevail"?

115. The recrudescence of acts of repression in Zimbabwe, the craven military aggression of the rebel régime against Mozambique, the closer military ties between the partisans of *apartheid* and the illegal white régime in Salisbury are revealing about the nature and purport of the discussions going on in Geneva.

116. Ian Smith has never concealed his intention to consolidate white domination in Southern Rhodesia under

the last-ditch pretext of preserving Christian civilization, as if Christianity can only be considered the religion of white people.

117. The stratagems to subvert the independence of the people of Zimbabwe were revealed by Ian Smith himself when, during the statement to which I referred previously, he said:

“Dr. Kissinger has assured me that we have a common objective, a common goal, namely, to keep Rhodesia within the free world and safe from Communist inroads”.

118. The aim, the purpose of those nations which love peace and justice is to do everything they can to help the people of Zimbabwe who are in a state of war “to recover the land of their ancestors and to determine their own future”. Those last few words were quoted from the statement of Colonel Charles Cissokho, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Mali, made before the General Assembly on 8 October last [see 24th meeting, para. 60].

119. The situation in Namibia is another direct and permanent threat to international peace and security because it is fraught with the possibility of racial conflict and because of the irresponsible attitude adopted by the racist and illegal régime of Pretoria, whose presence in the Territory is one of the most serious affronts to our Organization.

120. The reports of the Special Committee on decolonization, the Committee against *Apartheid* and the United Nations Council for Namibia provide ample detail about the ever more repressive policy practised by Pretoria against the black population of Namibia, although that Territory is in fact under United Nations trusteeship.

121. The bantustanization of the country is not only an insult to the Namibian nation and an attempt to perpetuate the vile system of *apartheid*, but it is also the reflection of one of the cherished dreams of the Fascist régime of Pretoria to surround itself with satellite States in order to slake its thirst for expansion and exploitation. Namibia also constitutes for the bands of racists a base for possible aggression against the People's Republic of Angola. This international Territory, which has been illegally occupied by the Vorster régime and heavily militarized, has been transformed into a bridge-head by international imperialism to satisfy its desires for colonial reconquests in Africa.

122. It is undoubtedly for that reason that certain States Members of the United Nations, particularly those most directly concerned with the maintenance of international peace and security, continue to defy the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on Namibia by encouraging international capitalism to exploit the resources of that country.

123. The wanton exploitation of the resources of Namibia by foreign interests, the fact that only blacks are denied the right to form trade unions in the country, the miserly salaries paid them, and the inhuman working conditions in the mines—which virtually become the graves of Africans—show the true face of big capital interests in Namibia.

124. The Namibian people will experience prosperity only when they have acquired self-determination in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

125. The sham constitutional consultation that was recently cooked up by the masterminds of reactionary diplomacy of the illegal and racist régime of Pretoria clearly violates those provisions. It only provides further evidence of the desire of Verwoerd and his allies to continue to defy our Organization and to keep the Namibians under their control.

126. The only way to bring about decolonization in Namibia has already been determined by the Organization of African Unity [OAU] and the Fifth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, as well as the United Nations itself. It necessarily involves the prior recognition of the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence, respect for Namibia's territorial integrity, the release of political prisoners opposed to the South African presence in their country, the withdrawal of the administration and all the troops of the South African racists from Namibia, the organization of free elections under the auspices of the United Nations, and the recognition of the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO] as the sole representative of the Namibian people.

127. SWAPO derives its legitimacy as the representative of the people from its mandate from the Namibian people themselves, whose authentic embodiment it is. Indeed, a dispatch from the Agence France-Presse has revealed that on 29 November 1976 the Executive Committee of the last of the Namibian political parties, which had previously been opposed to SWAPO—the Namibian African People's Organization—unanimously decided to join ranks with SWAPO because, the dispatch states, it published a communiqué saying: “We are convinced that only SWAPO, as the leading national liberation movement of the people, can unite the masses in Namibia”.

128. The United Nations must be gratified at the objectivity of such attitudes, which confirms the correctness of its judgements and involves it ever more each day in the implacable struggle that it is waging against colonial domination. It should, at the end of these discussions, adopt measures to make it possible for the Special Committee to complete its annual studies on the evolution of the situation in colonial Territories, by sending visiting missions. It should also encourage the Committee to extend the range of its co-operation with non-governmental organizations and endorse resolution No. 2 adopted by the Fifth Conference of non-aligned countries on the creation of a fund to support and give solidarity to liberation in southern Africa [see A/31/197, annex IV].

129. The struggle of peoples under colonial domination for their self-determination and independence derives its legitimacy from the provisions of the Charter. The unconditional support given by certain Member States to the colonial Powers to perpetuate colonization and the abuse of the right of veto in the Security Council against any resolution aimed at swiftly ensuring the triumph of the rights of peoples under foreign domination may serve to

continue the agonies of the colonized peoples, but will have no effect whatever on the final outcome of their struggle because, as the Mali Minister for Foreign Affairs said on 8 October 1976 before this Assembly:

“No stalling tactics, regardless of how subtle they may be, and no military force can prevent the African peoples from achieving their final goal, namely, the total liberation of the last bastions of colonialism and racism in Africa. The last vestiges of colonialism will also be uprooted from the continents of Asia and Latin America by their peoples.” [24th meeting, para. 64].

130. That is a truth which has never been disproved by history. Let the colonial Powers and their allies understand this and co-operate with the United Nations so that dynamic and firm decisions can be taken at this session to rid the world of the evils of colonialism and *apartheid*.

131. Mr. BULLUT (Kenya): Sixteen years ago this Organization resolved to work relentlessly towards the ending of colonialism by adopting resolution 1514 (XV) which, among other things, declared the right of dependent peoples to freedom, self-determination, national independence and territorial integrity.

132. In spite of some progress made since the adoption of that Declaration, more than 12 million people still remain under colonial rule, the majority of them in southern Africa. This is very regrettable given that some of the Powers administering those peoples and territories claim to be champions of human rights.

133. We have noted with great disappointment the excuses given by the administering Powers for failing to implement fully the 1960 Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial peoples and dependent territories. In the view of my delegation these excuses are nothing but delaying tactics intended to prolong the *status quo*.

134. In Namibia, the supremacist racists continue to occupy that Territory in complete violation of the United Nations Charter, international law, the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice and the many resolutions and decisions of this Organization. We reject without any reservation South Africa's persistent defiance of this Organization and, in particular, we consider it a continuous provocation and an insult to the international community. We consider that the letter dated 27 January 1976 contained in document S/11948,⁵ addressed to the Secretary-General by the racist Pretoria régime, stating, *inter alia*, that South Africa does not recognize any right of the United Nations to supervise the affairs of Namibia and further that the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971⁶ was advisory only as confirmation of that régime's persistent defiance of the principles and purposes of this Organization in order to continue its occupation of Namibia. We hold that South Africa is under obligation to

withdraw its presence from Namibia unconditionally and must do so immediately.

135. Colonialists and racists have been rightly compared with wild animals that are now extinct. At a certain time those animals had a heyday during their life-cycle before extinction. During that period of maximum level of development, their claws and teeth were aggressively sharp and did a lot of harm to other animals. But over time the prey developed their potential and power so much that their resistance and defence mechanisms rendered the survival of those predators impossible. Their sharp teeth and claws became powerless. They failed to readjust to a new environment and therefore they perished. In the same manner colonialists and racists have had their heyday. They have enslaved people, sold them as commodities of trade, exploited their labour and their material resources ruthlessly. The 1960 Declaration marked a culmination of explicit resistance by the colonial peoples against colonialism. It was a final warning that the colonialists had no alternative but to withdraw from the colonies. Some decided to maintain the struggle a little longer by adopting new strategies or giving a few pretexts here and there in order to delay implementation of that Declaration. It is now clear that the South African Government is among those die-hard racists and colonialists as it continues to keep its hold on Namibia.

136. It is well known that South Africa has been frantically implementing the notorious Odendaal Plan announced in 1964. That notorious plan is a blueprint for the bantustanization of Namibia, modelled to the letter and spirit on the notorious South Africa pattern. The people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, have fought gallantly against that diabolical policy and the illegal occupation of their country by South Africa. It is also well-known that South Africa's occupation of Namibia is first and foremost strategic, political and economic. South Africa needs Namibia as a buffer-zone in an attempt to prolong its *apartheid* policies in the Republic and to launch military attacks on independent African countries, as has happened in the case of Angola and Zambia, and economically to continue to exploit its labour and abundant natural resources. The strategic and political factors became more evident with the enactment by the South African racist Government of a law allowing its Fascist troops to intervene in independent Africa south of the Sahara. One wonders what interests South Africa has in independent Africa except to spread terror, destruction and confusion in order to impede the liberation of the oppressed peoples of southern Africa.

137. It has been my Government's policy to support the Namibian people both morally and materially. We shall continue to honour this pledge to the extent our national resources permit us.

138. We condemn South Africa's brutal oppression of the Namibian people and its persistent violation of their human rights as well as its efforts to destroy their solidarity and territorial integrity by bantustanization. We should like to take this opportunity to request all United Nations specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system to accept representation of the Namibian people in their conferences and meetings and to protect the

⁵ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-first Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1976*.

⁶ *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 16.*

rights and interests of the Namibian people on any possible occasion. We further believe that these organizations will continue to render, within their respective spheres of competence, all possible assistance to the people of Namibia and their liberation movement, SWAPO.

139. It is the view of my delegation that the international community, without reservations, should reinforce its concerted efforts to bring to an end South Africa's occupation of Namibia.

140. The South African fascists, faced with the resolute struggle of the Namibian people to liberate themselves and isolation by the international community, organized in 1975 a bogus conference allegedly to decide the Territory's future. In the view of my delegation this conference was bogus in that it excluded the authentic representative of the Namibian people—that is, SWAPO. It was illegitimate in that it was designed to divide the Namibian people and thereby perpetuate South Africa's domination. My Government will not recognize such a conference and we call upon all Member States of this Organization to deny the bogus Windhoek Conference any form of recognition.

141. With regard to the British colony of Zimbabwe and without prejudice to the outcome of the Geneva Conference, my delegation would like to reiterate our Government's policy that the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, as the administering Power, has the responsibility for seeing to it that the Conference is concluded with an immediate and definite programme and date for transfer of power from the minority Smith rebels to the majority African people. Nothing short of this will be acceptable to my delegation.

142. Finally, we should also like to take this opportunity to express our complete disappointment with the behaviour of some Members of this Organization on matters of decolonization. Some members of this Organization have deliberately impeded the process of decolonization by carrying out military operations against emerging new States with the intention of arbitrarily integrating them in their countries either for economic reasons or territorial aggrandizement, or both. We have seen this happening in Western Sahara and East Timor, and we are carefully following developments in Belize, the Falkland Islands and Djibouti in particular. Such acts are in complete contradiction with the spirit of the Charter, the 1960 Declaration on decolonization, international law and relevant resolutions and decisions of this Organization. We shall continue to support all those peoples which have fallen victim to these unwarranted actions in their legitimate struggle for self-determination, freedom, national independence and territorial integrity. We do not believe that might is a substitute for self-determination, and we regret that some States, having themselves experienced the pains of colonization, should subject others to a similar situation. We cannot understand how a people invaded and occupied can be said to have exercised its right to self-determination.

