

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

Official Records



**1505th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 26 April 1967,  
at 10.30 a.m.

FIFTH SPECIAL SESSION

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	Page
<i>Agenda item 7:</i>	
<u>Question of South West Africa (continued) . . .</u>	1

**President: Mr. Abdul Rahman PAZHWAQ**  
**(Afghanistan).**

**AGENDA ITEM 7**

**Question of South West Africa (continued)**

1. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): The General Assembly is now convened in special session to give further consideration to the question of South West Africa. We meet in accordance with the terms of resolution 2145 (XXI), adopted with virtual unanimity on 27 October 1966. It is my delegation's hope that, despite the difficulty of this matter and the known differences of view concerning it, we can again display the same unity of decision that we achieved last October; for it is from such a united stand, as well as from the intrinsic soundness of our decisions, that our Assembly resolutions derive their true force.

2. Since resolution 2145 (XXI) contains the basic agreed position of the United Nations on this question, it may be well to recall the essential steps we took in adopting that resolution.

3. We decided that, since South Africa had failed to fulfil its obligations in respect of the Mandated Territory of South West Africa, and had, in fact, disavowed the Mandate, the Mandate was terminated; that, apart from the Mandate, South Africa had no other right to administer the Territory; and that South West Africa now came under the direct responsibility of the United Nations.

4. We reaffirmed the right of the people of South West Africa to self-determination, freedom and independence in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

5. We reaffirmed that South West Africa, until it attained independence, had an international status, and called upon the South African Government to refrain and desist from any action which would tend to alter that status. In this regard, as the United States has already said, implementation of the recent statement by the South African Government concerning Ovamboland would fall into this category.

6. We created the Ad Hoc Committee for South West Africa to recommend practical means by which the responsibility of the United Nations in this matter was to be discharged. And we agreed to meet in special session no later than April to receive the Committee's report, and we are meeting here today for that purpose.

7. The United States today categorically reaffirms its support of this resolution and all that we have said in this Assembly in support of it.

8. The Ad Hoc Committee contained, among its fourteen members, a fair and representative cross section of the entire membership of the United Nations. The United States served as a member. I should like to express our appreciation to those who participated in its work—particularly to Ambassador Jakobson of Finland, its wise and impartial Chairman; its Vice-Chairman, Ambassador Piñera Carvallo of Chile; its Rapporteur, Mr. Wodajo of Ethiopia; and indeed to all of its members who, by their serious approach and by their willingness to consider all suggestions, helped the Committee in its difficult assignment. I also wish to acknowledge the indispensable support of the Secretariat, which performed with its customary efficiency.

9. The Committee's report [A/6640] is now before us. There have been expressions of regret that the Committee was not able to unite on a single recommendation concerning the "practical means" to be adopted. Such unanimity would indeed have been most desirable. Nevertheless, the Committee has performed a most useful and necessary function in presenting to the General Assembly the various alternative proposals which its report contains.

10. I agree entirely with our Chairman, Ambassador Jakobson, that it would serve no good purpose to gloss over the differences among these proposals. It will be a test of our statesmanship in this Assembly to find ways to maintain the vital unity of action that we achieved in our original resolution.

11. The United States, which joined in one of these three proposals in the Committee, fully understands and respects the motives of the sponsors of the other proposals. But I wish to state the reasons which impelled my country to join Italy and Canada in the proposal which we submitted together [*ibid.*, para. 84].

12. It is important that all of us—whatever our differences as revealed in these various proposals—should remember what it is that unites us. We are united in our common purpose to bring self-determination, freedom and independence to the people of South West Africa in accordance with the Charter, and in our common dedication to the terms of resolution 2145 (XXI). That resolution is our anchor. The greatest disservice to that resolution, and to its effective implementation, would be for us to create an impression in South Africa and in the world that the United Nations is fundamentally divided on how these principles are to be achieved. The issue is not among ourselves—I repeat, the issue is not among ourselves—but between us and South Africa. Our objective in this debate should not be to score

debating points against each other; rather it should be to work together in the spirit of resolution 2145 (XXI), in order to find, in the words of that resolution,

"practical means by which South West Africa should be administered, so as to enable the people of the Territory to exercise the right of self-determination and to achieve independence".

13. Now, some may question whether it is possible for the Assembly to unite on an effective course of action. I see no reason to doubt that we can do so. Indeed, we must do so, for unless we are substantially united, our action cannot be effective. In our debate last October I said—and this can be said with equal relevance now—that to be effective on this issue we need more than world opinion voiced by words in a resolution; we need the co-operation of all, manifested in concrete action.

