



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 64: Question of Namibia (<i>concluded</i>):	
(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) Appointment of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia	1
Agenda item 23: 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>continued</i>)	8

President: Mr. Emilio ARENALES (Guatemala).

In the absence of the President, Mr. Alvarado (Peru) Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 64

Question of Namibia (*concluded*):

- (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) Appointment of the United Nations Commission for Namibia**

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote is taken.

2. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): I should like to make it clear that my Government has supported and continues to support the historic decision [*resolution 2145 (XXI)*] of this Assembly taken in 1966 which terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. We shared in the overwhelming support given to the proposition that the United Nations must assist the people of the Territory to exercise their right to self-determination and to achieve independence. An essential element in the assistance which this Organization can give is in helping to prepare Namibians for positions of responsibility in their own country. My Government is anxious to assist in efforts to provide educational and training opportunities for the peoples of southern Africa. Canada will contribute to the consolidated programme which is dedicated to that purpose.

3. We share the general concern of Members at the inability to bring the people of Namibia to independence. We are not, however, able to agree with the direction that has been taken to implement the Assembly's decision of 1966. In our view, the approach that has been followed thus far cannot help the people of the Territory attain self-determination or help the United Nations discharge its responsibilities towards them. While holding to the principles that have been clearly defined by this Assembly, we must continue to seek methods that will command the widest measure of agreement and that will be within the operational capacity of the United Nations. For those reasons my delegation will abstain on the draft resolution [*A/L.556 and Add.1*] now before the Assembly.

4. I should, however, like to emphasize that my delegation recognizes that the bringing of independence to the people of Namibia is related to a whole range of problems created by the racial policies of the Government of South Africa and by the policies of Portugal towards its remaining African territories. I am not, however, suggesting that the problem of Namibia cannot be resolved independently of the issue of *apartheid*. On the contrary, we would hope that the Government of South Africa would come to the realization that it would be in its own best interest to reach an accommodation with the United Nations over Namibia.

5. So far the approaches taken towards the resolution of these problems have not been successful, nor have those approaches resulted in signs of a real willingness on the part of the administering powers concerned to reach an accommodation on the basic issues. At the same time we should acknowledge that often the approaches adopted in the United Nations have shown little recognition either of the realities of the situation or of the capacity of this Organization to act. Frequently, moreover, they have been advanced and pursued in a manner which took little heed of the legitimate concerns of other Members of this Organization or of the serious implications for the future of the United Nations itself.

6. In the absence of a positive response from the administering Powers to the repeated expressions of world opinion, the peoples of the territories, the peoples of Africa and Canadians themselves will not agree to remain forever frustrated in their efforts to see changes brought about.

7. Mr. ISSRAELIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Soviet delegation has carefully studied the draft resolution on Namibia which has been placed before the Assembly (A/L.556 and Add.1). Considering that this draft resolution reaffirms the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence, in accordance with the Declaration on the

Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and the legitimacy of the Namibian people's struggle against the foreign occupation of their country, and since this draft is acceptable to the Afro-Asian countries, the Soviet delegation will vote for it.

8. At the same time, however, we should like to make some comments on the draft resolution. The Soviet Union continues to consider that South Africa's policies and actions in regard to Namibia and its open contempt for the decisions of the United Nations are the direct consequence of the support and assistance given to the racist régime of South Africa in every possible way by the leading Western Powers. This support of the ruling circles in Pretoria by the principal NATO countries is a serious obstacle to the solution of the Namibian problem. For that reason, my delegation considers it essential to emphasize that the General Assembly must clearly state in its resolution that responsibility for the situation in Namibia rests not only on the Pretoria authorities, but also on those Western countries that maintain close and comprehensive ties with the South African régime.

9. The General Assembly should call on those countries to break off diplomatic, economic, military and other relations with the Pretoria régime and to cease giving assistance to the South African racists.

10. The draft resolution on Namibia would be considerably more effective if it named and severely condemned those States which are co-operating with the South African racist régime. Such a step would place South Africa's allies in a position of moral and political isolation. The identities of the principal allies of the South African racist régime are well known to all: they have been named time and again by numerous delegations speaking from this august rostrum. We therefore declare once again that full moral, political and material responsibility for the fact that the Namibian problem has not yet been solved in the interests of the Namibian people must be borne not merely by the racist authorities of South Africa, but also by the United Kingdom, the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, Portugal and a number of other States.

11. It must be pointed out that it is because of those Powers that the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia has been frustrated.

12. Paragraph 5 of the draft resolution *Commends* to the appropriate organs of the United Nations acting in conformity with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly the recommendations contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, while paragraph 7 *Requests* the Secretary-General to continue to provide the necessary assistance and facilities to enable the United Nations Council for Namibia to perform its duties and functions.

13. We express our confidence that the activities of the United Nations Secretariat in assisting the Council will be carried out strictly and fully within the limits of its competence under the United Nations Charter.

14. In conclusion, my delegation would like to express the deep conviction of all the people of the Soviet Union that

the Namibian people will secure their liberation from the racist colonial yoke of South Africa. The Soviet Union has supported and will continue to support the just struggle of the Namibian people for their independence.

15. Mr. COLE (Sierra Leone): Since my delegation addressed itself to the grave situation in Namibia during the resumed session of the twenty-second General Assembly, the attitude of the South African Government has continued to be intransigent and negative. At the same time, it has intensified actions calculated to consolidate its illegal occupation of Namibia and to destroy the unity of the people and the territorial integrity of Namibia.

16. The major developments take the form of the creation of bantustans, the forcible removal of Africans from the old location of Windhoek to Katutura, the illegal arrest and deportation of thirty-seven Namibians and their trial in South Africa, and the arrest and killing of Namibians in the Caprivi Strip. These are only a few more of the long list of deliberate actions calculated to show disrespect for this Organization.

17. Over the years since 1949, the sombre story of Namibia has cast a very dark shadow on every facet of the United Nations and all that it stands for. The international community, lying under the shadow of blatant defiance stands to lose if it does not act now.

18. The United Nations Council for Namibia, in paragraph 63 of its previous report¹ to the General Assembly, expressed its conviction that it would not be able fully to discharge its functions and responsibility unless effective measures were taken to ensure the immediate removal of South Africa's presence from the Territory. For this reason the Council to Namibia had recommended that the General Assembly should reiterate its request to the Security Council to take the necessary steps to secure this objective. By its resolution 2372 (XXII), the General Assembly has so recommended, to secure for Namibia its independence in accordance with resolution 2145 (XXI).

19. Document A/L.556 and Add.1, submitted to this General Assembly by the delegation of Somalia, supported by the delegation of Pakistan, is a draft resolution on Namibia sponsored by fifty-one nations. Its operative paragraphs 3 and 4 reflect the fears of the Council for Namibia, the disillusionment of the people of Namibia and the conviction of the sponsors that only if the Security Council realizes the explosive situation in Namibia and takes all effective measures to ensure the withdrawal of the South African authorities from Namibia will it be possible for the Council effectively to discharge its responsibility to Namibia, for the fears to be alleviated and for the respect and dignity of the United Nations to be restored.

20. My delegation believes that a persistent reminder to the international community and particularly to the Security Council that Namibia is now the responsibility of the United Nations and has been so for over a year now, since the General Assembly abrogated the Mandate of South Africa [*resolution 2145 (XXI)*], will not be over-

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Annexes, agenda item 64, document A/7088.*

emphasizing the point. My delegation, as sponsor of the draft resolution, repeats this reminder, therefore, and with the other sponsors recommends that the Security Council should now urgently take all effective measures to put an end to the defiance which has gone on for too long.