143. In conclusion, my delegation would like to express its appreciation to the Special Committee, the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Secretary-General for the continuous efforts they are making in the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence

to Colonial Countries and Peoples. We should like to assure them of our continued support until all remnants of colonialism are completely eradicated.

144. Mr. CAMARA (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly has this year considered the report of the Special Committee on the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples at a time when it is celebrating, not without legitimate pride, the sixteenth anniversary of the adoption of this Declaration on 14 December 1960. Thus we can say that this occasion has a twofold importance.

145. Before undertaking any assessment of the report of the Special Committee, I should like, on behalf of the delegation of the Party-State of Guinea, to congratulate the members of that Committee, especially its Chairman, our brother, Mr. Salim Ahmed Salim of the United Republic of Tanzania, whose commitment, competence and devotion enabled that body honourably to discharge the difficult but challenging task entrusted to it by the General Assembly.

146. The post-war period in general and the last 16 years in particular have certainly been characterized by an accelerated change in relations and structure which no longer meet the requirements of our time. One of the principal characteristics of this period is the disintegration of colonial empires. In the course of these years a large number of formerly colonized countries have become independent and sovereign States Members of the United Nations.

147. In celebrating the notable success achieved by the United Nations in the process of decolonization, it is our duty to pay a tribute to the innumerable fighters who laid down their lives for the freedom of their people. The history of the anticolonial struggle has proved, were any proof needed, that it is the courageous struggle of peoples, led by their national liberation movements, that has been the main factor in the downfall of the colonial system.

148. The events which have recently occurred in the sphere of decolonization and, in particular, those which have occurred in Africa since 1974, will certainly appear in the history of decolonization as landmarks of especial importance.

149. After the victory of the liberation movements of the Territories under Portuguese administration, leading to the success of the democratic forces in Portugal, the last colonial empire, that of Portugal, disintegrated. A new political balance of forces came into being in Africa.

150. The admission this year to the United Nations of the People's Republic of Angola is an important milestone in the history of the struggle of the African peoples to throw off the colonial yoke. And the admission of this brother State, despite the reticence of those who refuse to respect the verdict of history, also re-establishes one of the cardinal principles of this Organization, that of universality.

151. In this connexion I should like to express the hope that, when the Security Council next considers the application for admission to the United Nations of the Socialist

Republic of Viet Nam, it will at last cause this principle of universality to prevail so that that heroic people may take their rightful place among us.

152. While justly praising all the results achieved in the sphere of decolonization, let us not forget that a great deal remains to be done and that the forces which for 31 years have opposed this evolution continue to do so. Nor should we forget the sacrifices and the perseverance which are at the root of our achievements for if we look at the history of the United Nations and at the 16 years which have elapsed since the adoption of the Declaration on decolonization, in particular, equal merit would seem to be given to all as regards the historic process of decolonization. While we are proud that the General Assembly adopted the 1960 Declaration in resolution 1514 (XV) without a single dissenting vote, we must ponder over the fact that there were 9 abstentions and that there are still voices in this hall raised against the struggle being waged to eliminate the last remnants of colonialism. These attitudes and the absence of political determination are primarily responsible for the survival of flagrant examples of colonialism.

153. The situation of crisis prevailing in southern Africa is the result of this lack of political determination of certain States—and not the lesser ones—which are not really committed to genuine decolonization but which would maintain that part of our continent under the effective control of international imperialism and set it up as a military power poised against independent Africa.

154. The continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, which has only contempt for all the United Nations decisions expressing the universal condemnation of its abhorrent policy of *apartheid* and its practice of bantustanization, is inadmissible. South Africa has clearly proved that it has no desire whatever to see any change leading to the independence of Namibia, which it is determined to transform into a strategic base from which it can threaten the independent States of Africa. It is speeding up its acquisition of sophisticated weapons, and its disquieting acquisition of a nuclear potential emphasizes the growing danger which that racist régime poses for Africa and for world peace.

155. Using the arms and other assistance it is receiving, the illegal racist régime of the rebel Ian Smith is also adopting an increasingly aggressive attitude towards the neighbouring independent States, and is having recourse to the most pitiless and barbaric methods against the people of Zimbabwe, which it is oppressing and maintaining in a state of subjugation. It was only to be expected that the redoubled attacks of the liberation movements of that Territory would lead Ian Smith to seize the branch extended to him by the United States and the United Kingdom.

156. Although the rebel Ian Smith seems to believe that he is in Geneva as the "victor" to impose his conditions for Zimbabwe's independence on the "vanquished", we hope that the deep aspirations of the people of Zimbabwe, represented by the liberation movements, will prevail at that Conference and that nothing will be done to jeopardize that people's inalienable right to freedom and independence—a right which can in no case be negotiated, a right whose attainment cannot be subjected to any conditions.

So much is at stake at that conference that all the parties, and particularly those grouped behind the United Kingdom, must make resolute efforts to avoid the failure which is haunting it. For the failure of this final attempt to settle the Rhodesian crisis peacefully would represent eloquent confirmation of the need to continue the armed struggle on which the victory of the African peoples finally depends.

157. If the racist régimes of southern Africa are able successfully to resist the pressure of the international community, the mandatory sanctions, the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, it is precisely because they are being assisted by all these circles of well-known economic and strategic and other imperialist interests of certain industrially developed countries. The same circles offer Africa peaceful negotiations as measures towards solutions; they oppose "violence" as a method in the liberation from colonialism and racism. In fact, it is obvious that *apartheid* and racism, which are the worst forms of violence against the African population, are supported by the deeds and condemned by the words of these very Powers which refuse all concrete support for and assistance to Africa in the action it is taking to eliminate *apartheid* and colonialism from its soil.

158. We believe that it is in the interest of the international community to assist the liberation struggle of the peoples of Namibia, Zimbabwe and Azania. For if that assistance is not given the crisis in southern Africa can have unforeseeable harmful effects on international peace and security.

159. The question of what has been called the small Territories has taken on particular significance this year because of the ever-increasing pressure exerted by the peoples of those Territories for the liquidation of colonialism. It has become obvious that a small Territory does not of necessity pose a small problem. In our present interdependent world, where peace is indivisible and can be based only on freedom and co-operation among all peoples and all States, equal subjects in international relations, no problem can be neglected as being of minor importance. The refusal to grant any Territory, even the smallest, its legitimate rights can lead to an international crisis.

160. We hope that all the anti-colonialist forces will overcome all the dissensions regarding the decolonization of a given Territory, so that all the obstacles to this process may be eliminated and the peoples of the Territories concerned may be enabled freely to exercise their right to self-determination and independence. Such a determination on our part will doubtless permit Belize, Brunei, East Timor and Djibouti to rid themselves of colonial domination and join the family of nations represented here.

161. With regard to the Comorian island of Mayotte, we appeal to France to show its sense of responsibility in the process of decolonization, and on the basis of the frank and sincere friendship we intend to maintain with France, we ask it to respect the territorial integrity of the Republic of the Comoros by restoring to that country the island of Mayotte, a natural component of the archipelago.

162. The National Revolutionary Council of Guinea, at its last session, adopted a resolution reaffirming the unswerving

ing support of the Party-State of Guinea for the national liberation struggle of the African peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia and Azania, of the Arab people of Palestine, and of all other peoples still under the subjugation of international imperialism and its by-products, colonialism, neo-colonialism, *apartheid*, racism and zionism.

163. I should be failing in my duty if I ended this statement without paying a respectful tribute to some great heroes of the national liberation movement who fell on the field of honour because of their legitimate efforts to ensure the fulfilment of the objectives of the Declaration in resolution 1514 (XV), whose sixteenth anniversary we celebrated a few days ago. On behalf of the people of Guinea and their Party-State, I wish to salute from the rostrum of the General Assembly Patrice Lumumba, Kwame Nkrumah, Gamal Abdel Nasser, Eduardo Mondlane, Albert Luthuli, Amílcar Cabral, Herbert Chitepo and many other brave, great sons of Africa who made the supreme sacrifice for the liberation of the African continent. Their immortal names will remain engraved in the history of the permanent struggle of peoples against the forces of evil and for the victory of reason over arbitrariness, the triumph of justice over injustice.

164. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): It is not our intention to redefine the spirit of the Declaration in resolution 1514 (XV), because it is essentially a reproduction and expansion of the provisions of the Charter proclaiming the faith of the Member States in "fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small". Nor is it our intention to dwell on a fundamental democratic principle that is already well established—namely, the principle of the equality of the political rights of all peoples. It is a principle that we have sought to translate in the Declaration in resolution 1514 (XV) into steps which, through self-determination, can ensure a free and independent future for the colonial peoples that aspire to become sovereign States.

165. The present debate can be justified only by the conflicts which have broken out regarding the evolution of some of these peoples towards full self-determination and independence and by our not having yet reached any final result entailing the complete implementation of the fundamental princ. of both the Declaration and the Charter.

166. Some forces, which can easily be identified if only by their stubbornness and their reactionary reflexes, see fit to drag out something which the international community has already passed judgement on and condemned and rejected by adopting the Declaration in resolution 1514 (XV), in which we proclaimed the need unconditionally and swiftly to put an end to colonialism in all its forms and manifestations.

167. This is a need which the General Assembly saw fit to spell out by immediately placing the struggle against colonialism in the broader context of the defence of fundamental human rights and the whole cause of promoting international, universal peace, security and co-operation. In particular, it sought in the preamble to the Declaration to emphasize the decisive role that the peoples that are still dependent can play in pursuing these objec-

tives and particularly the responsibility of the administering Powers to contribute to these ends and to ensure that their actions and their attitudes towards the legitimate aspirations of these peoples do not provoke any crises or serious conflicts which might constitute a threat to international peace and security.

168. The principles laid down in the Declaration are too well known for me to have to rehearse them at any length. The most important of them relate to the right of all peoples freely to determine their political status and their economic, social and cultural future; the timely granting of independence and the transfer of power "without any conditions or reservations . . . without any distinction as to race, creed or colour"; transition to the status of genuine independence without any armed repression or opposition; and respect for the national unity and territorial integrity of the peoples and countries concerned.

169. These various tenets form a coherent whole aimed at achieving a precisely determined goal, which is to make it possible for all colonial countries and peoples to enjoy complete freedom and independence. They lay down a body of political law and rights which are inalienable and absolute and can therefore neither be truncated nor interpreted in a restrictive way, let alone be challenged.