14. Last October we achieved such concrete action. Let no one underestimate the historic consequence of what we decided. After twenty years of wrestling with this problem of South West Africa, after many years of proceedings before the International Court of Justice, the United Nations, through resolution 2145 (XXI), took the decisive action of declaring South Africa's Mandate over the Territory terminated by its own default. We further decided that South West Africa now comes under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. These actions were unprecedented in the history of this Organization, just as the problem which gave rise to them was unprecedented.

15. When the General Assembly took that action, the United States strongly supported it, and we still do. We do not in any way retreat from that support. On the contrary, we are prepared to move forward in keeping with the commitment which I made in my statement of 12 October 1966, proposing

"...steps which can be immediately and practically implemented and which lie within the capacity of this Organization ... to provide the community of nations promptly with a considered blueprint for united and peaceful action for the benefit of the people of South West Africa". [1439th meeting, para. 77.]

16. Indeed, it is precisely such steps that the United States has sought to develop by joining with Canada and Italy in the three-Power proposal. Let me briefly sum up the terms of that proposal.

17. First, it reaffirms the decisions of resolution 2145 (XXI). Second, it recommends that the General Assembly, in this special session, appoint a special representative for South West Africa, on the nomination of the Secretary-General. Third, it recommends that the special session also appoint a United Nations council for South West Africa, made up of three or more members to be designated by yourself, Mr. President, with which the special representative will co-operate and to which he will report. Fourth, it sets out a concrete mandate for the special representative. He is to survey the situation; to establish all necessary contacts; and to consult with all representative elements in the territory, looking toward the establishment, as soon as possible, of a nucleus

of self-government in South West Africa. He is also to recommend the nature and amount of external assistance for the administration of the territory, and to determine the necessary conditions that will enable the people of that territory to achieve self-determination and independence. Fifth, and finally, it calls for a report by the special representative, to the twenty-second regular session of the General Assembly, in September 1967 on the progress made and on his recommendations for the further implementation of the Assembly's decisions.

18. These steps which we proposed together with the co-sponsors are practical and complete. In offering them, we propose not to delay nor to reconsider our commitment, but to carry it forward. We propose not to step backward from resolution 2145 (XXI), but to find ways within the capacity of the United Nations to put it into practical effect. Indeed, certain provisions of these joint proposals of Italy, Canada and the United States parallel, to a major degree, provisions of the other two proposals tabled in the Committee. It is, of course, also a fact not to be ignored that the other two proposals contemplate additional steps not embraced in ours. It is these additional steps that involve a real difference of view which must be frankly faced. Its essence, in our view, is simply this. We are convinced that the United Nations should, in present circumstances, continue to seek peaceful means to resolve this important problem which has been a source of international tension for decades. The other proposals, however, explicitly or implicitly and in varying degrees, look toward an immediate or early confrontation with South Africa.

19. Now let me state briefly why we believe our approach is to be preferred.

20. First, as I have already suggested, in all realism—and we must deal realistically with this subject—it would be too much to hope that this problem, which has been developing for nearly half a century and with which the United Nations itself has wrestled for twenty years, could be resolved in the few months since the General Assembly first took decisive action with respect to it.

21. Second, although the General Assembly has adopted a far-reaching policy, we have not yet—either individually or collectively—entered into any dialogue with South Africa in an effort to implement that policy. Although we have declared—and, in my view, properly declared—South Africa's rights under the Mandate in the territory to be terminated, it is still a fact, of which our distinguished Chairman, Ambassador Jakobson, correctly reminded us in his statement, that South Africa has possession of the territory.

22. In these circumstances, the Members of the United Nations would clearly be remiss if they did not seek through diplomatic dialogue a peaceful solution. I shall frankly add that I do not know—nobody can know until we engage in the exercise—whether such a dialogue would be fruitful. But I do know that public opinion in my country, and indeed in many parts of the world, would not understand a policy which seems ready to resort to immediate coercion rather than explore the possibilities of peaceful progress.

23. Third, the world is already suffering from too many confrontations. It would be a strange irony if the United Nations—whose highest aim is to resolve disputes and achieve justice by peaceful means, and to harmonize the actions of nations—should itself fail to pursue such means and, instead, add still another confrontation to a list already too long. What is needed now is not confrontation but consultation. We have no cause to imitate the conqueror Alexander, who, when challenged to solve the puzzle of the Gordian knot, took a sword and cut it through. In this day and age the United Nations should not be in a hurry to use the sword; rather, we must apply ourselves to the task of untying the knot.