21. The Council for Namibia, in its present report [*A/7338 and Corr.1*] has again stressed its inability fully to discharge its functions. Is this one other instance when this Organization will hesitate and delay and overlook the rights of a suffering people? Is it not enough that it is the conviction of the Council for Namibia, a responsible body set up by the United Nations, one which has been studying the problem, that a dangerous situation exists in Namibia and that only if the Security Council acts now can this danger be averted?

22. The draft resolution before this Assembly purports to emphasize the role of the Security Council and its responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security in the world. My delegation commends it on behalf of all the other sponsors to the Assembly for its fullest support.

23. Finally, I wish to pay tribute to the members of the Council for Namibia for their untiring efforts to perform a task which is fraught with disappointment and frustration. The world will not forget those efforts and when—with the co-operation of the Security Council—a people will have been freed, a job will have been well done.

24. I wish to propose, on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution that the voting on the draft resolution before the Assembly should take place in the afternoon.

25. Mr. MOLEFHE (Botswana): I need not reiterate the views of my Government on its fundamental difference with South Africa over the policy of *apartheid* for which South Africa has been the focal point of persistent condemnation by almost all of the Member States of the United Nations over a number of years. In his statement to this Assembly this year during the general debate [*1694th meeting*], my Government's Minister of State noted with concern the continued production and adoption, not without reason, of resolutions whose implementation was doubtful, resulting rather in alienation and stultifying the resolution of the ominous problems that now exist.

26. Notwithstanding my Government's ardent desire for independence and self-determination for all peoples, it is my Government's contention that South Africa has administered in trust the Territory of South West Africa and, as the *de facto* administering Government, should be engaged in negotiations to facilitate the ultimate self-determination and independence of the people of Namibia. My delegation will abstain on this draft resolution [*A/L.556 and Add.1*].

27. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): My delegation will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution in document A/L.556 and Add.1 and although the position of my Government has been often explained before, I wish now to make a short statement in explanation of vote. I wish to set out, as shortly and clearly as I can, the considerations which have weighed with my Government in deciding that we could not support this draft resolution.

28. We have always been in agreement with the overwhelming majority of this Assembly that the people of South West Africa should be enabled to advance to the destiny of their own free choice in full self-determination. We have also consistently and repeatedly stated our conclusion that the Government of South Africa has forfeited the right to administer the Mandate over the Territory. Having stated that purpose and that conclusion, we have throughout urged that what was necessary was consultation—consultation to find practical and effective means to give effect to agreed aims. But we have also urged throughout that we should act within our capacity as an Organization and we have throughout been ready to consult on such measures and to help, if we could, in giving effect to them.

29. It is in accordance with that aim of concentrating on practical and effective action within our clear capacity that my Government has contributed to the United Nations Training and Educational Programme, which provides educational opportunities for people from all the Territories of southern Africa. My Government was amongst the first to contribute to that programme, and we have contributed, too, to the Trust Fund for South Africa; and I was glad to be able to report a further contribution of the equivalent of \$100,000 to the Training and Educational Programme last month.

30. In paragraph 35 of its report [*A/7338 and Corr.1*] the Council for Namibia recognizes that there might be administrative difficulties in disrupting the present programme and setting up a separate one for the Territory with which it is concerned. That seems to us a valid consideration; and on the grounds of administrative efficiency, we consequently think that the present arrangements for administering the programme should continue. We are convinced that the United Nations can play a useful role in giving assistance of this kind, and we are glad to be able to pledge our own practical support.

31. It was a matter of great regret to us that consultations on practical proposals which we supported for dealing with the wider question of the future of the Territory were not pursued. A different course was adopted, which we believed was mistaken. It was mistaken, in our view, because the action proposed was beyond the present capacity of the United Nations. We consequently believed that the action taken could not succeed. Moreover, we were gravely concerned that the decisions taken at that time raised hopes which could not be satisfied. It is for these reasons we were unable to support resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V).

32. At the same time, I wish to say how concerned we have been about a number of serious and dangerous developments in the Territory. We were gravely disturbed by the Pretoria trial under the provisions of the Terrorism Act of 1967. We sent an observer to that trial, and we stated in the Security Council our strong objections to an Act which, in the view of my Government, was offensive to the principles which should underlie the framing of criminal legislation. The Act was indeed at variance even with the standards which the South African Government itself professes to support. We made it clear that what my Government particularly abhorred and condemned was that

that retrospective criminal legislation carried the supreme penalty of death.

33. In the matter of the trial itself it was a matter of great relief to us, and to all of us that, despite that deplorable legislation, and despite the heavy sentences passed, the South African Government did not resort to capital punishment in that instance. Some of the sentences have been reduced on appeal, and it is well that no further trials of the same sort have occurred. I am sure world-wide protests, including those made here at the United Nations, contributed to those results.

34. Another action of the South African Government which has rightly exercised those who have taken part in this debate was the Homelands Act² passed by the South African Parliament on 6 June this year. My Government certainly cannot accept that the provisions of this new law served to promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and the social progress of the inhabitants, as the South African Government was required to do by the Mandate. I need not recount in detail the objectionable provisions of this legislation. The so-called homelands are mostly in remote areas, with poor communications. They can scarcely provide substantive economic benefits for their inhabitants. Indeed, they seem to be intended to serve as reservoirs of labour for industry and agriculture undertaken by the white few, while the areas themselves remain largely undeveloped. The so-called native nations for which the law provides would have no voice or interest in the central Government. The new law divides the land in such a way as to give to the white population the best land, the most land per head of population, and practically all the mineral deposits of the Territory. The law is essentially an extension of the evil practices of *apartheid* and the system of bantustans in South Africa itself.

35. The strength of feeling aroused by legislation of this kind is not, however, an argument for resorting to proposals beyond our capacity. Indeed, if such proposals are made they not only raise hopes amongst the people of the Territory which we cannot satisfy; they also, by their ineffectiveness, give encouragement to the South African Government in pursuing the oppressive and objectionable measures which we all condemn.

36. I repeat that it is a matter of very sincere regret that for these reasons I am unable to support this draft resolution and that I will abstain in the vote. In doing so, I can only repeat that we should concentrate on action, limited as it must be, which is within our present capacity. In consultations with that purpose in mind, we in my delegation will be ready, as we have been in the past, to make our contribution.

37. Mr. DESCHAMPS (France) (*translated from French*): At the resumed twenty-second session of the General Assembly, the French delegation, on 27 May 1968 [*1663rd meeting*], stated its position at length on the question still before us today. Then on 7 October, the Minister for

Foreign Affairs of France, addressing the General Assembly, said:

“There is no just international law that is not inspired by the right of peoples to existence and the right of men to freedom”. [*1683rd meeting, para. 88*].

38. Referring to that part of Africa where the plight of Africans does injury to mankind as a whole, he added:

“France deplores the fact that South Africa continues to shirk obligations deriving from the International Status of South-West Africa and persists, in particular, in imposing on it its *apartheid régime*”. [*ibid., para. 90*].

39. The French delegation has said many times that the ultimate object was to enable the people of the Territory freely to determine their own future and, therefore, to choose independence while preserving their territorial integrity. For that reason it strongly opposed the decision of the Pretoria Government to grant internal self-government to Ovamboland separately. Equally concerned at the extension and increasing severity of repressive and discriminatory legislation, contrary to the spirit of the Mandate, it particularly expressed its disapproval of the application to thirty-seven inhabitants of the Territory of a law on terrorism³ whose provisions are an affront to the conscience of mankind.

40. France therefore supported General Assembly resolution 2324 (XXII) and Security Council resolutions 245 (1968) and 246 (1968), and our representative took the matter up with the Pretoria authorities.