170. However, it is a far step from principles to practice.

171. In a rapidly changing world in which rivalry is rampant in all regions and areas, the desire of the colonial peoples for independence has more than once been subjected to the requirements and laws of confrontation between the major Powers. The defence of zones of influence or specific strategic points, the desire to preserve privilege, the wish to safeguard and to perpetuate a political environment which gives free rein to the lust for exploitation and domination—these are all reasons which, in the eyes of some people, justify maintaining the *status quo*, on attempts to confiscate power for the benefit of individuals in the pay of powerful economic foreign interests, of imperialism or even of international racism. Sometimes, also, the right of peoples to independence has been denied in the name of the questionable need to restore national unity in certain countries, or simply because of a naked desire for annexation.

172. In one case, despite the specific demands of the General Assembly and the Security Council, they refuse to organize a referendum on self-determination and instead to vest in an assembly of prominent persons the right to decide the future of an entire people. In another, the future of a people is determined by a so-called popular assembly established under a régime of foreign military occupation, which prevents the nationalist forces from freely participating in the elections. Or again, when the vast majority of the population has voiced its desire for independence, the colonial Power involved goes back on its commitments, gives a *sui generis* interpretation of the result of the vote and takes advantage of it to destroy the territorial unity and integrity of the country, in flagrant violation of the Charter and of paragraph 6 of the Declaration.

173. But none can equal the racist minority régimes of Pretoria and Salisbury in their blind determination to

oppose the liberation of the African majority. The revolutionary forces of the people of Azania have been bloodily repressed by a police apparatus inspired with the zeal of a torturer; an interventionary force of 50,000 men with the most sophisticated logistic support and armaments has been set up in Namibia, and the illegal Salisbury régime continues to indulge in unrestrained military expenditure in order to contain the arms of the national liberation movement. These facts are all very revealing of the attitude of those régimes towards the principles set forth in resolution 1514 (XV) and of their desire to oppose by force the right of the African majority to take their destiny into their own hands.

174. The fact that Ian Smith has visited the Geneva Conference should not lead us suddenly to give way to euphoria and jubilation and to consider that the problems of decolonization in Zimbabwe have thereby been resolved. The holding of that Conference shows that the intellectual reservations of the white minority are far from dispelled and that they are approaching these talks with the quite definite intention of restricting the sovereignty of the future majority government, imposing conditions on the independence of Zimbabwe, and as a matter of priority securing their own future even to the detriment of the majority, so that they can subsequently legalize and perpetuate a new neo-colonial and imperialist structure. When Ian Smith speaks of entrusting the Government of Zimbabwe to a "responsible majority", which is not the same as a simple majority; when he asks for the creation of a Council of State which he himself would preside over, and which would approve the composition of the government and prepare the constitution; when he requests that white rebel racist-minority ministers preserve the key Ministries of Defence and Justice in the so-called "transitional" government—are we certain that he has in fact given up the idea of minority government, and are we certain that he sincerely intends to give up the privileges now enjoyed by that minority?

175. As far as we are concerned, we have always supported the position of the so-called front-line Heads of State and the position of the nationalist movements which have rejected Ian Smith's interpretation of the Anglo-American plan, since it is intended to prejudge the decisions which the independent people of Zimbabwe alone should take in full sovereignty. We are convinced that it is still up to the United Kingdom as the administering Power more resolutely to support the nationalist forces of Zimbabwe during this transitional stage so that Zimbabwe may accede to independence. In so doing, the United Kingdom would resume the responsibility we have never denied it but which is not always fully assumed because of a certain logic which has largely been superseded by an evolution of thought and circumstance.

176. In connexion with Namibia, our delegation has already had occasion to give its views both in the Security Council and in the Fourth Committee. We continue to denounce South Africa's refusal to co-operate with the United Nations in order to find a solution to these problems which will satisfy both the Namibian people and the entire international community. We can neither accept nor sanction its idea of dismembering the international territory of Namibia through the tribal talks in Turnhalle,

which, in the opinion of the President of SWAPO, Mr. Nujoma,

"are simply a smoke-screen to camouflage the real intentions of South Africa, that is, to transform Namibia into a confederation of tribal mini-States controlled and manipulated by the racist régime in order to keep Namibia as a buffer against independent Africa".

177. We cannot conceive of any negotiations on Namibia before South Africa has accepted the conditions laid down by SWAPO, namely, that any negotiation between SWAPO and the illegal occupation régime should deal solely with the arrangements for the transfer of power to the Namibian people under the direction of SWAPO; that the negotiations must take place under the auspices of the United Nations; that the unconditional release of all political prisoners or detainees must take place before anything else is discussed; and that the South African armed forces must be withdrawn from Namibia.

178. These conditions had by no means been met on 19 October last, when France, United Kingdom and the United States vetoed the draft resolution proposing a mandatory embargo on arms deliveries to and economic sanctions against South Africa.⁷ Since then the negotiations which apparently were to be held at that time, and which, according to those delegations, made it untimely for new steps to be taken, were not the sort of negotiations that we can regard as serious.

179. Furthermore, it is a fact that a few weeks later no one was saying anything about the "negotiations" to which those three Western Powers had referred at that time. In other words, the irresponsible exercise of the triple veto has led to a slackening in the action of the Organization, which can only be to the benefit of South Africa in realizing its plans.

180. This problem of Namibia, as we see it, illustrates the tragedy of our Organization: it is powerless because of the conflicting interests which prevail in it to ensure the full implementation of principles which appear, at first sight, to be universally accepted; powerless also to impose decisions in regard to conflicts where some may withdraw from its jurisdiction in order to subject to so-called negotiations something which is not negotiable or to pursue objectives which are not easily reconcilable with the liberation and independence of peoples.

181. The United Nations, we believe, should reaffirm its authority, insist on the scrupulous implementation of its resolutions and refuse to be relegated to a secondary or peripheral role which would be incompatible with its function, which is to serve as a privileged centre for negotiations on and the settlement of international problems. It should under no circumstances agree that the principles of the Declaration contained in resolution 1514 (XV) may be diluted in their application or diverted from their true goal.

182. Faced to our general principles and recognizing as we do that the legitimate struggle of the colonial countries

⁷ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-first Year, 1963rd meeting.*

and peoples make it the bounden duty of our Organization to be more resolutely involved in the process that has been started internationally to eliminate colonialism, we believe that the forthcoming International Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, which is the subject of draft resolution A/31/L.31, should serve as a framework for the mobilization of effective and more substantial assistance to be provided to the liberation movements, whose success in the final analysis can only promote the realization of the purposes of the Charter.

183. The results which have already been obtained, however significant they may be, in no way diminish our common responsibility in this connexion, since it is true that the requirements of the new international order, which should be more democratic and more just, have both broadened and deepened this responsibility and enjoin upon us the task of persevering until equality among all men and all nations becomes a living and irreversible reality.

184. A debate is about to conclude during which we have all endeavoured to demonstrate our commitment to resolution 1514 (XV), the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, to display our responsibility in the eyes of world public opinion and to analyse the factors which have had a telling effect on the process of the liberation of peoples and in certain cases to ensure that the elimination of colonialism has entered its final stage. For our part, whatever be the value of these professions of faith, we shall continue to be guided by the aspirations and claims of peoples that are subjected and humiliated, to whom we would say: "As long as justice has not been fully rendered to you, our struggle will go on".

185. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We have now concluded our debate on agenda item 25.

186. The General Assembly has before it three draft resolutions, contained in documents A/31/L.29 and Add.1-3, A/31/L.30 and Add.1-3 and A/31/L.31 and Add.1-3. I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their votes on any or all of the three draft resolutions.

187. Mr. CASTILLO-ARRIOLA (Guatemala) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Guatemala has for 16 years firmly upheld the fundamental principles and purposes of decolonization as contained in resolution 1514 (XV). However, the delegation of Guatemala at this Assembly will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/31/L.29, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples", because we cannot accept certain political criteria expressed in the text which have no bearing on the real purpose of decolonization. These are political criteria which might affect the territorial integrity of Member States, and that is contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and to the maintenance of international peace and security and the defence of the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Member States.

188. If separate votes were taken, Guatemala would vote against several paragraphs in the draft resolution, because they contain dangerous generalizations which are not in accord with our particular claims on the Territory of Belize.

189. Mr. FORRESTER (Australia): The Australian delegation supports all the draft resolutions now before us. We are pleased to do so because we value our participation in the work of the Special Committee. We likewise endorse the Committee's important work in support of the oppressed peoples of Namibia and Zimbabwe and its concern for the interests and right to self-determination of the other remaining colonial Territories—in particular, the small Territories.

190. I should like to pay a tribute to the officers of the Special Committee who have each contributed to the Committee's work this year: the Chairman, Ambassador Salim of the United Republic of Tanzania; the acting Chairman, Ambassador Abdulah of Trinidad and Tobago; Mr. Garvalov of Bulgaria and Mr. Vraalsen of Norway, who has performed creditably this session as Chairman of the Fourth Committee, and the Rapporteur of the Special Committee, Mr. Glayel of the Syrian Arab Republic.

191. The Australian delegation in the Special Committee has participated actively in the work of the Committee throughout 1976. Our support for the process of decolonization and for majority rule in Namibia and Zimbabwe is consequently amply documented in the report of the Special Committee. The few reservations that we have had in relation to the decisions of the Committee are also recorded in the Special Committee's report.

192. On several occasions, both in the Special Committee and in this Assembly, we have stated the Australian Government's position on the legitimacy of armed struggle in the achievement of liberation from the racist and colonial régimes that persist in Zimbabwe and Namibia. As the Universal Declaration of Human Rights recognizes, there may be recourse to rebellion against tyranny and oppression as the last resort in situations where human rights are persistently denied. But recourse to armed struggle must be made only as a last resort. We believe that the international community has a continuing obligation to explore fully the opportunities that, in our view, still exist for a peaceful solution in Namibia and Zimbabwe. In this regard, we believe that all parties concerned should take advantage of the opportunities offered by the Geneva talks in relation to Southern Rhodesia, and we wish its Chairman and all those associated with this effort full success. We hope that those talks will culminate in arrangements for a smooth transition to majority rule in Zimbabwe. Consistent with our support for peaceful solutions, we deny to the illegal régime in Zimbabwe and to the South African Government all forms of military equipment and assistance.

193. In its operative paragraph 10, draft resolution A/31/L.29 refers to the presence of military bases and installations in colonial Territories. As we have noted in the Special Committee, and more recently in the Fourth Committee's vote on the draft resolution on Guam, the United Nations Charter recognizes the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence and that the existence of installations of an administering Power in its dependent Territory may well be justified by obligations relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as well as local defence.

194. Operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/31/L.29 refers also to nuclear and military collaboration with South

Africa. We should have preferred the draft resolution to focus specifically on assistance in the development of a nuclear weapons capability by South Africa rather than to condemn all collaboration in the nuclear field with that country. There is, in our view, no basis for condemning transactions for a peaceful purpose under full international safeguards or the development of a safeguarded, peaceful nuclear industry. Australia believes strongly that South Africa should become a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; and we are equally concerned to ensure that it does not develop a nuclear weapons capability. To that end we believe that any country that enters into arrangements for nuclear supplies to South Africa for peaceful purposes has a special responsibility to ensure that stringent controls and safeguards are applied.

195. Mr. VERGAU (Federal Republic of Germany) (*interpretation from French*): The Federal Republic of Germany has consistently supported the acceleration of the process of decolonization. As members know, Germany had the privilege of being stripped of all its colonies as early as 1919. Since the Federal Republic of Germany was thus never a colonial Power, its contacts with the countries and peoples concerned have been easy from the outset, and today it maintains friendly relations with almost all the countries of the third world. These are relations based on respect and mutual understanding and are aimed at long-term political and human understanding. Never in the framework of these relations has the reproach of colonialism played a role. We see our activities as aiming at better economic and social structures as a decisive contribution to the solution of the most pressing problems of those peoples, especially those in Africa. Going beyond simple statements and solemn gestures, we have translated our awareness of these problems into a practical policy, thus helping our African partners and others to achieve genuine independence. This material and human commitment for the benefit of almost all developing countries has been warmly recognized by our partners, and we are proud of this.

196. Given this progressive co-operation in the transformation of purely legal independence into true independence and self-determination, the principal content of draft resolution A/31/L.29 has always been a basic element of our approach to the problems of decolonization. That is why we should have preferred to accept this draft resolution by an affirmative vote and without reservation.

197. However, this text contains several passages that give rise to serious objections and which, consequently, make it necessary for us to request that our partners in the Assembly understand that the only choice remaining to us is to abstain.

198. We have always maintained that effective measures against *apartheid* are necessary and that they must be intensified. But one cannot, as does operative paragraph 2, identify this struggle with the decolonization struggle. South Africa does not represent a decolonization problem.

199. Armed struggle for decolonization should not, in our view, be recommended, since we feel that political solutions are always possible. The approval of armed struggle, which

seems to stem from operative paragraphs 4 and 5, is unacceptable to us, and we are convinced that such approval by the General Assembly would be incompatible with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

200. The existence of military bases is not necessarily an obstacle to self-determination. That is why operative paragraph 10 has no place in the context of this draft resolution. The retention of that passage is even less comprehensible to us, since the majority of the General Assembly has already expressed its reservations in this respect during the vote on 1 December 1976 on another draft resolution.

201. Other objections concern parts of the sixth preambular paragraph and the mention of a "threat to . . . peace and security" in operative paragraph 2.

202. We shall express our favourable attitude to the principle of decolonization by an affirmative vote on draft resolution A/31/L.30 on the dissemination of information on decolonization.

203. Mr. QUARTIN-SANTOS (Portugal): In reference to draft resolution A/31/L.29, I should like to express Portugal's reservation concerning operative paragraph 10 of the aforesaid draft, on the question of military bases maintained by administering Powers in Territories under their administration.

204. Consistent with what we have stated in the Fourth Committee regarding the questions of Guam and French Somaliland,⁸ we consider that neither the provisions of the Charter nor those of resolution 1514 (XV) prevent the administering Powers from maintaining such military installations, which do not necessarily in themselves constitute obstacles to the exercise of the right to self-determination by the peoples concerned. As we have said before, we think that it is up to the latter to decide upon the existence of such installations.

205. Also, our positive vote on the aforementioned draft resolution cannot be interpreted as an endorsement of all the decisions and conclusions contained in the report of the Special Committee referred to in operative paragraph 5 of the draft.

206. Mr. SHERER (United States of America): The United States will vote against draft resolution A/31/L.29 on the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

207. My delegation has reservations about a number of aspects of the draft resolution itself, as well as about portions of the report of the Special Committee on decolonization, which operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution approves. We have already addressed some of these, including the language on military activities and foreign economic interests, in committee or in plenary, and will not take the time to repeat our views today.

208. Concerning the section of the report of the Special Committee dealing with Guam, my delegation wishes to

⁸ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Fourth Committee*, 32nd meeting, para. 55 and *ibid.*, 33rd meeting, paras. 10-11.

bring to the attention of this body that the Guam Legislature, on 3 December 1976, adopted resolution 383, expressing *inter alia*, support for a continuing close relationship with the United States, in accordance with the wishes of the people of Guam, and support for the continued presence of United States military personnel and bases on Guam.

209. There are two additional questions raised by the report of the Special Committee which merit further comment.

210. Chapter 1 of the report of the Special Committee [A/31/23/Rev.1] contains a reference to discussion of Puerto Rico, including a decision to take up the question again in 1977. Puerto Rico is not a matter which falls within the purview of the Special Committee. The people of Puerto Rico are self-governing, as was recognized by the General Assembly in 1953, when it approved resolution 748 (VIII), and in 1971, when it decided not to inscribe Puerto Rico on its agenda.

211. The policy of the United States with regard to Puerto Rico is based on full acceptance of the principle of self-determination. We stated before this body in 1953 that if the Legislature of Puerto Rico should adopt a resolution in favour of independence, then the President would immediately recommend to the Congress that independence be granted.

212. The fact of the matter is that, in the exercise of their right to self-determination, the people of Puerto Rico have opposed independence for Puerto Rico and have selected a commonwealth relationship with the United States. This choice, which was made in 1952, was reaffirmed in a 1967 status referendum. The election held on 2 November of this year provides further current evidence as to the wishes of the people of Puerto Rico. Although pro-independence parties campaigned hard and freely, they received the support of only 6 per cent of the voters.

213. In view of these facts, discussion of Puerto Rico by the Special Committee is an unwarranted interference in the affairs of the United States and the people of Puerto Rico.

214. Concerning the Committee's discussion of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, I wish to point out that the Charter provides that all functions of the United Nations relating to Trust Territories designated as strategic areas shall be exercised by the Security Council. The Security Council has delegated to the Trusteeship Council the authority to consider the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands on behalf of the Security Council. For these reasons the United States considers inappropriate any consideration of the Trust Territory by the Special Committee, and does not participate in the Committee's consideration of the question. The record of the United States Administration of the Trust Territory is available in the documents of the Trusteeship Council, which clearly refute the views expressed by certain irresponsible delegations.

215. The United States will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/31/L.30 concerning dissemination of infor-

mation on decolonization. The United States supports the dissemination of objective information on decolonization, particularly in the Non-Self-Governing Territories, but has reservations concerning the language of the Special Committee, calling for greater publicity about such items as the role of foreign economic and other interests, and military activities in the Non-Self-Governing Territories—issues which we have already addressed.

216. The United States will participate in the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/31/L.31, concerning an International Conference in support of the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia. We reserve our position on the political significance of the Conference, its timing and United States participation.

217. Mr. ÅLGÅRD (Norway): I am speaking on behalf of the delegations of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Sweden and of my own country, Norway.

218. The Nordic delegations will vote in favour of draft resolution A/31/L.29. The position of the Nordic countries on the question of decolonization has been consistent and is well known. Our Governments take strong exception to anything that impedes the interests of the peoples in dependent Territories in exercising freely their inalienable right to self-determination. On the basis of an over-all consideration of the draft resolution and in view of the special responsibility of the United Nations concerning the question of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, we are in a position to support the draft resolution because we are in agreement with its main objectives.

219. However, the positive vote of the Nordic countries does not mean that we do not have reservations concerning certain provisions of the draft resolution which run counter to principles that we have consistently upheld or which raise constitutional difficulties. We have spelt them out on so many occasions in the past that we do not intend to go into any detail now.

220. We would, however, place on record our view that operative paragraph 4 contains elements that do not accord with the policy of peaceful solutions that the Nordic countries have always followed.

221. As regards the request in operative paragraph 9, it is our understanding that that does not entail a breach of the principle of universality.

222. We should also like to place on record that we do not agree with every part of the report of the Special Committee.

223. We should, finally, like to reiterate our hope that the ultimate goal of self-determination and independence will be achieved through co-operation and peaceful negotiations.

224. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom): The debates in the Special Committee and the Fourth Committee this year have shown that a wide measure of agreement exists on the question of decolonization. Inevitably, there are differences of approach on the best means of bringing about changes

and of securing for the inhabitants of dependent Territories the full enjoyment of their right to self-determination and independence. However, on Rhodesia and the smaller Territories which are of particular concern to my delegation, it has been possible to achieve a wide measure of agreement. For this reason, and as co-operation between the United Kingdom as an administering Power and the Special Committee has been fruitful, we would have wished to achieve here the meeting of minds which it has been possible to achieve during the year and we would have wished to have had that meeting of minds reflected in the main resolution on this item [A/31/L.29]. It will be with great regret, therefore, that we shall have to abstain in the vote. We also regret that no attempt was made by the sponsors of the draft to discuss with other delegations the wording of a text which could be generally accepted. It would surely have been possible to reach agreement on a text which would have reflected the activities of the United Nations in the field of decolonization and the resolutions already adopted on individual Territories much more accurately than does the draft before us.

225. It is a distortion of the truth to assert, as does operative paragraph 2 of the draft, "that the continuation of colonialism in all its forms . . . poses a serious threat to international peace and security". That statement is true for Rhodesia, as determined by the Security Council. It is certainly not true, for example, for the several hundred thousand inhabitants of Territories for which the United Kingdom remains responsible in the Pacific and Caribbean regions. As it fails to discriminate between different territories and situations, that paragraph is rendered virtually meaningless.

226. In the text as at present drafted, we are asked to accept, for example, that the imminent advance of the Solomon Islands to independence contravenes the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. That assertion is incompatible in substance with the resolutions of the General Assembly adopted on 29 November on the recommendation of the Fourth Committee [resolutions 31/29, 31/30 and 31/31] and contradicts paragraph 12 (d) of the draft itself, in which the Special Committee is requested "to continue to pay particular attention to the small Territories . . .".

227. We would not expect to agree with the Special Committee on every point. We are amply familiar with the range and variety of the issues it discusses. We have our well-known positions on such questions as, for example, the Falklands and Brunei. There have been occasions on which we have differed and cases where no further comment on our part is called for as the issues have already been thoroughly discussed.

228. There are, however, two issues raised by the draft in operative paragraphs 5, 7 and 10, on which I should like to comment. They relate to a point which I made earlier, namely, that a resolution can be robbed of meaning and force if it uses language indiscriminately. Foreign economic interests in many Non-Self-Governing Territories enhance the capacity of their inhabitants to proceed to self-determination and to attain early and secure independence. That fact received wide recognition in the course of the debate early in the session on agenda item 87. Nor does the draft

resolution recognize that in most of our remaining dependent Territories it is the local Government which takes decisions on economic matters.