24. There is no reason whatever to think that the proposed dialogue or consultation would go against the purposes of the United Nations. On the contrary, the aim of any such dialogue would be to achieve genuine self-determination—freedom and independence for the people of South West Africa, in accordance with the Charter—and their rapid advancement. To consult for this purpose is not to capitulate: it is to explore the ground over which we must move. And in this, as in every situation of conflict, I always bear in mind the famous admonition of President Kennedy in his great inaugural address. He said—and this is applicable to the present case and, I believe, to every conflict in international affairs: "Let us never negotiate out of fear; but let us never fear to negotiate".

25. Fourth, when we urge that progress be made with all reasonable speed, we do not thereby suggest or in any way condone indefinite delay. What we do suggest is that the next step we must take is one which employs the art of diplomacy—the "peaceful means" enjoined upon us by the Charter. One of our reservations about the other proposals is, in all frankness, that they appear either to shun a dialogue or to suggest in advance that any dialogue would end in failure. Our proposal does not assume either success or failure. We do maintain, however, that no one can know until it has been tried. We have a responsibility to history to try this next step, and to try it with all reasonable means at our disposal.

26. Fifth, we do not agree with the view expressed in this debate that would simply have the United Nations arbitrarily declare the Territory of South West Africa to be independent here and now, with no regard for the means by which that pretended independence is to be achieved, or for the welfare of the people involved. Such a course would be incompatible with, and indeed an irresponsible step backward from, our commitment under resolution 2145 (XXI). We have in that resolution declared South West Africa to be a responsibility of the United Nations, and that responsibility cannot and should not, in fidelity to the resolution, be disowned. To retreat from that commitment would be a betrayal of the interests of the people of South West Africa and would bring the United Nations into disrepute before the world.

27. For all those reasons, the United States believes that the proposal which we have joined with Italy and Canada in supporting is a sound approach. We do not suggest that in putting forward this pro-

posal we and our Italian and Canadian colleagues have spoken the last word on the subject; nor that the General Assembly, if it adopts this proposal, as we hope and trust it will, will have spoken the last word. But now is not a time for the last word to be spoken. Rather let the United Nations speak the next word—and let it speak with a united voice. It is of the utmost importance, in my view, that we continue to manifest our common determination to proceed with all the unanimity and effectiveness we can muster to achieve the objectives of resolution 2145 (XXI).

28. In this effort, speaking for the United States, I wish to assure this Assembly that we shall not for a moment forget the basic human issue involved. We continue to be guided by the view expressed by President Johnson last May that "domination of one race by another leads to waste and injustice. A nation in the twentieth century cannot expect to achieve order and sustain growth unless it moves—not just steadily but rapidly—in the direction of full political rights for all its peoples".

29. If this human principle is to be realized against the obstacles that confront us, we cannot always hope for immediate success. We must know how to persist and to tackle resolutely the problems that face us, every step of the way.

30. A celebrated philosopher, Salvador de Madariaga, once uttered a wise saying about the most effective form of human action, and I should like to conclude with his words:

"Our eyes must be idealistic and our feet realistic. We must walk in the right direction but we must walk step by step. Our tasks are to define what is desirable; to define what is possible at any time within the scope of what is desirable; and to carry out what is possible in the spirit of what is desirable."

31. Let the United Nations proceed to discharge its duty to South West Africa in that spirit—expeditiously, faithfully, peacefully, in the greatest unanimity, and step by step—until our humane, our sound, our rightful goal is attained.

32. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (translated from French): Mr. President, may I first of all convey my delegation's sincere congratulations and great pleasure at your overwhelming and unanimous reelection to the presidency of this Assembly.

33. After a lengthy monologue spanning two decades and the disappointment at the decision of the International Court of Justice of 18 July 1966<sup>1/</sup> the United Nations concentrated its attention on South West Africa and undertook a thorough re-examination of the problem. It is once again pressing forward. This problem was given priority at the twenty-first session, which culminated in a historic decision: the revocation of the Mandate and the assumption by the United Nations of direct responsibility for South West Africa in order to guide the Territory towards independence.