41. Finally, the French delegation here would like to say how disturbed it has been at the news of recent events in the Caprivi Strip, during which several Africans are said to have died. As the Head of our Diplomatic Service said on 7 October 1968, France is always willing to join in any attempt to find a solution whereby peoples who have for too long been deprived on their rights and their dignity may recover them. It is in that spirit that the French delegation has followed the discussions on item 64 of the agenda and has considered the draft resolution now before us, A/L.556 and Add.1.

42. While sharing to a large extent the attitudes of the sponsors of this draft, our delegation feels, however, that this text simply does not provide the solution that we so desire for this trying and complex problem. Its adoption would merely prompt our Organization to continue on a course which experience has clearly shown to be a cul-de-sac. In addition to its references to General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 2145 (XXI)—for which France did not vote—this draft, in one of its most significant provisions, draws our attention to certain recommendations, some of which seems to be illusory in scope or of dubious legal validity. These recommendations stem, moreover, from a United Nations body whose creation, likewise of doubtful legal validity, derives from a resolution on which the French delegation abstained together with twenty-nine other delegations, including those of the permanent members of the Security Council.

² Development of Self-Government for Native Nations in South West Africa, Act No. 54 of 1968.

³ Terrorism Act, No. 83 of 1967.

43. In these circumstances, the French delegation cannot support draft resolution A/556 and Add.1. We shall like, however, to reaffirm, as we stated at the twenty-second session, that France remains open to any reasonable and practical suggestions. France would certainly not withhold its support from decisions taken by qualified bodies of the United Nations which were based on such suggestions and were, in our view, likely to ensure the triumph of justice and human dignity.

44. Mr. DENNY (United States of America): The United States position on the issue of Namibia was set forth in detail before this Assembly on 10 December [1737th meeting]. This morning we wish briefly to state our position on the draft resolution before us [A/L.556 and Add.1]. We shall abstain.

45. When the Assembly undertook its debate on the future of Namibia in 1966 culminating in its major decision stated in resolution 2145 (XXI), the United States representative at that time stated that the United States would do its utmost, by all appropriate and peaceful means, to help to carry to fruition the aims of that resolution so that the people of Namibia would be enabled to exercise their right to self-determination. We continue to share that view and shall continue to join with others in seeking to formulate steps which can be practically implemented and which lie within the capacity of this Organization.

46. We appreciate the effort made by the co-sponsors in drafting the present draft resolution to make it more moderate in tone. We regret that we are unable to vote affirmatively on it. There are certain provisions within the draft resolution with which we agree. There are, on the other hand, other provisions which my delegation either did not support in previous resolutions or is unable to support in the present draft resolution because of the approach advocated.

47. I wish to reiterate on behalf of my Government that we remain determined to see the people of Namibia achieve their just rights, and determined also that the United Nations shall do its part in accordance with its decision of 1966 to see this matter through to a conclusion.

48. Mr. CREMIN (Ireland): I wish to say a few words in explanation of the vote my delegation will cast on the draft resolution contained in document A/L.556 and Add.1. Ireland's position on the question of Namibia is well known. It was set forth on a number of occasions at the twenty-first and twenty-second sessions by the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for External Affairs of Ireland, Mr. Aiken, as well as in our explanation of vote on 12 June last in connexion with General Assembly resolution 2372 (XXII) [1671st meeting]. In that statement my delegation summarized the action which we felt would be best calculated to implement General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) adopted by the Assembly on 27 October 1966.

49. It is unnecessary to repeat now what we said then. I would however recall our firm opinion that any text adopted by the Assembly should meet the criteria of effectiveness and practicability. We are convinced that no recommendation of the General Assembly can satisfy those

criteria which does not recognize that fruitful action can only be taken by the Security Council.

50. We have therefore all along had serious reservations about the wisdom of entrusting to the Council for Namibia the functions conferred on it by General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967. It followed that, as we said in our explanations of vote on 16 December 1967 [1636th meeting] and again on 12 June 1968 [1671st meeting], we were not happy with the provisions of the resolutions then under consideration which continued the existence of the Council.

51. Nothing which has occurred since the General Assembly adopted resolution 2372 (XXII) has led my delegation to modify its view on that particular aspect of the matter. Thus we have reservations concerning operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution before us. Despite those reservations my delegation will vote for the draft resolution as a whole. We will do so particularly because we think that the third and fourth operative paragraphs go in the right direction in asking the Security Council to consider the situation and to take steps to bring Namibia to independence.

52. Mr. ERALP (Turkey): My delegation has not taken part in the debate on the question of Namibia, as we intended to speak on the draft resolution now to be voted on, in explanation of vote, the fifty-one-Power draft resolution [A/L.556 and Add.1] which was very ably introduced by my colleague, Mr. Farah of Somalia [1739th meeting].

53. Turkey is a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia. This is a great privilege and responsibility. The question of Namibia is in fact as old as the United Nations. New solutions have to be envisaged by way of new approaches to this chronic problem.

54. It is our belief that, although this Organization has passed more than half a dozen resolutions in the course of the past twenty years, it is only now, and especially since the twenty-first session of the General Assembly; that for the first time world public opinion is being awakened to the problem, which is gathering world-wide attention and international importance. This in itself is a notable achievement on the part of the United Nations. The historic resolution 2145 (XXI), which was adopted almost unanimously by this Assembly two years ago, essentially and fundamentally changed the political nature and the legal basis of the problem of South West Africa and introduced a new approach and a new legal situation by terminating South Africa's Mandate over South West Africa once and for all.

55. In fact resolution 2145 (XXI) inaugurated that new responsibility of the United Nations regarding Namibia, and the fifth special session by its resolution 2248 (S-V) created the Council for South West Africa, which is now the Council for Namibia, and instructed it to administer the Territory until Namibia became independent.

56. The terms of reference of the Council for Namibia were initially set forth in resolution 2248 (S-V). However, in view of the inability of the Council to carry out its

mandate, the powers and functions of the Council for Namibia were later broadened by resolutions 2325 (XXII) and 2372 (XXII).

57. It is a well-known fact that the policy of South Africa is the only obstacle in the way of the realization of the special responsibilities of this Organization with regard to the question of Namibia. It is because of the illegal presence of South Africa in Namibia that the Council cannot discharge its responsibilities and fulfil its task. The repeated acts of defiance and persistent refusal to implement the decisions of this Assembly are the major source of frustration of the Council for Namibia.

58. In paragraph 63 of its report to the General Assembly last year⁴ the Council for Namibia has expressed its dissatisfaction and pointed out that it would not be able to discharge its functions and responsibilities unless effective measures were adopted to ensure the immediate removal of South Africa from the Territory. The situation in fact has not changed since the last report of the Council for Namibia to the General Assembly. South Africa still holds the Territory. The United Nations is still hampered by its own limitations. In the course of the year, again in clear violation of the resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council, a number of significant political steps were taken to consolidate the illegal control over Namibia.

59. By its resolution 2372 (XXII), the General Assembly has recommended that the Security Council should take effective measures to ensure the freedom and independence of Namibia. In its third report to the General Assembly, the Council for Namibia, among other things, recommends that the Security Council take effective measures. In other words, in view of the persistent and intensified defiance of all the United Nations resolutions and decisions, there remains only one alternative for this Organization, and that is obviously Security Council action, whatever form it may take, so as to enable the people of Namibia to attain their independence within the meaning of the principles of the Charter and in accordance with the provisions of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which found expression in resolution 1514 (XV).

60. There is no doubt that the United Nations has a clear responsibility towards the people of Namibia, especially so since the adoption of resolution 2145 (XXI). With every passing day, the failure to secure early independence creates greater disappointment for the Namibian people. To this day the Council for Namibia has not been able to fulfil its responsibility and to discharge its primary functions fully and effectively. We have served on the Council since its inception with a sense of purpose and dedication. It is a fact that the record of the Council is neither a spectacular success story nor a complete failure.