229. Similarly, the existence of military bases in certain colonial Territories does not necessarily conflict with the right of self-determination. We have repeatedly called on South Africa to withdraw from Namibia, in accordance with the unanimous demands of the international community. That is one thing. The presence of British forces in Belize, or the use of facilities elsewhere, in accordance with the clearly expressed wishes of the population concerned is completely different. We cannot accept that there is any validity or sense in an indiscriminate appeal to administering Powers in general to withdraw military bases.

230. It will be clear that my delegation regards some of the wording of the draft resolution as false and unrealistic. Much of it, however, we accept. We shall continue to take part in the relevant discussions of the Special Committee and to convey its conclusions and recommendations, as appropriate, to the Governments of United Kingdom Territories. We are grateful to the members of the Special Committee, and to its Sub-Committee on Small Territories in particular, for the achievements of 1976, and we look forward for our own part to a productive session in 1977.

231. My delegation will be ready to join in the consensus on draft resolution A/31/L.31 concerning the holding of a conference on Rhodesia and Namibia at Maputo next year. We are in favour of open and full discussion of these important questions. But I think it only right to say that we shall also have to consider in due course the timing of the conference in relation to developments elsewhere towards a negotiated settlement in Rhodesia. We also have reservations about the reference to the word "struggle" in the fourth paragraph of the preamble.

232. I close with a general observation. My Government welcomes frank discussion of conditions in our Territories. We resent, however, the kind of propagandistic, ill-informed and ill-intentioned criticism which we have heard from representatives of Czechoslovakia and of what, borrowing a phrase of their own, I shall describe as "other Warsaw Pact circles". Our claim to abide by democratic principles in our remaining dependent Territories rests on facts which can be attested to by any impartial observer and to which in the recent past no fewer than three United Nations visiting missions have already attested. We believe in the free determination of their future status by their inhabitants. We have confidence in the democratic process in our dependent Territories. We can only think that people who have had experience of the Brezhnev doctrine have difficulty in understanding the very idea of the wishes of the people freely expressed.

233. Mr. FUENTES IBÁÑEZ (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Bolivian delegation would like to express its reservations on operative paragraphs 4, 5 and 10 of draft resolution A/31/L.29. Operative paragraph 4 sanctions the use of all means at the disposal of colonial peoples; in other words, it includes violent means thus in a way placing on a secondary level the peaceful means which are prescribed by our Charter. Operative paragraphs 5 and 10 involve situations which are not similar, and if they are

applied in a general way it could sanction attitudes and criteria with which my Government does not agree and which it cannot support.

234. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Assembly will now take a decision on the various draft resolutions.

235. We shall vote first on draft resolution A/31/L.29 and Add.1-3 entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples". The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution are contained in document A/31/442/Rev.1, section A. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, 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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Italy, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands.

The draft resolution was adopted by 121 votes to 2, with 8 abstentions (resolution 31/143).⁹

236. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We shall now turn to draft resolution A/31/L.30 and Add.1-3, entitled "Dissemination of information on decolonization". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

⁹ The delegation of Mozambique subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution. The delegation of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished its vote to be recorded as an abstention.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, 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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: France, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 132 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (resolution 31/144).

237. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/31/L.31 and Add.1-3, entitled "International Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia". The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/31/442/Rev.1, section B. I have been informed that it is the wish of the General Assembly to adopt this draft resolution by consensus. In the absence of any objection, I shall consider that it is so decided.

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 31/145).

238. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the vote.

239. Mr. GREGORIADES (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): The Greek delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/31/L.29. It also voted in favour of draft resolutions A/31/L.30 and A/31/L.31 because it approved of the way in which those important subjects are treated in those drafts. Our vote in favour of draft resolution A/31/L.29, however, should be understood in the light of the position taken by my delegation on specific aspects of certain questions dealt with in that resolution, a position we expressed in our statements by our votes in the Fourth Committee.

240. Mr. KENNEDY (Ireland): The delegation of Ireland voted in favour of draft resolutions A/31/L.29 and A/31/L.30 and joined in the consensus on A/31/L.31. I should like, however, to clarify our position on some of the points in these resolutions.

241. With regard to draft resolution A/31/L.29, my delegation has reservations about operative paragraph 2, which declares that the continuation of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations poses a serious threat to international peace and security. Not only do we feel that the definition of such a threat is essentially a matter to be decided by the Security Council, but we also have grave doubts about the accuracy of the statement in many colonial situations.

242. In operative paragraph 4, which reaffirms its recognition of the legitimacy of the struggle of the peoples under colonial and alien domination to exercise their right to self-determination and independence by all the necessary means at their disposal, we interpret this to mean by all peaceful means in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

243. With regard to operative paragraph 9, which refers to withholding "assistance of any kind from the Government of South Africa", we also have a reservation in the context of our long-standing attitude that requests such as this properly fall within the area of competence of the Security Council.

244. In connexion with operative paragraph 10, we cannot accept that the presence of military bases is necessarily incompatible with the process of decolonization. We feel that our view was clearly endorsed earlier this year when the overwhelming majority of the inhabitants of one Non-Self-Governing Territory—Guam—voted to retain their association with their administering Power and its military base. The representative of the United States has just recently referred to this point this evening from this rostrum.

245. In addition, although fully recognizing the importance of the work of the Special Committee in the United Nations system, we cannot unreservedly endorse those elements of its report [*A/31/23/Rev.1*] which correspond to the reservations we have just expressed.

246. In conclusion, Ireland wishes once more to reaffirm its support for the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, by which the Assembly affirmed that the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights and is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations. We voted for that resolution in 1960 as we continue to support it now.

247. Mr. JANKOWITSCH (Austria): The Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples is one of the fundamental documents of this Organization. Austria has never failed to lend its full support to the rights of colonial countries and peoples to self-determination and independence, and our attitude in

this year's session of the General Assembly was no exception to that rule.

248. We were pleased to note that the process of decolonization goes on unabated and that it has led to the admission of three new States to membership of the United Nations during this session. I should like to take this opportunity to extend our warm welcome to the newest Member State in our midst, the Independent State of Western Samoa.

249. The Austrian delegation has whole-heartedly agreed with the general thrust of the three draft resolutions on which we have just voted, and it therefore cast positive votes on draft resolutions A/31/L.29 and A/31/L.30 and joined the consensus on A/31/L.31. We did so in spite of some reservations which we must express with regard to the wording of various provisions of these resolutions.

250. In particular, I should like to refer to operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/31/L.29, which we interpret to mean that the use of all peaceful means in conformity of the Charter of the United Nations is envisaged.

251. Finally, in the context of draft resolution A/31/L.31, which has just been adopted by consensus, I should like to indicate that my Government is giving active consideration to a voluntary contribution to defray some of the additional costs of the proposed conference on Zimbabwe and Namibia in Maputo.

252. Mr. KATO (Japan): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/31/L.29, which has just been adopted, because it firmly supports its basic objective, namely to reaffirm the inalienable right of the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories to self-determination and independence.

253. However, there are some paragraphs which my delegation finds difficult to support. They are the sixth preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 2, 5, 9, 10 and 12 (*b*).

254. With regard to operative paragraph 7, my delegation understands that it does not condemn all activities of foreign economic and other interests.

255. My delegation's affirmative vote does not constitute acceptance of certain implications of the language used in the fifth preambular paragraph and in operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 11.

256. Mr. ESFANDIARY (Iran): I should like briefly to explain the vote of the delegation of Iran on draft resolution A/31/L.29, which has just been adopted.

257. Iran has always strongly adhered to the principles of self-determination and independence enshrined in the United Nations Charter. This is evidenced by the fact that my Government has always been and continues to be among the fervent supporters of the decolonization process throughout the world. In pursuance of this objective, we therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution on the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

258. However, my delegation wishes to place on record that it has some reservations on certain paragraphs of that draft resolution.

259. Mr. GARRIGUE GUYONNAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of France had to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/31/L.29 because it does not agree with the general spirit of its provisions.

260. In particular, my delegation cannot accept the recognition of "the legitimacy of the struggle . . . by all the necessary means . . .". Moreover, we do not believe that foreign economic interests are necessarily impeding the independence and development of the Territories concerned. We have objections also to the use of the language of Chapter VII of the Charter.

261. With regard to draft resolution A/31/L.30, on the dissemination of information on decolonization, and draft resolution A/31/L.31, on the Maputo Conference, my delegation would merely recall its reservations about references to resolutions for which it has not voted, as well as about the report of the *Ad Hoc* Group of the Special Committee, of whose conclusions recommending armed struggle we do not approve.

262. Some of these objections, in particular those relating to recognition of the legitimacy of armed struggle, could have led my delegation to cast a negative vote. We did not do so in order to demonstrate our determination to associate ourselves, over and above the differences on methods, with our common aim: freedom for the peoples by means of a recognition of their right to self-determination. My delegation is still firmly devoted to the maintenance of the principles of our Organization. Our Organization cannot work for peace except through dialogue and other peaceful means. Any other kind of action is, we feel, not in keeping with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

263. Mr. VISCONTI DI MODRONE (Italy): The Italian delegation gladly voted in favour of draft resolution A/31/L.30, and was happy to join in the consensus on draft resolution A/31/L.31, but was obliged to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/31/L.29, concerning the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. While in fact fully sharing the principles and the spirit behind draft resolution A/31/L.29, and while noting with approval the positive developments that have taken place this year in the process of decolonization, we cannot endorse the wording of some of the paragraphs of the draft resolution. In particular, we have reservations about the paragraphs implying support for the use of force, which we cannot approve and which are not likely to bring about any progress. We have reservations also about those paragraphs suggesting that all foreign investments in colonial countries are necessarily detrimental to the interests of the peoples of the Territories concerned. Such an indiscriminate statement runs counter to the facts, in our view. Moreover, we cannot accept the principle implied in operative paragraph 10 that the presence of military bases in Non-Self-Governing Territories is detrimental to the interests of the peoples of the Territories concerned. That, too, has been proven not to correspond to the real state of affairs.

264. In conclusion, we feel that draft resolution A/31/L.29 contains language which should have been brought more closely into line with the current reality so as to ensure the broadest possible support from Member States—a necessary condition for making the resolution really effective.

265. Mr. TÜREL (Turkey): We voted in favour of draft resolution A/31/L.29 because of our constant support for the acceleration of the process of decolonization and our complete agreement with the spirit of the draft resolution. We believe that the speedy and complete elimination of the last vestiges of colonialism, particularly with respect to Namibia and Zimbabwe, and the total eradication of racial discrimination, *apartheid* and the violations of the basic human rights of the peoples in colonial Territories will be achieved with the complete and faithful implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

266. My delegation would like to state, however, that our affirmative vote should not be considered as an endorsement of all the views expressed in draft resolution A/31/L.29, particularly those expressed in the paragraphs dealing with military bases and installations. We should like to express our reservations also about the paragraphs in the report of the Special Committee which deal with military bases and installations.

267. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of their right of reply.