34. Although self-evident, the formulation and definition of that responsibility gave rise to controversy

<sup>1/</sup> South West Africa, Second Phase, Judgement, I.C.J. Reports 1966, p. 6.

during the debates of the twenty-first session. That discussion led to the inclusion of paragraph 6 in the resolution finally adopted [resolution 2145 (XXI)]. The Algerian delegation abstained from voting on that paragraph because it was convinced that the difficulties raised had no connexion with the problem itself but related to other questions of particular concern to certain States. It was plain that the contradictions inherent in certain attitudes would not be eliminated by the creation of a committee. Today, alas, the report submitted by that committee to the General Assembly [A/6640] confirms that view. Despite the good intentions of the great majority of delegations on the Committee, those contradictions prevented a solution from being reached.

35. What, then, is our task? It is to recommend practical—and not, as some would wish, expedient—arrangements for the administration of South West Africa such as would enable the people of the Territory to exercise their right of self-determination and achieve independence.

36. The transfer of the Mandate to the United Nations carries with it the responsibility of ensuring that South West Africa passes from international trusteeship to international sovereignty. This is the principal aim of resolution 2145 (XXI). To achieve it, the United Nations must take over the administration of the Territory—there is no other way. There can be no question of the United Nations simply replacing South Africa in exercising an anachronistic trusteeship.

37. My delegation wishes to reaffirm that it considers the administration of South West Africa by the United Nations as a transitional phase preceding independence. The same is true of every colonial territory. It is not a matter of replacing the trusteeship of South Africa by that of the United Nations, since the very idea of trusteeship is a vestige of the past and reflects the philosophy of the Berlin Congress rather than one based on the principles of equality and freedom, those corner-stones of the United Nations Charter. It is reminiscent of outrageous notion of mature and immature races, and so we reject it as obsolete and contrary to the aims and aspirations of the United Nations.

38. Although it was originally under mandate and its administration had been entrusted to authorities which built up racial segregation into a political system, the Territory was and is still exploited by a minority imposed on it by Pretoria. By trying out their policy of racial segregation, robbing the Territory of its resources and exploiting its people, the South African authorities have prided themselves on administering it in accordance with the principles of the Mandate. It is well known, however, that Pretoria's sole aim was to annex the Territory. This ambition, which dates back to the time of the Boer Republics, was expressed in their slogan: "Then it shall be from Simonberg to the Zambesi, Africa for the Afrikaners". The realization of that ambition means the continuation of colonialist domination in South Africa. Unless the Territory is annexed and its people subjugated, the South African stronghold would be threatened and the exploitation of southern Africa jeopardized. Whence the need for the South African authorities to dominate

South West Africa and to make of it a rampart and a shield against popular demands. These designs, coupled with the strategic position of South West Africa, determined its true status. From being internationally administered, South West Africa has moved towards a classic colonial status. There can be no doubt of that. The true situation in South West Africa must be viewed in the context of decolonization.

39. We feel that the legal context in which this problem is presented should not blind us to its true nature. The people of South West Africa have the right to accede to full sovereignty. Our action should not stop short of that end, although some steps must be taken to meet the exigencies of the moment.

40. First, South Africa's hold over this Territory is such that the people of South West Africa cannot regain their freedom without risking a conflict which would have serious consequences. Our first aim should be to eliminate any possibility of confrontation. We must therefore endeavour to restore their political rights to the people of South West Africa. This will require the withdrawal of South African forces and the provisional assumption of the administration of the Territory until such time as the danger is past. Being aware of the intransigence of the South African authorities, we must not ignore the threat of annexation. All the necessary conditions are there for carrying out that plan and presenting us with a fait accompli: a large police force, military bases, the policy of apartheid and the exploitation of the Territory's resources. We must safeguard the integrity of the Territory. Hence we reject the "nucleus of self-government" in Ovamboland. That experiment is aimed at the partition of South West Africa. It is nothing new; South Africa has made a number of similar attempts in the past.

41. Secondly, we are in duty bound to scrutinize the political context of southern Africa and its possible effects on the future of South West Africa. This region has become one of the trouble spots of the world. The threat of conflict between the independent African States and the Pretoria, Salisbury and Lisbon régimes grows daily.

42. These facts demonstrate the need for a transitional period before independence. Consequently, we must examine closely what that responsibility implies and how it is to be discharged. We must, to begin with, accept the principle of the administration of a territory by the United Nations. Regarding the principle itself there can no longer be any doubt. First, Article 81 of the Charter recognizes the competence of the United Nations in that respect; secondly, the majority of Member States confirmed that prerogative of the Organization at the first session particularly during the work of the Fourth Committee, at the third session, mainly in the First Committee.