61. The Council for Namibia has taken up certain technical, legal and political aspects of the question of Namibia, which was perhaps all it could do under the existing circumstances. After careful consideration, it has put forward some recommendations in its third report to this

Assembly. The Council has spared no effort to discharge its primary functions properly and will continue to devote its best efforts to the many important problems which are before it.

62. The draft resolution [*A/L.556 and Add.1*] on the question of Namibia is now before the General Assembly to be voted on. It is, we all realize, neither lengthy nor detailed. In the view of my delegation, if and when this draft resolution is adopted by near unanimity, the Security Council will have a clear mandate to act on behalf of the United Nations. In fact by its resolution 246 (1968) the Security Council has taken cognizance of its special responsibility towards the people and Territory of Namibia. My delegation wholeheartedly supports this draft resolution and recommends its adoption by the General Assembly.

63. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The representative of Sierra Leone has asked for the floor on a point of order.

64. Mr. COLE (Sierra Leone): Earlier my delegation, on behalf of the co-sponsors, asked for a postponement of the vote on the draft resolution on Namibia [*A/L.556 and Add.1*]. This was due to the fact that the Fourth Committee was meeting. Since the Chairman of the Fourth Committee has agreed to postpone that meeting, and as we have a full House, I now, on behalf of the co-sponsors, withdraw the proposal I made earlier.

65. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The General Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/L.556 and Add.1. The financial implications are set forth in the Fifth Committee's report [*A/7395*]. A roll-call has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Cambodia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldive Island, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Against: Portugal, South Africa.

Abstaining: Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway,

⁴ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Annexes, agenda item 64, document A/7088.*

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana.

The draft resolution was adopted by 96 votes to 2, with 16 abstentions [resolution 2403 (XXIII)].

66. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Spain, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

67. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) (*translated from Spanish*): The Fourth Committee suspended its meeting a short while ago so that we could vote on the subject of Namibia. The Fourth Committee is now going to continue with its work. We are faced, however, with exactly the reverse situation. The Fourth Committee is going to vote on the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, an item which is also being discussed by the General Assembly at the same time and while the voting is in progress.

68. My delegation would like to know, therefore, whether it would be possible to proceed to other items on the Assembly's agenda, so that while the vote was being taken in the Fourth Committee, the General Assembly would not then be discussing the same item. This is what I wish to propose to you, Mr. President, and to the General Assembly.

69. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I now call on the Under-Secretary General for General Assembly Affairs.

70. Mr. NARASIMHAN (Under-Secretary-General for General Assembly Affairs): The programme for the plenary meeting has been worked out in close co-operation with the Chairman of the Fourth Committee. We have not yet completed consideration of agenda item 64 and thereafter we have to proceed to the consideration of agenda item 23 this morning. The Rapporteur of the Special Committee of Twenty-Four and the Chairman of the Special Committee of Twenty-Four are ready with their interventions and we have to proceed with those interventions this morning. That is my understanding, after consultation with the secretariat of the Fourth Committee.

71. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I believe that covers the point raised by the representative of Spain.

72. I now call on the representative of Sweden, who wishes to explain his vote now that voting has taken place.

73. Mr. ÅSTRÖM (Sweden): The Swedish delegation voted in favour of the resolution on Namibia just adopted by the General Assembly. In explaining this vote, let me first of all pay tribute to the authors of the resolution who, while keeping the fundamental objective clearly in view—which is to bring the now illegal administration of South Africa over Namibia to an end—have acted with a sense of realism and moderation. We feel that the text that has emerged is well designed to express the continued and increasing concern that is felt by the overwhelming majority of Member States at the refusal of the Government of

South Africa even to take the first steps to enable the United Nations to assume responsibility for the Territory in accordance with the decision of the General Assembly two years ago.

74. We also feel that the course of action indicated in the resolution is, under the circumstances, the one most likely to enable the United Nations to achieve its purpose with regard to Namibia. This course of action is to request the Security Council to consider the question of Namibia in its entirety. We note that the resolution, in its operative paragraph 3, draws the Security Council's attention "to the serious situation which has arisen as a result of the illegal presence and actions of the South African Government in Namibia".

75. We think that this is a correct description of the situation. The resolution recommends in its operative paragraph 4 that the Security Council "take all effective measures, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, to ensure the immediate withdrawal of South African authorities from Namibia...". With regard to this paragraph, it is the understanding of the Swedish delegation that it is not intended to circumscribe and to determine the range of action open to the Security Council. We feel that the Security Council should not be bound to act in accordance with any one Article or any one Chapter of the Charter, but should be free, within its total competence under the Charter, to choose the course it considers appropriate.

76. For any action to be fully effective there is a need for collaboration and understanding between all members of the Security Council, in particular between the permanent members. As I said on 13 May this year:

"... every attempt must be made to achieve a wide measure of agreement between Member countries and, in particular, amongst those countries which are in the strongest position to influence the decisions taken in Pretoria." [1653rd meeting, para. 71.]

77. During that same debate in the Spring the representative of Kenya indicated that if the four permanent members of the Security Council were agreed on how to proceed and how to implement General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) the Government of South Africa would react in a completely different manner and would have to give serious thought to relinquishing its now illegal hold over the Territory [1646th meeting].

78. I should also like to say a word about the United Nations Council for Namibia. When that Council was created by General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V) my delegation abstained because we feared that the various provisions in that resolution were not balanced in such a way as to provide a firm basis for further United Nations action. In particular we did not feel that the mandate laid down for the Council was realistic. It was therefore not without some hesitation and some reservation that the Swedish delegation supported the resolution which has just been adopted. Mrs. Alva Myrdal speaking in the general debate on this question on 5 December 1968 [1734th meeting], set out our views on the activities of the Council as well as of the activities of other organs of the United Nations in this field.

79. It is our hope that this resolution will prove to be the beginning of a constructive effort on the part of the United Nations to exercise the responsibility that the Organization has assumed for the Territory. We owe it to the people of Namibia that the United Nations should act with determination and a sense of urgency in creating the conditions necessary for their exercise of the right to self-determination and independence.

80. Mr. MBEKEANI (Malawi): I should like to apologize for the fact that when the vote was taken on the draft resolution [A/L.556 and Add.1] I was not in the Hall. I wish to record that if I had been here when the vote was taken I would have abstained. My delegation's views are as stated during the resumed session last June and I find that there is nothing to change in the stand I took at that time.

81. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution [A/L.557] submitted by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. This draft resolution relates to petitions on Namibia.

82. Since there has been no request for a vote, I shall take it that the General Assembly has decided to adopt the draft resolution.

The draft resolution was adopted [resolution 2404 (XXIII)].

83. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): Before concluding our consideration of this item, I shall like to draw the attention of the General Assembly to subparagraph (c) entitled "Appointment of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia". If no proposal is put forward to change the existing provisions in regard to the Acting Commission for Namibia, I shall take it that the General Assembly wishes to maintain those provisions.

It was so decided.

84. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): That concludes our examination of agenda item 64.

AGENDA ITEM 23

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 (*continued*)

85. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The General Assembly will remember that the question of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was allocated to the plenary, at the 1616th meeting, for an over-all study of the way in which the Declaration had been implemented. All the chapters of the Special Committee's reports on individual Territories were referred to the Fourth Committee. The General Assembly has so far

studied the Fourth Committee's reports on Southern Rhodesia [A/7270 and Add.1], Equatorial Guinea [A/7265], and the Territories under Portuguese administration [A/7352 and Corr.1]. Later on, it will study the Fourth Committee's reports on the other Territories.