268. Mr. LECOMPT (France) (*interpretation from French*): Whatever the representative of Somalia may have said here yesterday [102nd meeting] I note that he at no time indicated that his country was withdrawing its sponsorship of the draft resolution on the French Territory of Afars and Issas, adopted in the Fourth Committee and then, without any change, in the General Assembly [resolution 31/59].

269. My delegation is thus authorized to conclude—as is the entire international community—that Somalia remains committed to all the provisions of that text, and particularly to the reference to the solemn declarations of the leader of its delegation at Port Louis and in the Fourth Committee, and to the specific reference in paragraphs 10 and 11 of the resolution to certain resolutions adopted by OAU and the United Nations; I have in mind resolutions 431¹⁰ and 480¹¹ adopted by OAU, the declaration adopted by the OAU Co-ordinating Committee for the Liberation of Africa, and resolution 3480 (XXX), adopted by the United Nations General Assembly.

270. Moreover, with regard to the idea of political guarantees—and I stress the word "political"—sought by France, I would make it clear that that idea in no way implies a derogation from international law. Rather, it implies unequivocal commitments by the two neighbouring States to accept without reservation the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the future State and

¹⁰ See document A/10297, annex I.

¹¹ See document A/31/196 and Corr.1, annex.

to abstain from any interference in its internal affairs—in other words, to recognize that they have no claims on that State.

271. Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia): In his second statement in exercise of his right of reply yesterday the representative of Somalia made certain remarks which require a brief response from my delegation.

272. The representative of Somalia asserted that Ethiopia's insistence that Somalia implement the pertinent General Assembly resolutions calling for the renunciation of territorial claims on Djibouti is but an attempt on our part "to inject into the discussion on the decolonization of French Somaliland matters which have nothing to do with that specific problem" [*see 102nd meeting, para. 178*].

273. I should like to assure the General Assembly as much as the representative of Somalia that at no time did my delegation inject into the debate on Djibouti matters extraneous to the future of the Territory. On the contrary, we have consistently endeavoured to ensure that the international community focus its attention on the real problem pertaining to Djibouti on the eve of its independence. We have shown that, France having finally committed itself to a clear time-table for decolonizing the Territory, the only impediment in the way of Djibouti's independence and the darkest cloud hanging over its future sovereignty and territorial integrity is Somalia's continuing claim on the Territory. In the circumstances I hardly think anyone seriously entertains the view that Somalia's claim on Djibouti and its reluctance to renounce it is a matter extraneous to the decolonization of the Territory.

274. We have repeatedly heard the pious declarations of the delegation of Somalia to the effect that its country will respect Djibouti's independence. On the other hand, that delegation continues to this very minute to persist in its refusal to offer a reasonable and convincing explanation as to what compelled it to register a formal reservation to resolution 31/59 if not its territorial claim to Djibouti.

275. Since the reservation Somalia has registered at this session is the third in a series, the General Assembly can only conclude that Somalia is intent upon subverting Djibouti's independence to suit its expansionist designs.

276. Notwithstanding the verbal acrobatics at which its representatives seem to be particularly adept, those who sponsored and supported resolution 31/59 surely have no grounds to take at face value Somalia's seeming lack of interest in expanding at the expense of Djibouti. Since Somalia's representatives have time and again effectively demonstrated that they do not mean what they say or say what they mean, the only way they can convince the General Assembly that Somalia does not have territorial designs on Djibouti is by the formal withdrawal of their reservations concerning resolution 3480 (XXX) and the speedy implementation in particular of its paragraph 6, which calls for the renunciation of territorial claims to Djibouti and spells out a specific procedure. The General Assembly would have to consider anything short of that a deliberate attempt by Somalia to mislead the international community as to its designs on the Territory of Djibouti.

277. As regards the overriding need to ensure the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the future State of Djibouti endorsed by the General Assembly in paragraph 11 of resolution 31/59, a brief reference to what the delegation of Somalia said on a previous occasion from this very rostrum will suffice to show Somalia's real intentions.

278. Addressing the twenty-first session of the General Assembly on 18 October 1966 in his capacity as Prime Minister of the Republic of Somalia, Mr. Hussen stated the following:

"Should the people of the Territory decide by a majority vote to become independent, arrangements should be made to guarantee the territorial integrity and sovereignty of their State".¹²

279. I am sure the members of the General Assembly appreciate the fact that since the statement I have just quoted was made by Ambassador Hussen as head of government of his country, the authority with which he spoke does not permit of any doubt. Yet in the course of the current session of the General Assembly, when the question of Djibouti was being discussed in the Fourth Committee, the representative of Somalia declared:

"... as the situation regarding [Djibouti] has changed since October 1966, it was inappropriate to refer in the present context to Somalia's action at that time".¹³

280. Having due regard to Somalia's continuing territorial claim on Djibouti one may at this juncture ask what situations have changed with respect to the Territory to warrant a statement such as that made by the representative of Somalia in the Fourth Committee and repeated by the Ambassador here yesterday. Why is Somalia reversing its position of a decade ago at a time when the early accession to independence by Djibouti is practically assured? Certainly it could not be out of concern over imaginary limitations on the sovereignty of Djibouti. If its proposal implied such limitations, why did it have to make it in the first place?

281. Does this reversal of position by Somalia on the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Djibouti and its present refusal to abide by the provisions of successive resolutions of the General Assembly mean that it is now committed to absorbing the Territory? If such is the case, let the representative of Somalia say so without further subterfuge.

282. The present issue is, then, Somalia's credibility concerning faithful implementation of the provisions of all General Assembly resolutions on Djibouti in their entirety without any reservation or exception whatsoever. In the event of failure by Somalia to indicate clearly here and now that it is going to implement those resolutions, the international community should draw the appropriate conclusion and stand ready for whatever steps Somalia might take to achieve its designs on Djibouti.

¹² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1447th meeting, para. 58.

¹³ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-first Session, Fourth Committee*, 27th meeting, para. 107.

283. Mr. HUSSEN (Somalia): I am in the rather disadvantageous position of having to reply to statements made by two representatives in 10 minutes.

284. In the first place, with regard to the statement of the representative of France, I should like to state that his delegation has the right to interpret the provisions of the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on the question of so-called French Somaliland as it wishes.

285. We have interpreted that resolution according to how my delegation and my Government understand it, and I have nothing to add, except that the injunction against interference in the internal affairs of an independent French Somaliland is addressed to France also—not only to Somalia, but also to France, and to all other States.

286. With regard to the statement of the representative of Ethiopia, I do not think I have much to say about it. The Ambassador of Ethiopia mentioned a statement I made before this General Assembly in 1966 in my capacity as Prime Minister of my country. I think it important that I reply immediately. It is true that at that time he mentioned I supported an arrangement of guarantees for the Territory in the event of the people of the Territory opting for independence, because at that time there was a referendum taking place. I made that proposal at the time because the Ethiopian Government at that time had officially declared that, in the event of the population of the Territory opting for independence, Ethiopia would not hesitate to intervene militarily. That was the reason why my Government, quite wisely, came before the General Assembly and proposed that arrangement: in order to avoid a military confrontation between the neighbouring countries on the question of French Somaliland. Unfortunately, that proposal was not acceptable to Ethiopia at that time.

287. Time passed, and last year Ethiopia thought that perhaps the question of guarantees would go in its favour this time. And it was not the Somali Government that rejected that idea in 1975, before the OAU Co-ordinating Committee for the Liberation of Africa in Dar es Salaam; it was the people of the Territory that rejected that idea.

288. With your permission, Mr. President, I should like to read to the General Assembly, to refresh its memory, what the President of the Government Council of the Territory, Mr. Abdallah Mohamed Kamil, stated before the Fourth Committee on 3 November of this year on this question of guarantees. He said:

“There had been talk, however, of having its independence guaranteed by a covenant to be concluded by the two neighbouring States”—that is, Somalia and Ethiopia “in, it seemed, the future State’s own interests. The population of the Territory did not want such a covenant. One very recent example had shown what agreements of that kind, concluded by large States on the pretext of defending and protecting a small State, led to.

“The population did not want a covenant which might give any one of the signatory Powers the right to take a hand in its affairs on the pretext of protecting it from the other signatory Power”.¹⁴

289. It was exactly on that basis and because of the fact that the Somali Government had always accepted and respected the wishes and desires of the people of the Territory that we refused to subscribe to that idea of guarantees which had been a part of the resolution adopted by the General Assembly.

290. Again, Mr. Kamil, speaking about the need for his country’s complete independence, on accession to independence from France said that his Territory “must fight in order to win and preserve genuine independence, an independence without any conditions or restrictions”.¹⁵ On this basis, we felt that the resolution adopted by the General Assembly, which was a resolution formulated on the basis of a compromise, was not completely in conformity with the genuine interests and desires of the people of the Territory as I have just mentioned and it is for this reason that we have to place on record our reservations in that regard.

291. I do not want to indulge in any acrimony as the Ethiopian delegation wants me to do. I should like also to remind the Assembly that it is not true that there is no territorial problem between Ethiopia and Somalia. It is not so simple. The General Assembly is well aware of it, OAU is well aware of it, and it is our firm belief that Ethiopia has always tried in every forum to inject extraneous propositions into the question of French Somaliland and to fish for something else, even in regard to territorial disputes which are well known to the world body and which are at the present time in the hands of a special committee of the OAU Heads of State.

292. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Today the General Assembly has adopted a resolution on an extremely important question, the question of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Everyone who is sincerely interested in the absolute and full solution of this problem cannot but be concerned and distressed over the fact that millions of people are still suffering under colonial oppression. Probably the General Assembly would not have any reason for once again adopting a resolution on this question were the situation different. I do not know how the representative of the United Kingdom voted. Apparently he did not vote at all on this question, for a number of reasons, but in any case he did make a few comments here to explain his position. He said that some statements from the Warsaw Pact countries on this question were propagandistic and he pleaded for democratic principles in resolving the colonial question and achieving decolonization.

293. If democratic principles had been applied in resolving the problem of decolonization, then today we would doubtless have no reason at all to talk about this problem. Namibia would doubtless be an independent State. Zimbabwe (Southern Rhodesia) would doubtless be an independent State; and the English could be sitting somewhere alongside that State here in the General Assembly hall.

294. However, such an understanding of a democratic solution as was expressed by the representative of the

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 14th meeting, paras. 50 and 51.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, para. 35.

United Kingdom today shows that he is not really referring to democratic methods. If one want to resolve the problem of decolonization democratically, then it should be done quickly. Free those peoples and let them form independent States, standing on their own feet.

295. However, this is not happening in Rhodesia, where the United Kingdom is the administering Power, so I do not think that it is fitting that it should call propagandistic a statement by people who are advocating a democratic solution.

296. And it is completely out of place to repeat from this rostrum inventions of Western bourgeois propaganda concerning the policy of the Warsaw Pact countries and the doctrines of that policy invented in the West.

