



Monday, 11 December 1967,  
 at 10.30 a.m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

**Agenda item 64:**

Page

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

(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 South West Africa;

(c) Appointment of the United Nations Commissioner for South West Africa. . . . .

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 (continued) . . . . .

11

**President:** Mr. Corneliu MANESCU (Romania).

**AGENDA ITEM 64**

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

(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 South West Africa;

(c) Appointment of the United Nations Commissioner for South West Africa

1. Mr. CLARK (Nigeria): It is now over a year since the General Assembly adopted by an overwhelming majority resolution 2145 (XXI) under which the United Nations terminated the Mandate conferred upon His Britannic Majesty to be exercised on his behalf by the Government of the Union of South Africa and thereby assumed direct responsibility for the Territory of South West Africa. It is also now more than six months since the General Assembly established under its resolution 2248 (S-V) the United Nations Council for South West Africa and charged it with the task of administering the Territory on its behalf. By its report of 10 November 1967 [A/6897], the United Nations Council for South West Africa has demonstrated the fact of its legitimate existence and its willingness to perform the functions and responsibilities entrusted to it.

\*Resumed from the 1620th meeting.

2. The discussions leading to the establishment of the United Nations Council for South West Africa were conducted in a spirit of compromise and co-operation. The views that were expressed were varied and, in some cases, contradictory, but happily none of them seriously challenged the validity of resolution 2145 (XXI). It is important that this fact be recorded and emphasized. The General Assembly, having terminated the Mandate of South Africa over the Territory of South West Africa, enjoined South Africa not to continue to administer it thenceforth.

3. It was on this clear understanding that the issues underlying resolution 2248 (S-V) were considered. Two of these are worth recalling. The first was that the United Nations Council for South West Africa could not discharge its functions and responsibilities effectively until after the South African authorities had withdrawn from the Territory. This condition has not been fulfilled so far. The Government of South Africa has continued to exercise its pernicious rule over the Territory in flagrant and defiant violation of resolution 2125 (XXI).

4. The second point to remember was the plea of our Latin American friends that the Council, after its establishment, should follow the due process of law by entering immediately into contact with the authorities of South West Africa in order to lay down procedures for the transfer of the administration of the Territory to the Council.

5. As its report before the General Assembly shows, the Council sent a letter dated 28 August 1967 [*ibid.*, annex I] to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of South Africa in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) and in compliance with the terms of section IV, paragraph 2, of resolution 2248 (S-V). The Council, as a duly constituted organ of the United Nations, is entitled to some show of courtesy from the South African authorities. But as the report of the Council again shows, the South African authorities did not consider it necessary to communicate with the Council. They only sent an indirect reply to the Council's letter through some communications to the Secretary-General dated 26 September [*ibid.*, annex II].

6. The sole objective of both resolution 2145 (XXI) and resolution 2248 (S-V) is the exercise, within the meaning of the well-known resolution 1514 (XV), of self-determination and the achievement of freedom and independence without undue delay by the people of South West Africa. It was to this end, and this end only, that the Council for South West Africa was established. The Council must therefore now be put in a position to discharge fully its functions and responsibilities towards South West Africa.

7. The negative and frankly arrogant attitude of the Government of South Africa to resolutions of the United Nations in general, and to the purposes of the United Nations Council for South West Africa in particular, has made it impossible for the Council to perform its administrative task in the Territory. In fact, it is true to say that this unfortunate contingency was foreseen by some of us during the fifth special session. Those of us who did had suggested in anticipation at the time that appropriate measures should be considered to meet the probable violations of resolution 2145 (XXI) by the Government of South Africa. But against our judgment, we allowed ourselves to be persuaded and to hope that with the whole-hearted co-operation of all Member States and with the Security Council taking appropriate measures to enable the United Nations Council for South West Africa to discharge its functions and responsibilities, as envisaged by both resolutions, the purposes of resolution 2145 (XXI) and resolution 2248 (S-V) would be attained before June 1968. But what is the situation today?