86. The General Assembly will today begin considering item 23 as a whole, so that all questions related to this item can be raised. However, in order to simplify the discussion, it would be preferable if representatives wishing to comment on specific Territories were to do so when the Assembly takes up the draft resolutions on individual Territories.

87 Mr. GHAUS (Afghanistan), Rapporteur 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 have the honour to present to the General Assembly the report of the Special Committee covering its work during 1968. This report, which relates to item 23 of the agenda, is submitted in accordance with operative paragraph 12 of resolution 2326 (XXII) of 16 December 1967, by which the General Assembly requested the Special Committee

"to continue to perform its task and to seek suitable means for the immediate and full implementation of the Declaration in all Territories which have not yet attained independence".

88. The complete report of the Special Committee covering its work during 1968 is contained in documents A/7200/Rev.1 and A/7320 and Add.1. An account of the Special Committee's examination of the situation in individual Territories is set out in chapters VI to XXXI of the present report and an account of the Committee's consideration of the specific items referred to it in the relevant General Assembly resolutions is contained in chapters I to V and Chapter XII.

89. In addition, the report of the Committee relating to item 68, namely, activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Southern Rhodesia, Namibia and territories under Portuguese domination and in all other territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination in southern Africa is contained in document A/7320 and Add.1.

90. Members will no doubt observe that the Special Committee's report to the General Assembly this year is much less voluminous than last year's report.⁵ Due to the implementation of the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2292 (XXII) of 8 December 1967 concerning the control and limitation of documentation of the United Nations, the Special Committee decided that it would, for its annual report to the General Assembly, adopt with effect from this year, the same pattern as that followed by the main committees of the General Assembly concerned with political matters, particularly the Fourth Committee. As will be noted, the new form of report adopted by the

⁵ *Ibid.*, addendum to agenda item 23, document A/6700/Rev.1.

Special Committee no longer includes, as it had done in the past, summaries of the views expressed by members. The summary records containing these views, however, are available to delegations, and references to the relevant summary records are included in each chapter of the Special Committee's report.

91. It will be recalled that, with regard to agenda item 23, the General Assembly at its 1676th plenary meeting on 27 September 1968, decided that the question of the implementation of the Declaration in general should be considered in plenary meetings and that chapters of the Special Committee's report relating to specific Territories should be referred to the Fourth Committee for consideration and report.

92. The Fourth Committee has already submitted reports on Equatorial Guinea [A/7265], on Southern Rhodesia [A/7290 and Add.1], on the hearing of petitioners concerning the question of Namibia [A/7347] and on the Territories under Portuguese administration [A/7352 and Corr.1]. Reports of the Fourth Committee on the other Territories covered by the Special Committee's report will be submitted to the plenary as soon as they become available.

93. In 1968, the Special Committee considered all the territories on its list of territories to which the Declaration applies with a few exceptions, and on almost all these Territories the Special Committee either adopted resolutions or consensus or submitted conclusions and recommendations which are set out in the relevant chapters of the report. The report of the Special Committee also contains information on the Territories which it was not able to consider. In the case of some Territories, because of new developments concerning them, it was necessary to consider them more than once.

94. In operative paragraph 16 of General Assembly resolution 2326 (XXII), the General Assembly requested the Special Committee

“to examine the compliance of Member States with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and other relevant resolutions on the question of decolonization, particularly those relating to the Territories under Portuguese domination, Southern Rhodesia and South West Africa, and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its twenty-third session.”

95. In the light of the mandate thus given to it by the Assembly, the Special Committee considered the item, taking fully into account the various provisions of resolution 2326 (XXII) as well as all other relevant General Assembly resolutions on the question of decolonization. An account of the Special Committee's consideration of the item and the recommendations which it submits for approval by the Assembly are set out in chapter II of the present report.

96. Under the terms of General Assembly resolution 2326 (XXII) in operative paragraph 13 by which the Assembly requested the Special Committee

“to make concrete suggestions with a view to assisting the Security Council in considering appropriate measures

under the Charter of the United Nations with regard to developments in colonial Territories which are likely to threaten international peace and security, and recommends the Council to take such suggestions fully into consideration”,

the Special Committee in 1968 drew the attention of the Security Council to the situation existing in Namibia, Southern Rhodesia and the Territories under Portuguese administration. An account of the action taken by the Special Committee in this respect is set out in paragraphs 142 to 147 in chapters I and II.

97. Having regard to the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, particularly resolution 2326 (XXII) of 16 December 1967, by operative paragraph 4 of which the General Assembly approved

“the programme of work envisaged by the Special Committee during 1968, including... the study of military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers in Territories under their administration which might be impeding the implementation of the Declaration”,

on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Special Committee continued its study of military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers in territories under their administration which might be impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

98. The report of the Special Committee on this question is contained in Chapter IV of the present report. In the light of the conclusions and recommendations adopted on this question, the Special Committee proposes to continue its study on this question, as appropriate, at its next session.

99. In operative paragraph 14 of resolution 2326 (XXII), the General Assembly invited

“the Special Committee, whenever it considers it proper and appropriate, to recommend a deadline for the accession to independence of each Territory in accordance with the wishes of the people and the provisions of the Declaration”.

100. In requesting its Sub-Committees I, II and III to carry out the tasks assigned to them, the Special Committee called their attention to the above-mentioned provisions of General Assembly resolution 2326 (XXII). Further, in its examination of specific territories, the Special Committee took that provision into consideration.

101. In operative paragraph 17 of the same resolution, the General Assembly invited

“the Special Committee to pay particular attention to the small Territories and to recommend to the General Assembly the most appropriate methods and also the steps to be taken to enable the populations of those Territories to exercise fully their right to self-determination and independence”.

102. An account of the Special Committee's examination of this matter is set out in paragraphs 125 to 135 of chapter I. The Special Committee intends to initiate a study

of the question of the small Territories taking into account the relevant provisions of United Nations resolutions on the question of decolonization, in particular those relating to the small Territories.

103. Owing to the negative attitude of certain administering Powers to the sending of visiting groups to the Territories for which they are responsible, the Special Committee was again unable to dispatch any visiting groups this year. The Special Committee continued to attach great importance to such visits as a means of securing adequate information regarding conditions in the Territories as well as the views, wishes and aspirations of the people, with a view to assisting in the implementation of the Declaration. Accordingly, the Special Committee has set out recommendations with regard to the sending of visiting groups in chapter V and in many of the chapters of the present report relating to specific Territories. The Special Committee intends to pursue its recommendations and to continue to seek the co-operation of the administering Powers to enable such visits to take place during the forthcoming session.

104. In operative paragraph 4 of resolution 2326 (XXII), the General Assembly approved "the programme of work envisaged by the Special Committee during 1968, including . . . the review of the list of Territories to which the Declaration applies". In 1968, the Special Committee considered a report submitted by its Working Group concerning this question. An account of the Special Committee's consideration of this report is set out in chapter I, section F, in the present report.

105. The Special Committee, in accordance with the mandate entrusted to it in General Assembly resolution 1970 (XVIII) of 16 December 1963 and other relevant resolutions examined during 1968 the question of information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter. Details of its consideration of this item are contained in chapter XXXII of the report. This chapter of the Special Committee's report is currently under consideration by the Fourth Committee.

106. In accordance with operative paragraph 19 of resolution 2326 (XXII) by which the General Assembly requested the Special Committee "to consider and submit recommendations to the General Assembly at its twenty-third session regarding the holding early in 1969 of a special conference of representatives of colonial peoples for the purpose, *inter alia*, of considering the most effective means by which the international community can intensify its assistance to them in their efforts to achieve self-determination, freedom and independence", the Special Committee considered the various aspects of this matter and adopted suggestions for consideration by the General Assembly. Those suggestions are set out in section VII of chapter I in the report. Should the suggestion contained in the recommendation be acceptable to the General Assembly, the Committee would be prepared to undertake, or, as appropriate, participate in the necessary preparatory arrangements for approval by the Assembly at its twenty-fourth session.