297. In our foreign policy there is but one doctrine—that of Lenin advocating the peaceful coexistence of countries with different socio-economic systems. That policy also requires us to provide assistance to people suffering under colonial oppression. This is the Leninist policy, which we have always followed and will continue to follow. We have no other doctrine, and that is the only democratic way of resolving the problem of decolonization.

298. Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia): In the first place, we do not have any territorial dispute with Somalia, as the Ambassador of Somalia claimed. If we have anything, it is a boundary dispute with Somalia, and there is no OAU body considering this problem.

299. Secondly, we have taken note of the Ambassador's statement to the effect that his country has a serious reservation with regard to the resolution that was adopted by the General Assembly on 1 December. If that is so, then why did his country join in sponsoring it?

300. Mr. RICHARDSON (United Kingdom): My delegation only wishes to point out that the policies and good faith of my country are constantly called into question, directly or indirectly, by certain States, and that we have been singularly restrained in the tone and frequency of our replies. There really should be no surprise whatsoever if my Ambassador felt impelled to make a few remarks in reply to suggestions by the representative of Czechoslovakia—and not, incidentally, the representative of the Soviet Union—as to how “so-called democracies” conduct elections in dependent Territories.

301. Now it may be that the representative of Czechoslovakia meant to attack another country, but if so he should say so. We are tired of hearing generalized accusations and insinuations, and we are tired of hearing lectures on democracy from countries which do not practise it themselves and who try to exploit this debate on decolonization for blatantly propagandistic reasons.

302. As regards our vote, I hasten to reassure the Ambassador of the Soviet Union that we have already indicated to the Secretariat that we had intended to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/31/L.29.

303. In conclusion, I should also say that I was delighted to hear that the Soviet Union believes in the principle of non-intervention in the affairs of other States.

304. Mr. HUSSEN (Somalia): In the first place, I do not think that I owe any reply to the representative of Ethiopia as to why we have explained our vote on the resolution regarding French Somaliland. I am very sorry to have forgotten in my earlier statement to rebut the accusation made by the Ethiopian representative that Somalia had interfered in the internal affairs of French Somaliland.

305. I have before me an interview with Abdallah M. Kamil held on 18 November by a correspondent of the British Broadcasting Corporation, London. Mr. Kamil was asked about the attitude of the two neighbouring countries with regard to his territory. Speaking about the future independence of the territory, he said: “As for Somalia, President Siad has said repeatedly that his country wishes to see a fully independent Djibouti”. I do not think that our President used the word “Djibouti”. We usually use the words “so-called French Somaliland”, because Djibouti is only a city and does not represent the Territory as a whole. Such is our opinion of the name “Djibouti”. He went on to say: “I think that if President Siad had designs to annex our country he would not have made such a statement”.

306. He was then asked what the attitude of Ethiopia would be on the question, and this is what he said:

“Answering a question on Ethiopia's attitude to the future independent State of Djibouti, the President said”—the President is Mr. Abdallah M. Kamil—“Ethiopia's attitude towards our territory is rather unsatisfactory”.

“‘For instance,’—he continued—‘the Ethiopian representative in the United Nations Decolonization Committee said that my Government’—that is, the present Government of Djibouti—‘does not enjoy the confidence of the inhabitants of the territory.’

“‘What prompted the Ethiopian representative to utter such a statement? What is the meaning of that statement? To me, it is clear interference in our domestic affairs. I hope that Ethiopia will in the future demonstrate good faith towards our territory and will stop interfering in our internal affairs.’”

307. That is a very, very recent statement, and it shows that the people of the territory have no doubt at all about the good faith of the Somali Republic with regard to their future destiny. It shows also their preoccupation, doubt and concern about the present and future attitude of Ethiopia with regard to their future destiny.

AGENDA ITEM 85

Question of Namibia:

- (a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;
- (b) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;
- (c) United Nations Fund for Namibia: report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/31/437)

AGENDA ITEM 86

Question of Southern Rhodesia: 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

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/31/447)

308. Mr. MANGAL (Afghanistan), Rapporteur of the Fourth Committee: I have the honour to present for the consideration of the General Assembly the last two reports of the Fourth Committee to the General Assembly at its current session. They relate to items 85 and 86 of the agenda, namely, the question of Namibia and the question of Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe), and are contained in documents A/31/437 and A/31/447.

Mr. Suleiman (Oman), Vice-President, took the Chair.

309. In view of the new developments in southern Africa and the diplomatic efforts launched for the peaceful solution of those two colonial problems, which coincided with the start of the work of the Fourth Committee, the Committee left those two items to be considered towards the end of its consideration of the items allocated to it.

310. On the question of Namibia, a considerable number of Member States took part in the general debate and expressed their views on the present situation resulting from the illegal occupation of that international Territory by South Africa. Almost all the representatives who took part in the general debate on this item referred to the failure of the Government of South Africa to comply with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations calling on South Africa to terminate its illegal occupation of Namibia.

311. The representative of SWAPO took part in the discussion of this item as an observer, and provided useful information on the situation in that Territory.

312. At the end of its consideration of the item, the Fourth Committee adopted eight resolutions on the item, covering various aspects of the question. Those resolutions, which have been recommended to the General Assembly for adoption, are contained in paragraph 18 of the report that I have just presented.

313. In draft resolution I, the main, or omnibus, draft resolution relating to the situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa, the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia, in accordance with the Charter, resolution 1514 (XV) and other relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, is recognized. By adopting that draft resolution the General Assembly would recognize SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. The illegal South African administration in Namibia, and its massive repression of the people of Namibia and their liberation movement, and the military build-up in the Territory are condemned in the draft.

The so-called constitutional talks in Windhoek, by the Government of South Africa, received the

serious attention of the members of the Committee. In a separate paragraph of the main draft resolution, the Government of South Africa is strongly condemned for organizing those so-called constitutional talks, which seek to perpetuate the *apartheid* and "homelands" policies, as well as the colonial oppression and exploitation of the people and resources of Namibia by misrepresenting the genuine aspiration of the Namibian people for self-determination and independence.

315. In order that the people of Namibia may be enabled to determine freely their own future, the General Assembly, by adopting the main draft resolution, would declare that it is imperative that free elections, under the supervision and control of the United Nations, be held immediately in a united Namibia.

316. In this connexion, in view of the failure of South Africa to comply with Security Council resolution 385 (1976) the General Assembly would urge the Security Council to impose a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa.

317. Other draft resolutions relate to some of the important aspects of the question of Namibia, such as the intensification and co-ordination of United Nations action in the support of Namibia, action by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations with respect to Namibia, the United Nations Fund for Namibia, observer status for SWAPO, a nationhood programme and dissemination of information on Namibia, and, finally, the programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

318. As reflected in paragraph 17 of the report, a draft resolution presented to the Fourth Committee by the representative of Saudi Arabia was not pressed to the vote, and therefore has not formed part of the recommendations of the Fourth Committee as contained in the report. However, at its meeting of 10 December 1976, the Fourth Committee, at the request of the sponsor, decided that the text of the draft resolution should be brought to the attention of the General Assembly by the Rapporteur when presenting the report on the item. Accordingly, I should like to read out the text of the draft resolution of the representative of Saudi Arabia. The text, which fortunately is short, reads as follows:

"The General Assembly,

"Taking into account all the resolutions on the question of Namibia adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council,

"Considering that over half a century has elapsed since South Africa assumed the responsibility of preparing the people of Namibia to govern themselves, during which period all other Mandated Territories acceded to full independence,

"1. Requests the Secretary-General to invite, without undue delay, representatives of South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization to meet him at United Nations Headquarters for discussions as to the composition and agenda for a conference to be convened by the United Nations in order to agree upon the

modalities necessary to ensure the holding of free elections in Namibia under United Nations supervision;

"2. *Further requests* the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia to work as a liaison officer and co-ordinator among all the parties concerned with the liberation of Namibia."

319. Having read out the text of the draft resolution, I add my personal hope that generally—and I should like to emphasize the word "generally"—the procedure of reading out to the General Assembly the texts of draft resolutions not adopted in Committee will not be encouraged in the future, despite the good intentions and constructive motives that may prompt such actions and despite any precedents that may exist.

320. The second report contained in document A/31/447 relates to the question of Southern Rhodesia. The report contains in paragraph 11 two recommendations by the Fourth Committee resulting from the adoption of two draft resolutions on the matter by that Committee. Many delegations took part in the general debate on this item.

321. The convening of a Geneva conference on the future of Zimbabwe was welcomed by several delegations which took part in the debate. In this connexion, draft resolution A contained in the report expresses the hope that the conference on Zimbabwe at Geneva will succeed in establishing the conditions for early independence on the basis of majority rule, in accordance with the relevant resolutions adopted by the United Nations.

322. By adopting that draft resolution, the General Assembly would reaffirm the inalienable right of the people of Zimbabwe to self-determination, freedom and independence and the legitimacy of their struggle to secure that right by every means at their disposal, as set forth in the Charter and resolution 1514 (XV). Furthermore, the General Assembly would reaffirm the principle that there should be no independence before majority rule in Zimbabwe and that any settlement relating to the future of the Territory must be worked out with the full participation of the people of Zimbabwe and in accordance with their true aspirations. The General Assembly would also call upon the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, in the discharge of its primary responsibility as the administering Power, to take all effective measures to enable Zimbabwe to accede to independence in accordance with the aspirations of the majority of the population.

323. Draft resolution B in the report relates to the question of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. As reflected in the draft resolution, all violations of the mandatory sanctions imposed by the Security Council and the continued failure of certain Member States to enforce those sanctions strictly have been condemned.

324. There are other equally important provisions in the recommendation of the Fourth Committee that need no elaboration or introduction.

325. For those and other important considerations, I commend the two reports that I have just presented to the

General Assembly for its serious attention and the recommendations contained therein for adoption by it.

Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Fourth Committee.

326. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will first consider the report of the Fourth Committee on agenda item 85 [A/31/437].

327. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting on any or all of the eight draft resolutions recommended by the Fourth Committee in paragraph 18 of its report. Representatives will also have an opportunity to explain their votes after all the votes have been taken.

328. Mr. HUSSEN (Somalia): My delegation supports without any reservations the draft resolutions on Namibia that have been recommended to the General Assembly by the Fourth Committee. Those draft resolutions reflect the grave concern of the majority of Member States over the inability of the United Nations to carry out its special responsibilities for the Territory. They also reflect the determination of all freedom-loving States to continue their efforts to remove the obstacles in the way of self-determination and independence for the people of Namibia.

329. It is particularly frustrating that the General Assembly, which has played such an historic role in the decolonization process, should be hampered in its efforts to implement the provisions of resolution 1514 (XV) in the single case where the Organization has assumed direct responsibility for a Territory. Its failure in this regard is all the more disconcerting in the light of the fact that there is no issue before the United Nations which seems to elicit such unanimity in principle as the question of Namibia. The termination of South Africa's Mandate over the Territory 10 years ago received the widest support from the United Nations membership and was firmly endorsed by the Security Council.