43. Having accepted this principle, we must assess its scope of application. To do that, we need but recall certain precedents. Moreover, the experience of the League of Nations with regard to the Saar, for example, could give us useful guidance. It is worth recalling that the League directly—and successfully—administered the Saar over a number of years.

44. The machinery set up by the League of Nations consisted of an administrative council called the "Saar Basin Governing Commission". It was composed of five members of whom one, the Chairman, acted in an executive capacity. The Commission had administrative and legislative powers and reported directly to the League of Nations Council. Its task was to bring about conditions which would enable the population to decide on its future. After several years of administration, that task was successfully accomplished. The point illustrated by this example is that an international organization, the League of Nations, directly administered a territory and with good results. Acting through one of its organs, it enabled the population of the Saar to decide its own future.

45. If we examine the machinery proposed by the African and Asian States, we shall see that in many respects it is identical with that set up for the Saar. What was achieved by the League of Nations would seem, *a fortiori*, attainable for the United Nations. The latter, in contrast to the League of Nations and despite its various failures and crises, enjoys great moral and material authority both because it is quasi-universal and because its Members, in the words of the preamble of the Charter, are determined to "establish conditions under which justice ... can be maintained".

46. Therefore we are justified in looking into the reasons of those who question whether the machinery envisaged by the representatives of the Third World would work. Indeed the workability of any machinery of this kind cannot be judged until it is set in motion. Moreover, some of us seem to be admitting *a priori* that the United Nations' will to achieve justice can be seriously shaken; that, on the other hand, South Africa's desire for domination can be strengthened and that, finally, it would be better for the United Nations to avoid putting itself to the test.

47. Thus, a debate on the practical worth of certain specific proposals would appear to disguise a desire to prevent the Organization from committing itself unreservedly and fully assuming its obligations under resolution 2145 (XXI).

48. This is a legitimate concern on the part of some Members. They hope to prevent a situation which would reveal the glaring contradiction between their relations with South Africa and their commitments to the United Nations.

49. This concern is shown in a proposal which seems to run counter to paragraph 6 of resolution 2145 (XXI), although the sponsors of that proposal accepted it. Paragraph 6, I need scarcely recall, states explicitly that the members of the Committee shall recommend practical means by which South West Africa should be administered.

50. The delegations of Canada, Italy and the United States have proposed a provision [A/6640, paragraph 84] calling for the appointment of a Special Representative of the United Nations and of a United Nations Council for South West Africa. Their mandate would be to survey the human and material resources of the Territory and to establish the necessary contacts to determine under what conditions South West Africa can accede to independence.

51. One comment is called for here: paragraph 6 of resolution 2145 (XXI), under which the *Ad Hoc* Committee was established, laid down the latter's precise terms of reference, which were to recommend practical means for the administration of the Territory. I should like to stress the fact that the recommendations must deal with the administration of the Territory. The formula proposed by the three western delegations, however, departing from the spirit and letter of paragraph 6, suggests certain measures which, in our opinion, have nothing to do with the administration of the Territory in either the immediate or the distant future. In fact, those measures allow South Africa not only to continue its domination, but even to reinforce it. This proposal is not in accordance with the spirit of paragraph 6 because it is a delaying tactic; if not in principle, at least in effect. There is no need to repeat here that none of the Powers having economic or other relations with South Africa wish to endanger their economic interests by United Nations action.

52. The Algerian delegation wishes to pay a tribute to the delegations of Chile and Mexico, representing the Latin American countries, which have adopted a constructive and consistent attitude and abided by the mandate of the *Ad Hoc* Committee. The Latin American States, which sponsored the amendments now appearing as paragraph 6 of resolution 2145 (XXI), have suggested a method for the administration of South West Africa [*ibid.*, para. 93]. Their view largely coincides with that of the African and Asian States [*ibid.*, paras. 45 and 82]: they propose an administrative council with specific powers. It is true that there are some divergencies with regard to measures for implementation. The Latin American delegations while advocating a dialogue, exclude the possibility of recourse to coercive measures if South Africa should refuse to abide by the decisions of the General Assembly.

53. In the case that is before us, can it be said that the Pretoria authorities have shown any proof of goodwill? Is it considered that they share the hopes of the international community and are working to make them come true? We do not think so. How then can we conceive of a dialogue with Pretoria? For the last twenty years the United Nations has been urging it to abide by universally accepted standards, and seeking to initiate a dialogue and to bring about understanding.

54. In reply, Pretoria has pursued its policy of oppression and has scorned the resolutions of the United Nations. Faced with this situation, we have no right to hesitate any longer. Like others, this conflict is such that it cannot be peacefully resolved.