107. In connexion with the publicity for the work of the United Nations in the field of decolonization, the Special Committee, with a view to assisting the Secretary-General

in the implementation of the request addressed to him by the General Assembly in operative paragraph 20 of resolution 2326 (XXII), as well as in operative paragraph 19 of resolution 2262 (XXII) and in operative paragraph 15 of resolution 2270 (XXII), undertook an examination of this question in close co-operation with the Secretariat. It will be noted from paragraphs 113 to 119 of chapter I, in the report, that in view of the importance it attaches to this question, the Special Committee proposes to continue its consideration of the question at its next session. In this regard, the Special Committee recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General to proceed with the measures envisaged by him and to urge the administering Powers to co-operate with the Secretary-General in promoting the large-scale dissemination of information on the work of the United Nations in the implementation of the Declaration.

108. Having regard to operative paragraphs 1 and 3 of General Assembly resolution 2292 (XXII) of 8 December 1967 on the question of publications and documentation, the Special Committee undertook a review of its documentation requirements with a view to complying fully with the terms of that resolution. The recommendations made by the Special Committee in this respect, which will result in a considerably smaller total expenditure than existing arrangements, are set out in paragraphs 107 to 112 of chapter I. In submitting those recommendations, it is the intention of the Special Committee to continue exploring further ways and means of limiting the volume of its documentation requirements.

109. In accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2361 (XXII) concerning the pattern of conferences, and taking into consideration its experience in previous years as well as its probable workload for next year, the Special Committee has approved a tentative programme of meetings for 1969, as set out in paragraphs 138 to 141 of chapter I of the report. In the same connexion, the Committee took into consideration the provisions of operative paragraph 6 of resolution 1654 (XVI) by which the General Assembly authorized the Committee to meet elsewhere than at United Nations Headquarters whenever and wherever such meetings might be required for the effective discharge of its functions. Following its consideration of the matter, the Committee decided to inform the General Assembly that it might consider holding a series of meetings away from Headquarters next year and to recommend that in making the necessary financial provision to cover the activities of its Committee, during that year, the General Assembly should take that possibility into account. In reaching that decision, the Committee recalled that it had not held meetings away from Headquarters during 1968 although the General Assembly had made the necessary financial provision for that purpose.

110. Finally, the Special Committee suggested that the General Assembly, in its consideration of the implementation of the Declaration, might wish to take into account the various recommendations of the Special Committee which are reflected in the relevant chapters of its report and, in particular, to endorse the proposals outlined in section XIV entitled "Future Work", in order to enable the Special Committee to carry out the tasks envisaged by it. In

addition, the Special Committee recommended that the General Assembly should renew its appeal to the administering Powers to take immediately all necessary steps for the implementation of the Declaration and the relevant United Nations resolutions. In that connexion, the General Assembly might also wish to renew its appeal to all States to comply with the various requests addressed to them by the General Assembly in the relevant resolutions of the United Nations on the question of decolonization.

111. Further, the Special Committee recommended that in approving the programme of work outlined in the section of the report to which I have referred, the General Assembly should also make adequate financial provision to cover the activities of the Committee as envisaged for 1969. The Special Committee expresses its confident hope that the Secretary-General would continue to provide it with all the facilities and personnel necessary for the discharge of its mandate. May I apologize to Members for this somewhat lengthy statement. I commend the report to the serious attention of the Assembly.

112. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I now invite Mr. Mahmoud Mestiri of Tunisia, Chairman 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, to address the Assembly.

113. Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia) (*translated from French*): At a time when certain Committees of our Assembly are devoting their attention to the organization of an international order which, if not futuristic, is at least somewhat *avant-garde*, we find ourselves here, in December 1968—that is, eight years after the adoption by the United Nations General Assembly of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*—meeting to discuss decolonization.

114. If it were simply a matter of analyzing the course of history and of discerning through the confusion of events, its meaning, for anyone with a clear mind and a moral concern for progress, the task would have been reasonable enough. We are, however, the political representatives of States, men of action whose duty it is to make history. It is therefore sad to note that colonialism is a living fact, a dreadful reality, and that despite our solemn commitment to turn the course of the world resolutely towards universal freedom, millions and millions of men remain enslaved and persecuted.

115. "International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space" (item 24) and "The Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa" (item 31) are both on the agenda of this session, a bitterly ironic testimony to two radically different eras running side by side before our very eyes: the era of men advancing resolutely towards the future and boldly challenging the gods—the era of the superman—and the era of men threatened more tragically with each passing day in their frail humanity—the era of the slave.

116. Unless a so-called realism finally stifles in us every moral impulse and every desire to think clearly, the situation of the subject peoples will continue to plague our

conscience and foreshadow our inevitable failure. For their sake, but also for our own, and for the future of the international community, we must ponder, we must decide and then act with firm determination.

117. If we take history to be the stormy progress of man towards freedom, if we regard the succession of civilizations as significant only to the extent that the ills of mankind are offset by the achievement and fruition of their humanity, then who would not agree that we must look on the present century as the greatest period in history, for it is in this century that the vast subject multitudes of the world—the peoples of Asia and Africa—have broken their chains and taken charge of their own destinies? A century of freedom, yes, because it is in our time that decolonization has taken place. Of the 126 States present in this General Assembly, seventy-five came into being after the San Francisco Conference. The first manifestation of universality, formal universality, that which comes with the achievement of national sovereignty, is a necessary, if not sufficient, condition for the reconciliation of man with man. The international community dreamt of by Abbé de Saint Pierre or by Kant is today a reality, at any rate from the legal standpoint. Never before in history have so many peoples, so many civilizations, or so many cultures, met in a common endeavour, as generous as it is ambitious, to unite mankind.

118. Is there any need to remind the Assembly that, without the conjunction of the wind of freedom which blew over the world after the Second World War and the nationalist movement of the colonial peoples—whom no hardships can halt in their irresistible surge towards dignity—without the confluence of these two currents, decolonization would probably not have become what it did: a powerful, worldwide and, at times even, peaceful movement?

119. My country and many other peoples of Africa will never forget that during those harsh times, many Europeans—particularly Frenchmen and Britons—ranged themselves on the side of the colonial peoples, even at the risk of their own lives. Similarly, regardless of the surviving relics of the colonial era, we must not forget the rôle played by the United Kingdom since 1945, and by France—above all the rôle of General de Gaulle—in the task of decolonization which has made both the world as a whole and this Assembly in particular what they are today.

120. This is, of course, the direction in which we should have wished to see history move. Who among us would not have wished with all his heart for the colonial Powers to see the light and renounce privileges which were not only basically unjust, but also and above all singularly archaic, and that relations of equality, mutual respect, and sincere and fruitful co-operation could be established between those Powers and the peoples under their domination, in place of the theoretical and practical inequality, hatred and violence which threatened to jeopardize the future forever?

121. Thus, on 14 December 1960 we welcomed the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples as an unprecedented ray of hope in the history of freedom, dignity and brotherhood. Through the Declaration, the United Na-

tions—the concrete expression of our collective wisdom—having noted the irreversible and inexorable march of history towards the independence of peoples, enjoined the colonial Powers to exercise their judgment, open their eyes to reality and not vainly oppose the new order of things.