8. The United Nations Council for South West Africa is unable to function effectively. The illegal administration of South West Africa by South Africa has continued. The corporate will and resolutions of the United Nations are being defied, rejected and held in abject contempt by South Africa. The sorry plight of the people of South Africa, groaning under the yoke of their racist oppressors, remains unalleviated. Referring to this sad situation, the Commissioner for External Affairs of Nigeria, Mr. Arikpo, in his contribution to the general debate of the current session, said:

"To emphasize its contempt of the United Nations, South Africa has gone ahead to integrate South West Africa into itself; it has gone ahead to export more and more into that Territory those policies of apartheid and 'Bantustanism' which this Organization has unequivocally condemned; and it is now conducting a mock trial of thirty South West African nationalists whose only crime is that they support the decision of our Organization. How much longer is the United Nations going to tolerate this state of affairs?" [1586th meeting, para. 146.]

9. With your permission, Mr. President, I should like to ask the same question. How much longer is the United Nations going to tolerate the illegal and inhuman acts of South Africa in South West Africa? I do not think that this is the right moment to make a case for the termination of the administration of South Africa over South West Africa. Such a case, already made in extenso, was concluded a long time ago, even before the adoption of resolution 2145 (XXI) last year. What we should ask ourselves now is whether or not the continued presence of South Africa subsequent to the adoption of resolution 2145 (XXI) is legal; whether or not the rejection by South Africa of resolution 2248 (S-V) frustrates or obstructs the discharge by the United Nations of its direct responsibility for South West Africa; whether or not the current events and happenings in South West Africa, including the shamefully illegal trials of thirty-seven South West Africans, one of whom has since died in the hands of his racist tormentors, are compatible with the spirit and letter of resolution 2145 (XXI);

whether or not it is too much for the people of South West Africa, nay the people of Africa, to expect justice and fair play from the United Nations in the light of resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V).

10. It is painful to learn that a spokesman of the Government of South Africa said on 3 November 1966 that South West Africa would remain an integral part of the Republic of South Africa and that South Africa would never allow it to be taken away from it. This was after the adoption of resolution 2145 (XXI) on 27 October 1966.

11. What was the reaction of the United Nations to this statement of vibrant defiance of its authority? The United Nations continues to sit back in apparent indifference and impotence, while South Africa arms itself to the teeth to suppress the legitimate aims and aspirations of the people of South West Africa under its prescriptive administration; the United Nations continues to watch inactively while South Africa exports its nefarious and fascist laws to the Territory of South West Africa, which is now a direct responsibility of the United Nations, to terrorize its indigenous inhabitants. In utter dismay, we watch the South African authorities implementing the obnoxious recommendations of the Odendaal Commission, contrary to paragraph 7 of resolution 2145 (XXI), thereby partitioning the Territory in their mindless pursuit of apartheid and "Bantustanism".

12. In the view of my delegation, this session of the General Assembly must do three things. First, it must call upon the authorities of South Africa to release unconditionally and forthwith the thirty-six South West Africans at present on trial in Pretoria. Second, it should now request the Security Council, in accordance with both resolution 2145 (XXI) and resolution 2248 (S-V), to enable the United Nations Council for South West Africa to perform in full the duties and responsibilities assigned to it. Thirdly, it must make a determined effort to demonstrate to South Africa that its rights of membership of the United Nations also carry corresponding obligations in respect of the acts of the Organization.

13. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): At its last regular session, this Assembly concluded with near unanimity that South Africa, by its pursuance of policies contrary to the interests of the people of South West Africa and the principles of the Mandate and the Charter, had in effect disavowed its Mandate to administer that Territory. The Assembly decided that the Mandate was therefore terminated and the United Nations would henceforth exercise direct responsibility for the Territory.

14. My delegation participated actively in the preparation of resolution 2145 (XXI), reflecting that decision. It was our considered view that the Government of South Africa, by its introduction and implementation of the racial policy of apartheid, and by its refusal to accept supervision by the United Nations, had proved itself to be an unacceptable administrator of the Territory. This view was reinforced by South Africa's long history of failing to pay regard to the inalienable right of the people of South West Africa as a whole to self-determination. We voted for resolution 2145 (XXI) last year and we continue to support it today.