55. The African and Asian States have proposed a solution which, we believe, answers the main requirements of the problem. Bearing in mind the situation in the Territory of South West Africa and in southern Africa, these States, avoiding precipitate action, have proposed a transitional period between the revocation of the Mandate over South West Africa and independence. However, they feel that this period should be used to prepare the groundwork for genuine independence. This explains the proposal regarding administrative machinery, with which the Latin Ameri-

can States concur. It is the reason why the African and Asian States seek to guarantee the normal functioning of this administrative machinery by taking preventative measures against South African designs. It is the duty not only of some States, but of all States, to set in motion the process whereby South West Africa will attain independence and to guarantee its sovereignty and territorial integrity. This is a joint responsibility in which we must all share. It is the price we must pay in order to continue the work of decolonization to which the United Nations has made such a substantial contribution.

56. If we do not take a clear stand we shall be casting doubt upon the aims of our Organization. The United Nations, as we know, is already suffering from a lack of confidence, which may become even more pronounced. It must help the people of South West Africa to achieve freedom and sovereignty.

57. By adopting the proposals of the African and Asian States, the United Nations will make a rational and effective contribution towards the realization of the wishes of the South West African people and of the international community.

58. The solution to this problem lies within the reach of the United Nations, provided that all its Members work hand in hand in discharging their responsibility. This is a test which the international community has already undergone and from which it has emerged victorious in other regions of the world. International public opinion cannot but be concerned that the world Organization should find itself in a vulnerable position whenever it is called upon to deal out justice to a people of the Third World.

59. Mr. WALCOTT (Barbados): Mr. President, I should like, first of all, to associate the delegation of Barbados with the congratulations which previous speakers have showered upon you on your election as President of the General Assembly at its fifth special session. I myself was fortunate enough to be present at meetings of the twenty-first session and to see in action the tact, wisdom and authority which you brought to your high office. It is a matter of deep gratification to my delegation that you should again be seated in the Presidential chair for this profoundly important special session.

60. During the twenty-first session, the General Assembly adopted, by an overwhelming majority, its now historic resolution 2145 (XXI). At that time, Barbados had not yet acceded to independence and so was not represented in this Assembly. Let me, therefore, go on record here as stating that my delegation would most certainly have voted in favour of that resolution. That is not merely a formal statement. It is meant to emphasize and underline the fundamental position of my delegation and of the Government I represent. For what was an issue when the plenipotentiaries of 121 nations were called upon to register their vote on 27 October 1966 is a matter that goes to the root of the very existence of the United Nations and thus to the root of the whole concept of sovereignty and nationhood.

61. Stripped of the gratuitous and ambivalent legal niceties with which certain interested parties have

attempted to surround it, the question of South West Africa reduces itself to this: the United Nations must decide whether this Organization is going to stand idly by and permit half a million Africans to be swallowed by the vicious and corrupt monster of apartheid. As we understand it, the General Assembly, in its October resolution said "no". That, too, is what the Government and people of Barbados say.

62. When we turn to the report of the Ad Hoc Committee for South West Africa [A/6640], I must confess to some disappointment at the evasive and dilatory approach which has been taken by one group in the Committee. The General Assembly, in overwhelming majority, asked the Committee to bring to this special session recommendations on practical means by which South West Africa should be administered; this group offers us recommendations for surveys, for consultations.

63. I think that, since 1945, we have had time enough to study, consult and survey. These nations are nations which voted with the majority on 27 October 1966 in support of the decision that South West Africa should come henceforth "under the direct responsibility of the United Nations". But nowhere in their proposals can we find any indication that they envisage the practical means of administering the territory which the Committee was called upon to recommend. We are offered a special representative and a council which, as far as we can see, will go nowhere near South West Africa, and will do nothing to discharge the direct responsibility of the United Nations, of which resolution 2145 (XXI) speaks so unambiguously.

64. The proposals of the Latin American and African representatives come closer to fulfilling the Mandate which the Committee received from the General Assembly. There are, admittedly, differences between the two proposals; but what they have in common is fundamental. Both proposals envisage the installation of a United Nations presence in South West Africa to administer the Territory in the interval before full independence. Both proposals not only recognize the right of the people of South West Africa to self-determination and independence but recommend practical means by which they may in fact accede to that self-determination and independence.