122. Unfortunately, it must be recognized that contrary to the widespread belief, the appeal made in 1960 was heeded only to a small extent, and that a misguided resistance to the historical necessity of our time has not yet exhausted all its resources. The new situation is all the more dangerous since it obtains at a time when world public opinion regards colonialism as a thing of the past.

123. We must, I fear, face the fact that colonialism still holds under its yoke millions of Africans and continues to exploit for its own profit an enormous part of the riches of Africa.

124. It must also be stated in plain language that the conditions prevailing in Namibia represent abject colonialism; that the shameless exploitation to which the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau) and the Cape Verde archipelago are being subjected is the same execrable colonialism; that the violence inflicted on the African populations of Rhodesia and South Africa has no worse precedent in the history of mankind but the Nazi régime; that all—absolutely all—the situations obtaining in those African lands result, directly or indirectly, from the same phenomenon—colonialism—and cannot possibly be explained away, as some people would like to think, as arrangements for racially, ethnically or culturally different communities to live together in the same territory; and above all, that none of these anomalies could have persisted for such a long time without culpable indifference and complaisance—why not say so openly?—on the part of the entire international community, and more particularly, of its most powerful members, whose commercial, financial, political and military links with the capitals of the “Defiant Entente”, known as the “Unholy Alliance”, are well known to all.

125. We must also make it clear to world opinion, to which we are responsible in the final analysis, that in addition to the tragic colonial situations which I have just described, there are Antigua, the Bahamas, Bermuda, Dominica, Grenada, Guam, the Cayman Islands, the Cocos Islands, the Gilbert and Ellice Islands, the Solomon Islands, American Samoa, the Seychelles, Tokelau, the Turks and Caicos Islands, the United States Virgin Islands, the United Kingdom Virgin Islands, Montserrat, Niue, the New Hebrides, Pitcairn, St. Kitts-Nevis and Anguilla, St. Helena, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, the Fiji Islands and the Falkland Islands, not forgetting New Guinea and Oman, where the people do not have self-determination and yet have a profound aspiration to freedom, that freedom which we have solemnly undertaken to procure for them.

126. Under various legal titles, ranging from “colonial province”, pure and simple, as is the case with Guinea (Bissau), to “Non-Self-Governing Territory” and “Trust Territory”, colonialism in various guises and using various devices, is rampant even today, one and indivisible, essentially retrograde inhuman in its effects and intolerable in all

its aspects and to all men: we must therefore condemn it utterly and fight it with all our might.

127. What have we done in the past eight years? We have adopted, to quote the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Tunisia, “Resolutions, hundreds of resolutions, which become louder all the time, but about which one may wonder legitimately whether they are not merely alibis to conceal our lack of determination”. [1685th meeting, para. 28].

128. We are only too well aware of the reception which our pious wishes have met with in the “Defiant Entente”. The only effect has been a tightening of the repressive vice on peoples who have long since reached the limits of human endurance.

129. The Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples—of which I have the honour to be Chairman—has, for its part, spared no effort to lead colonial countries and peoples to the self-determination called for in the Charter and clearly and solemnly reaffirmed in the Declaration of 1960. Nevertheless, the mere will to succeed has not been sufficient nor, it is plain, will it be so in the future.

130. The problem, the crux of the matter, is that the Special Committee has not met with enough co-operation from the administering Powers. Evasions, subterfuges, and at times, an outright refusal to abide by the terms and spirit of the 1960 resolution, have so far been the standard feature of the Special Committee’s relations with certain colonial Powers. Among these Powers there are some which no longer even submit, in respect of the territories under their control, the information required by the United Nations, and which refuse to admit visiting missions; in short, these colonial Powers do everything possible to conceal behind a veil of absolute and dangerously mysterious secrecy the countries where illegally and unjustly, their writ runs. We have every right to concern ourselves about those territories, remote and unfortunately isolated into the bargain, and to inquire into the use made of them by one Power or another.

131. For all that, I must say that during the past year we have thought we detected a glimmer of hope in the matter of co-operation. On more than one occasion we have felt that, on the question of visiting missions, the United Kingdom or New Zealand was preparing to take the decisive step which would enable the Special Committee to come directly to grips with reality.

132. The atmosphere which, one and all, we have striven to create in the Special Committee, has helped to cool passions on certain aspects of the colonial question, and I remain convinced that it is within our power to reduce tension still further. Modest but significant progress might be achieved on this particular question of visiting missions, for example, and we believe that the way would thus be opened to more considerable achievements.

133. It is true that this is the century of decolonization, but it is so only on condition that the task is completed. We have, after all, no choice if we wish to spare mankind

upheavals with incalculable consequences, the tragic explosion of pent-up resentment.

134. The General Assembly, the Security Council and the Special Committee have already on many occasions drawn attention to the threat to peace presented by the situation in Rhodesia, South Africa and in the Portuguese territories; I need not, therefore, revert to those subjects.

135. We should however, like to draw the attention of the international community to the special danger arising from these situations which weighs on the African States adjoining the subjugated territories; this danger is such that it could have increasing repercussions and, eventually, set the entire continent—indeed, the entire world—in flames.

136. Regarding the other colonial territories, we feel it our duty to urge the international community to remain alert, and not forget that colonialism, in all its aspects, is still with us, and that its elimination calls for vigilance on the part of us all. Otherwise it might well continue indefinitely.

137. Should we confine ourselves to these warnings? We do not believe so, because, with the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration in the offing, as also the twenty-fifth anniversary of our Organization, the colonial situation is becoming, after the epic age of decolonization, ever more parlous.

138. As in all human endeavours, renewed efforts and a strengthened determination are the prerequisites for successful political action, especially when it is on an international scale and has to overcome such varied obstacles as cultural, legal, ideological and other differences.

139. A United Nations conference on decolonization might prove to be the ideal instrument for this second and, in our view, necessary offensive. By convening such a conference on the eve of the celebration of two anniversaries so anxiously awaited by the world, we would reaffirm our commitment to the colonial countries and peoples and, by showing them that they are not alone in their struggle, give them increased hope and confidence.

140. In the face of the arrogant defiance of some and the lamentable evasions and refusals of others, the conference would, in our view, have the task of preparing precise directives in regard to decolonization, directives that the Special Committee—which now seems at times to be drifting—would then put into practice.

141. Clearly, this would be a difficult undertaking, one which would require, on the part of all, effort, goodwill and the determination to have done with this deplorable anachronism. It is an undertaking which can be accomplished successfully only if the major Powers and all the colonial Powers agree to co-operate actively and generously, in the conference, with the countries of the Third World.

142. In the course of this session, the latter countries have shown that, despite the absolute legitimacy of their feelings, they were capable of acting with restraint and adopting a moderate approach to the colonial problem in the hope, of course, that their realism would be properly appreciated by the Western Powers.

143. In recent months we have observed the emergence of a kind of conciliatory trend, the impact of which has been particularly noticeable in the draft resolutions submitted to the Assembly on the Portuguese territories and on Namibia.

144. It seemed to us that Portugal, up till then openly denounced and condemned for its inadmissible policies, was this time being invited to make the effort required to rejoin the concert of just nations, to reform, change its ways and enter into the mainstream of the world. The same realistic and reasonable approach may be seen in the draft resolution on Namibia.

145. As we stressed a moment ago, the colonial Powers must not misinterpret this moderation and confuse it with weakness, defeatism or compromise. We believe it to be our duty to warn them of the untoward consequences to which such a misjudgment might lead. It is neither unawareness nor a mood of surrender which has inspired our conciliatory attitude. The truth is that, aware of the need for frank and sincere co-operation, we deliberately tried to open the way, in the hope that the other side would grasp the opportunity to reach together with us, an honourable, just and lasting settlement of this distressing problem. The conference that we are proposing might very well be the right venue for such co-operation.