330. Both before and after the International Court of Justice gave its advisory opinion on South Africa's illegal occupation, the General Assembly and the Security Council repeatedly condemned Pretoria's persistent refusal to withdraw from Namibia. They have also condemned in the strongest terms Pretoria's imposition of *apartheid* on the Namibian people and its attack on the unity and integrity of the country through the application of the bantustan policy. In addition, the legitimacy of the struggle of the Namibian people has been affirmed and SWAPO has been widely recognized as the authentic representative of the Namibian people.

331. In recent times, the General Assembly and the Security Council have also expressed deep concern over Pretoria's military build-up in Namibia. The threat of that development to both the freedom struggle and the territorial integrity of neighbouring States was illustrated by the armed aggression against Angola and Zambia—an aggression condemned in both cases by the Security Council.

332. In spite of this seeming unanimity of purpose on the part of the world Organization, the situation in Namibia has

deteriorated and the threat which it poses to international peace and security has grown more dangerous.

333. The reason for this state of affairs is not hard to find. The Security Council has been issuing ultimatums to Pretoria since 1968 because of the latter's non-compliance with the specific demands with regard to Namibia. But the Council has failed to translate its demands into concrete and positive action. Each unenforced ultimatum has, of course, encouraged the Pretoria régime to hold on to the Territory and to use one subterfuge after another in attempting to cloak in respectability its illegal occupation and on its contempt for the world Organization.

334. The promise that repressive legislation would be annulled and that a climate for free political expression would be established in Namibia has meant in actual fact the mounting of an oppressive campaign against political leaders who oppose white minority rule, and particularly against SWAPO. In this context, my delegation joins with other States in reiterating our indignation at the cruel and illegal imposition of the death sentence on two SWAPO leaders, an act which has aroused indignation and condemnation in the world community.

335. The extension of *apartheid* legislation and practices to Namibia is also a matter of serious concern. As the report of the decolonization Committee has pointed out, the much advertised removal of racist restrictions is nothing but window dressing, and in any case it does not touch the fundamental bases of *apartheid*. The military build-up in Namibia, a glaring symbol of Pretoria's illegal occupation, long condemned by the Security Council, continues to increase and now includes the establishment of a free-fire zone on the border with Angola.

336. The latest attempt to hoodwink the world community was the convening of the so-called Constitutional Conference at Windhoek. The majority of the Member States have followed the lead of the Council for Namibia in rejecting that Conference as a sham, which cannot in any way fulfil the Security Council's demand that the Namibian people be enabled forthwith to exercise their right to self-determination and independence on the basis of free elections.

337. The so-called Windhoek Conference has, of course, been master-minded by the Vorster régime. Its participants are hand-picked puppets of the racist authorities in Pretoria. It has excluded even the possibility of a United Nations role in its procedures. It excluded the participation of non-white political parties, including SWAPO, and its declaration of intent shows that its purpose is to maintain the *status quo*, a *status quo* which means the perpetuation of *apartheid*, bantustans and the economic exploitation of the Territory.

338. Responsibility for the inaction of the Security Council in the face of Pretoria's intransigence must, of course, be laid squarely at the door of Pretoria's Western allies and trading partners who are permanent members of the Security Council. Some years ago when those permanent members counselled patience and moderation in dealing with the situation and gave credence to every small apparent concession from the Pretoria author-

ities, it could still be believed that they were sincere in their efforts to find a peaceful solution to the Namibian problem. Today their motives can only be viewed with the strongest suspicion and scorn. The triple vetoes in June 1975 and in October this year were directed against resolutions which were the logical outcome of previous decisions of the Council. Those actions can only be interpreted as arising out of collusion with the Vorster régime and as being motivated by economic and strategic interests. Certainly the veto on the proposal to make mandatory the voluntary arms embargo already accepted in principle by all States cannot be considered in any other light.

339. The position taken by Pretoria's friends on the Security Council is dangerous because it severely undermines the credibility and authority of the United Nations and because it fails to deal with a clear threat to international peace and security.

340. The excuse that the Namibian situation does not threaten peace is, in the view of my delegation, completely untenable. As the representative of Mexico has pointed out during the debate, the illegal occupation of a territory by a State is an act of aggression, and since Namibia is under direct United Nations responsibility, South Africa is committing an act of aggression against the United Nations. The use of Namibia as a base for aggression against neighbouring territories removes any doubt that might have existed about the nature of the situation and about the responsibility of the Security Council in this regard under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

341. It is extremely unfortunate that the wishes of the overwhelming majority of Member States have been frustrated by the refusal of South Africa's Western allies to take such minimal action as would emphasize the isolation of the Vorster régime and prohibit the supply of arms which contribute to the repression of the Namibian people and to the threat to neighbouring countries.

342. However, it is pertinent to recall here the most eloquent and appropriate reaction of the SWAPO representative, Mr. Gurirab, when he addressed the Security Council after the triple veto on 19 October. He said that States

“... can veto resolutions now and in the future, as they have in the past, but they cannot veto the will and the determination of the people of Namibia to achieve liberation in our country”.¹⁶

343. All freedom-loving States are determined to continue and to extend their support to the Namibian people, through their authentic representative, SWAPO, in its liberation struggle. The SWAPO leaders have shown statesmanship in their reasonable and just demands for a constitutional and democratic framework on the transfer of power which, they quite rightly insist, should be under United Nations auspices. They have rightly demanded the release of political prisoners and the withdrawal of South African troops from Namibia as prerequisites for negotiations. Generous material and moral support for the goals and programmes of SWAPO will be a most significant form of aid for the people of Namibia as a whole.

¹⁶ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-first Year, 1963rd meeting*.

344. It is a matter of satisfaction to my Government that many countries and organizations have increasingly extended positive support for SWAPO, in recognition of its relentless struggle for the legitimate national freedom and dignity of the Namibian people. My delegation urges that the strongest support be given also to the United Nations Council for Namibia in the exercise of the heavy responsibility entrusted to it by the United Nations. We believe that the adoption of the Decree on the Natural Resources of Namibia is an extremely important measure, and we hope that all States to which it applies will join in the effort to prevent the rampant pillage of the natural resources which are the heritage of the people of Namibia.

345. The Institute for Namibia, established in Lusaka with the support and co-operation of the Government of Zambia, will add a new dimension to the work of the Council, as it will provide a valuable centre for promoting research and implementing projects in connexion with the Namibian situation.

346. Those countries which have been making generous contributions to the United Nations Fund for Namibia are to be highly commended, and we hope that all States and institutions able to do so will also contribute to that important Fund.

347. My delegation particularly commends and supports the proposal of Finland for a nationhood programme for Namibia, which would co-ordinate and intensify the programmes of the United Nations, its specialized agencies and concerned Governments. The specialized agencies have an important role to play in this regard, and my delegation hopes that they will follow the lead of the United Nations Development Programme, which has included an indicative planning figure for Namibia for the period 1977-1978.

348. Among the most important provisions of the draft resolutions now before the General Assembly are those which condemn the activities of foreign corporations operating in Namibia under the illegal administration of South Africa, those which call for the termination of economic, diplomatic and consular relations with South Africa in the context of its illegal occupation of Namibia and those which call once again for the strict observance of the arms embargo. Those States which have in the past ignored these provisions have shown a callous disregard for the human rights of the oppressed Namibian people, many of whom are already paying with their lives for the freedom of their people and their country.

349. The experience of the past gives little ground for hope that the Security Council will take note of the General Assembly's renewed request that it impose a mandatory arms embargo on South Africa. When I speak of South Africa, I mean, of course, the white minority régime which is now arbitrarily ruling South Africa. However, my delegation would like to recall in this connexion that the representative of France stated in the Security Council on 19 October¹⁷ that his delegation could not rule out the possibility of further restrictive measures if the hoped-for progress did not come about because of renewed bad faith

on the part of Pretoria. The progress hoped for by the representative of France as a result of American initiatives has not come about, and Pretoria's bad faith is glaringly evident. We hope that France and South Africa's other supporters will now see their way to bringing this fact home to Pretoria and that a just solution to the question of Namibia will be delayed no longer.

350. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia on a point of order.

351. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Many of our colleagues have already left because they had previous appointments and, indeed, some of them were getting tired. After all, they are human.

352. I should like to point out that it would not be fitting to vote on such important draft resolutions as the ones of which we are now seized, when approximately half of the members are not present or when those that are present are so tired that they might vote unintelligently and mechanically.

353. May I therefore suggest, Sir—and, in deference to the President, this is not a formal request—that we come earlier on Monday morning and take the 20 or 30 minutes needed to dispose of the business now before us, instead of continuing in this manner.

354. I make this suggestion hoping that you, Sir, in your capacity as President, will adjourn the meeting, and let us go home and rest a little.

355. The PRESIDENT: There is clearly a quorum here. Since representatives have waited this long, perhaps they would wish to proceed to the vote this evening. If, however, any representatives feel that we should adjourn until tomorrow morning, I should be prepared to accede to their desire.

356. I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia on a point of order.

357. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Everyone knows that no plenary meeting of the General Assembly had been scheduled for tomorrow. We had all hoped that it would be possible to complete our consideration of all these items this evening.

358. I am not acting on my own initiative. I have been here for quite a number of years, and it is therefore the habit of some of my colleagues to approach me and ask me to speak for them in these matters. They have asked me to inform the President that they have commitments for tomorrow morning. They had no way of knowing that there was a possibility that the Assembly would vote on these draft resolutions tomorrow. Indeed, to vote tomorrow would be worse than proceeding to vote now, because half, or perhaps even more than half, of the members would not be here.

359. It is not fair to our African, Asian or European brothers—regardless of ideology or political persuasion—to use our time in a wanton manner and then to vote tomorrow as a mere formality.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

360. I therefore plead with you, Mr. President, to defer the voting until Monday, with the proviso that whoever is in the Chair will appeal to members to proceed to the vote without delay, so that this session may be finished on the target date of Tuesday, 21 December. If need be, we can stay here Tuesday until 9 or 10 o'clock. We have done that before. But I plead with you, Sir, not to ask us to vote tomorrow.

361. I repeat that I am not speaking on my own behalf. I am at your command, Sir, and at the command of the Assembly. I have been in the General Assembly and in the Security Council at all hours of the day and night. But I think that for practical reasons we should adjourn now. I am making a formal motion for adjournment, with the proviso that we meet on Monday to finish our work on this item.

362. Mr. EL-ZOEBY (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): If there is any need to do so, I wish to support the motion just put forward by Mr. Baroody.

363. It is true that there is a quorum at the moment. Nevertheless, we wish to associate ourselves with Mr. Baroody's request that the vote be deferred until Monday.

364. The PRESIDENT: If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly wishes to adjourn at this time and meet on Monday morning to vote on the draft resolutions now before us.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 8.15 p.m.