65. The Barbados delegation has no illusions about what all this implies. We know that the South African régime has pledged itself to defy the decisions of the United Nations. We know, too, why some nations are hesitant, evasive and tentative in their proposals. They claim to be afraid of "confrontation" with South Africa. We hear about the need for what is called "proper timing". We hear about the danger that the reputation and effectiveness of the United Nations may be damaged. It is not support for the freedom and self-determination of dependent peoples that can damage the reputation and effectiveness of this Organization. We cannot damage the reputation and effectiveness of this Organization by liberating the defenceless people of South West Africa from the shadow of apartheid. But we shall damage this Organization irreparably if we show to the peoples of the world that it offers them no protection against injustice, that it dances only when certain nations call the tune and cringes when certain nations crack the whip.

66. We cannot go on evading our responsibility. For once, on a major issue involving the fate of the oppressed and exploited, we have had a consensus of the vast majority of the independent nations of the world. That consensus declares that South Africa has forfeited its right to carry out the Mandate over South West Africa which it received from the League of Nations. That consensus declares that the United Nations is the proper body to exercise the "sacred trust" of leading the people of South West Africa to independence. The nations of Latin America do not falter before this responsibility. The nations of Africa do not falter before this responsibility. The nations of Asia do not falter before this responsibility. What is holding us back, then? It is the proclaimed reluctance of certain nations to "intervene"; it is their fear of what they call confrontation. These nations were not afraid of intervention at the time of the Suez Canal crisis; they were not afraid of intervention in Viet-Nam; they were not afraid of intervention in the Dominican Republic. They did not wait then for a United Nations resolution; they did not fear then that the effectiveness and reputation of the Organization might be impaired.

67. The overwhelming majority of the Members of this Organization are calling for the liberation of the people of South West Africa. If the Organization cannot take action when it has the nearly unanimous support of its membership, then its effectiveness is no more than a myth and it deserves to have no reputation at all.

68. Mr. P. V. J. SOLOMON (Trinidad and Tobago): There can be no doubt in anyone's mind about what is required to be done by this special session of the General Assembly. Equally there can be no doubt as to what we are not required to do. The Assembly has passed by an overwhelming majority a resolution concerning the future of South West Africa and I agree entirely with the representative of Ethiopia that we are not here to reopen discussion on the merits or demerits of South Africa's case in relation to the South West African Mandate. Neither is it arguable that the United Nations is solely and entirely responsible for the administration of South West Africa. What we are here to discuss is the procedure to be adopted in implementing the decision of the General Assembly at its twenty-first session.

69. The report of the Special Committee indicates that three draft resolutions are under consideration and while they agree on several material points there are important differences of detail. My delegation extends sincere congratulations to the sponsors of the African-Pakistan proposal [A/6640, paras. 45 and 82] on the clear and unambiguous terms in which they have set forth the needs of the situation. As a member of the Latin American group my delegation also notes with pleasure the substantial agreement between the proposal of Chile and Mexico [*ibid.*, para. 93] and that of the African-Pakistan group. I am extremely hopeful that the statesmanlike and co-operative attitudes already displayed by members of both groups will soon result in bridging the very narrow gap which now exists between the two proposals. This is vital if effective action is to be taken to solve this problem.

70. The Assembly is convened in special session for the purpose, *inter alia*, of discussing South West Africa. We must, therefore, assume that all Members are aware of the urgency of this problem and are determined once and for all to take some concrete action and not to fritter away our time in idle debate which arrives at no conclusion. Unless we are prepared to take action now, then we might just as well discontinue this debate, for we shall be doing nothing more than wasting our time and sorely trying the patience and the forbearance of the people who look to us for assistance in their hour of need. If we fail once again in this issue we shall have given one more blow—and quite possibly the fatal blow—to the principles which underlie our Charter, a blow which might very well result in the dissolution of this Organization which has lasted through twenty-one years of groping and fumbling and of insult and frustration.

71. In the view of my delegation, the issues are clear and unambiguous. The Assembly has decided that South Africa's Mandate has been terminated and from there on full responsibility for the future of South West Africa rests with the United Nations. In order that we shall be able to discharge this obligation it is imperative that we take immediate steps to establish a United Nations presence in South West Africa. Whether you call it a committee or a council is, as my friend from Saudi Arabia mentioned [1503rd meeting], unimportant. What is necessary is an administering authority created by this body to control the affairs of South West Africa and to give the people of that country an opportunity to exercise their inalienable right of self-determination. It is possible to discuss the administrative details, but there is no room for discussion of whether or not a United Nations presence is necessary. The General Assembly resolution made it the unavoidable responsibility of the General Assembly to set up machinery and make provision for the transfer of authority from South Africa to the people of South West Africa themselves. There can be no argument on this point. The South African presence must immediately be eliminated from the administration of South West Africa and the power it now exercises must, as soon as possible, be transferred to the people of South West Africa.