146. We emerge from all these difficulties with, for sole reward the feeling of having justified the confidence placed in us by mankind, and thus also having made peace with ourselves, re-established our internal harmony, our satisfaction will be great indeed. What more sublime duty, indeed, than to participate in the struggle to free men from servitude and thus make our deeds fit our words?

147. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): Before giving the floor to other speakers, I wish to announce that it is the intention of the President to close the list of speakers on item 23 of the agenda at 6 p.m. today.

148. If there are no objections, the list of speakers on the above item will be closed today, Monday, at the time specified.

It was so decided.

149. Mr. BORCH (Denmark): When the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was adopted by the General Assembly on 14 December 1960 [*resolution 1514 (XV)*] the process of decolonization was already well advanced, not only in the number of former colonial Territories which had obtained their independence but even more so in the number of human beings who had under the process advanced to being citizens of independent States under their own Governments. It will be recalled that the Declaration stressed the right of all peoples to self-determination and called for immediate steps to transfer in still dependent Territories all power to their peoples. My Government supported the adoption of the Declaration. We still adhere to its principles.

150. The Declaration, in formulating the principles which should govern the transition of the remaining colonial Territories to their new status based on self-determination,

was made to serve as a useful basis for the preoccupation of the United Nations with colonial problems in the years to come and as guidelines to be followed by the administering Powers.

151. Since the adoption of the Declaration a considerable number of other Territories have obtained their independence in co-operation between their peoples and the administering Powers. With respect to the extent of this further process of decolonization, a quick glance at the increase in the membership of the United Nations will speak for itself. However, at the same time, it is a matter of record and indeed of deep regret that today, eight years after the adoption of the Declaration, much is left to be desired in regard to the implementation of the Declaration and that the termination of colonial rule in some Territories is long overdue.

152. The question of how to apply the principles of the Declaration raises no reasonable doubt in relation to most colonial Territories, which fall within a certain classic pattern. However, in the case of some very small Territories flexibility is called for. This has been recognized by the General Assembly, which most recently in its resolution 2326 (XXII) invited the Special Committee on decolonization to pay particular attention to the small Territories and to recommend to the General Assembly the most appropriate methods to enable the populations in those Territories to exercise their right to self-determination. What is called for here is a pragmatic approach taking into consideration all the specific circumstances in each single case. It would exceed the scope of this debate for me to go into any one of the cases in this category; but I should like to make the general observation that my delegation agrees that solutions to the problems of these Territories do call for particular attention, that such solutions must be based on strict respect for the right to self-determination and that a special responsibility in this respect rests with the administering Powers.

153. The most serious of the remaining colonial problems are concentrated in the southern part of Africa: Southern Rhodesia, Namibia and the Portuguese colonies. In the opinion of the Government of Denmark, the proper way to apply the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in these cases should raise no question or any doubt. These Territories should long ago have been allowed to obtain their freedom on the basis of the exercise by the populations of their right to self-determination. However, we have to accept the fact that in these cases we are faced with serious difficulties and forthright resistance which considerably complicate the situation and hamper an immediate solution in accordance with the principles to which the United Nations has pledged itself. It is in the light of these considerations that my Government, always attaching the greatest importance to the principle of application of non-violent means, has taken its position on the concrete issues relating to Southern Rhodesia, Namibia and the Portuguese colonies.

154. With respect to Southern Rhodesia, we have condemned the illegal declaration of independence and the oppressive measures taken by the illegal régime in Salisbury; and we have from the very beginning recommended and worked for stern and realistic measures to be taken by the

United Nations in an effort to bring down that régime, with a view to the liberation of Southern Rhodesia on the basis of self-determination. We have pursued this policy of ours in our statements and in our votes in this Assembly as well as in the Security Council and we have carried out the mandatory economic sanctions invoked against the illegal régime in Salisbury. With particular regard to recent developments, we have taken note of the repeated assurances given by spokesmen of the Government of the United Kingdom to the effect that it remains committed to the well-known six principles and that among these the most vital is the principle that any settlement must be acceptable to the people of Southern Rhodesia as a whole.

155. In the question of Namibia we supported resolution 2145 (XXI) by which the twenty-first session of the General Assembly decided that the Mandate of South Africa was terminated and that Namibia came under the direct responsibility of the United Nations, and reaffirmed that the people of Namibia had the inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence. This remains the policy of the Government of Denmark. For us the principles laid down in resolution 2145 (XXI) constitute the only basis on which the United Nations could deal constructively with this matter. Therefore, in our opinion it is on this basis that Members of our Organization must unite if the United Nations is to play a positive role in the process towards independence for Namibia.

156. In the light of our vote today on the resolution on Namibia, may I be allowed here to emphasize that my Government reaffirms the responsibility of the United Nations for Namibia and fully supports the proposal that the question be taken up for thorough discussion and treatment by the Security Council, a discussion upon which all concerned, in our view, should enter with an open mind on how best to further the purposes of resolution 2145 (XXI).

157. With respect to the Portuguese colonies, the Government of Denmark does not accept that the system at present in force can be characterized as based on the self-determination of the peoples of those Territories. It was primarily in this context that my country voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 2395 (XXIII) on the question of Territories under Portuguese administration. Recently a new Government has come into power in Portugal and we have taken note of the fact that in certain matters it has taken a position somewhat different from that of the previous régime. We appeal to that new Government to reconsider the colonial policies of Portugal. We hope that it will see fit to take the example of other colonial Powers so that the peoples of Portugal's colonies may be enabled to exercise their right of self-determination in an atmosphere of harmony.

158. In an assessment of the possibilities of the United Nations in the further process of decolonization, I think that three factors are paramount—vision, patience and unity. Vision, so that in the gloomy picture of the present we may some day see the potentialities of the future in order that it may help to transform them into the fulfilment of our ultimate goals; patience—certainly not inactivity, but patience in the proper sense of the word—because we must realize that progress towards the solution of the remaining

great colonial problems may prove painfully difficult and slow; and unity, because experience shows that only if we do stand united shall we be able to tackle constructively the problems facing us in the remaining serious colonial matters, and only then may we hope to render a meaningful contribution to the ultimate attainment of our goals: to complete elimination of the remnants of the colonial system.

159. In the meantime we should all do our utmost to assist those victims of the remaining colonial régimes who need our help and whom our aid is able to reach. With this in mind Denmark, as well as other Nordic countries, has rendered its contributions to the United Nations Consolidated Educational and Training Programme and to other organs which assist in bringing relief and aid to refugees. We certainly share the hope expressed by the Secretary-General that the extremely serious financial situation of the consolidated programme will not be allowed to deteriorate further, especially in view of the extremely important reasons for which the programme was established.

160. Evidently the activities to which Denmark thus has decided to contribute serve humanitarian purposes of the highest priority, but in doing so they also serve to build up cadres and thus to eliminate unnecessary complications in connexion with that transition from colonial status to

liberty which will come to all peoples and Territories still under colonial rule.

161. The position of Denmark with respect to the resolutions of the United Nations in colonial matters, both on the concrete issues and on the item which is at present on the agenda of the Assembly, is based on the considerations that I have outlined in this statement.

162. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): Before the meeting is adjourned, I wish to draw the Assembly's attention to Section I of Chapter I of the report of the Special Committee [A/7200/Rev.1], where certain references are made to the Committee's documents and the records of its meetings.

163. I have been told that the Secretary-General, in accordance with the provisions of Rule 154 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly, and also the provisions of Paragraph (j) of the Annex to General Assembly resolution 2292 (XXII), has presented a separate report* to the Fifth Committee on the implications of the decision of the Special Committee regarding the records of its meetings.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.

* Subsequently circulated as document A/C.5/1229.