72. Even at this stage I would be reluctant to accept that those who desire to continue a dialogue with South Africa are altogether wasting their time. Let it never be said that it was we who closed the door to peaceful negotiation. But while we continue the dialogue it must be made abundantly clear that we are discussing only the time-table for the transfer, and that there must be a time-limit—and a very short one at that—for the termination of the dialogue. If no agreement has been reached within the specified time-limit, then the United Nations administering body must take action. Moreover, let it be clearly understood that the right of the United Nations administering authority to enter South West Africa is not to be the subject of discussion with the Government of South Africa. The admission of this body, the United Nations presence, into South West Africa, without let or hindrance, should be a condition precedent to the engagement of any dialogue. We cannot accept any smaller token that the South African Government does

not intend to use this dialogue as a further opportunity for dishonest procrastination.

73. If a decision is taken by this Assembly and steps are taken to implement that decision, then clearly any State or group of States which is deliberately obstructing or physically opposing the implementation of that decision is committing an act of aggression, not against South West Africa, but against the United Nations itself, and therefore I must agree again with the realistic approach of the representative of Ethiopia who maintains [1503rd meeting], that provision must be made for such an eventuality.

74. There are some who feel that this is not the stage to talk about enforcement action; that in fact we should wait and see; but the twenty-year history of the relationship between this body and the racist Government of South Africa is all the evidence we need that goodwill is lacking on the part of South Africa; and while we may merely hope that, at long last, a spirit of sweet reasonableness will prevail, too great optimism on this point can be almost criminal folly, and consequently we must prepare now for the possibility, indeed the likelihood, that South Africa will refuse to co-operate and prepare the machinery necessary to enforce the decisions of the General Assembly.

75. Unlike my friend from Ethiopia, I do not believe that this is an occasion for the use of economic sanctions. Even a complete economic boycott of South Africa—and this we know is well-nigh impossible—will take a long time to bring those brutal and arrogant people to their knees. The people of South West Africa cannot wait that long. What is necessary now is a firm decision to make forcible entry into South West Africa if the South African Government should repeat its defiant tactics of 1960 and have armed patrols on the border with a view to forbidding the entry of United Nations personnel.

76. Once a United Nations presence has been firmly established in South West Africa, urgent steps will be needed to repair the ravages of the South African administration. Again, I agree whole-heartedly with the representative of Ethiopia, who maintains that every people is entitled immediately to independence if they so desire; and if it should be ascertained by the proper means that that is the desire of the people of South West Africa, it would be our duty and pleasure

to make the necessary arrangements towards that end. But we must face the fact, nonetheless, that the system of apartheid is a hindrance rather than a help to any people desiring to exercise their right of self-determination. During the oppressive years of the South African administration the native peoples of South West Africa have been forcibly deprived of any opportunity to share in the administration of their country and have been afforded little opportunity to acquire the skills, the technology and the professional education so valuable in the modern world to any independent State. And so, whatever may be the decision of the people of South West Africa regarding the date of their independence, it should be made clear that the United Nations has a great and urgent responsibility to provide them with technical assistance on a massive and unprecedented scale to make up in some small part for the years that have been lost.

77. There is one further responsibility which we have and cannot shirk, and it is the responsibility to maintain and protect by every available means the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of South West Africa once that country has gained its freedom.

78. This is the challenge that faces us; this is the obligation that we must accept if we are to discharge our duties to humanity. This is the action that we must take if we are to regain, in the eyes of the world, a little of the self-respect which we have been steadily losing as a result of our failure to discipline an impertinent and recalcitrant Member. There are some who say what we propose, what we seek, is impracticable. I pour scorn on such a defeatist attitude. If what we seek is just and if it is necessary, then we must make it practicable. We have found strength and resources for lesser causes. There is no single issue before the world today more important either for the preservation of peace or for the dignity of mankind.

79. The PRESIDENT: Before adjourning the meeting I wish to suggest that the list of speakers be closed at 3 o'clock on Friday afternoon, 28 April.

*It was so decided.*

80. I would inform the Members of the General Assembly that, with their co-operation, we may be able to conclude the general debate on this item with the afternoon meeting on Wednesday, 3 May.

*The meeting rose at 12.5 p.m.*