15. Having assumed responsibility for the Territory, the Assembly was required to decide how best to discharge its undertaking to bring self-determination, freedom and independence to the people of South West Africa. Throughout the search for a plan of action, my delegation was constantly guided by two considerations: the interests of the people of South West Africa and the capacities of the United Nations. Resolution 2145 (XXI) had rightly stressed the need to find what it called practical means to administer the Territory and bring it to self-determination and independence. Various alternatives were open to consideration by the Assembly, including administration by a State, by a group of States, by the United Nations directly or through a representative, by the Organization of African Unity, or by some combination of these. There were various possibilities for exercising United Nations supervisory responsibility, such as the General Assembly itself, the Security Council, the Trusteeship Council, the Secretary-General, or a corporate body set up for the purpose.

16. For the United Nations to establish what steps might most effectively help the people of South West Africa attain its self-determination, it seemed to my delegation essential to obtain access to the Territory and to make contact with its representatives in order to learn their wishes, to establish communications with them. This in turn necessitated conducting a dialogue with the de facto administration. At the same time my delegation believed that if they were to be effectively implemented the means decided on by the Assembly would have to have overwhelming support, including that of all the permanent members of the Security Council. This is still the approach favoured by the Canadian delegation.

17. It was against these criteria that, at the fifth special session, my delegation gave its careful consideration to the seventy-nine Power proposal for the direct and immediate administration of the Territory by the United Nations, and we were forced to conclude that the proposed United Nations Council for South West Africa would not, within the terms of its Mandate, be in a position to contribute significantly to a solution of the problems. Accordingly, my delegation was not among those which felt able to support resolution 2248 (S-V).

18. The General Assembly now has before it the report of the United Nations Council for South West Africa [A/6897]. The Council has not — as could have been foreseen — been able to carry out the task which was given to it, and has reported that in the circumstances it has found it impossible to discharge the functions and responsibilities entrusted to it by this Assembly. Annexed to the report is a letter addressed to the Secretary-General by the South African Foreign Minister [*ibid.*, annex II]. My delegation regrets that in that letter the South African Government, while professing that South Africa's objective in South West Africa remains self-determination, did not seize the opportunity to offer to co-operate with the United Nations in this respect.

19. My delegation moreover is concerned by a number of recent developments in South African policy towards South West Africa. In March the South African Government announced that it proposed to establish

a so-called "homeland" for the Ovambo people in South West Africa. Now both the Ad Hoc Committee for South West Africa and the Committee of Twenty-Four endorsed the view that the proposals of the South African Government were contrary to General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) and were therefore illegal. Nevertheless, the South African Government has not only taken further action regarding Ovamboland but has also stated that it is to introduce a similar so-called "homeland" plan for the Herero people. My Government is disturbed by the implication of these steps for the territorial integrity of South West Africa; it is also concerned by the reports of the perfunctory manner in which the Hereros themselves were told of this decision, which is difficult to reconcile with South Africa's proclaimed objective of self-determination.

20. My delegation is also concerned by the announcement made by the Prime Minister of South Africa that major constitutional changes affecting the status of South West Africa would be introduced by the South African Government in the South African Parliament as soon as possible. This intention of the South African Government does not seem to accord with its own stated position that it does not deny the international character of the Territory.

21. In this connexion, my delegation would like to reiterate the statement made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada in the general debate when he said that the Canadian Government would "consider invalid any attempt by South Africa to take action which would have the effect of dividing the Territory into smaller parts or of incorporating [South West Africa] into South Africa." [1569th meeting, para. 94.]

22. The third development which causes immediate and grave concern to my delegation is of course the detention and trial in Pretoria of thirty-six South West Africans, to which reference has been made by the preceding speakers. Members of the United Nations are justified in asking why are these people on trial in Pretoria and what manner of justice is being dispensed. The United Nations Council for South West Africa and Committee of Twenty-Four have both issued appeals for the release of these prisoners. My delegation has studied with dismay the Terrorism Act under which they are being tried. In particular, we are disturbed by the fact that the Act is retroactive, that it is vague in describing the offences it covers and that it places the onus of proving innocence on the accused. These provisions of the Act represent, prima facie, a deplorable denial of fundamental rights. This Act is clearly contrary, in letter and spirit, in our view, to the legal tradition which South Africa claims to share with a large number of States represented in this Assembly. The extension of this South African law to South West Africa is merely one more indication, if one were needed, that the South African Government is not qualified to act as trustee of the interests of the people of South West Africa, with a proper regard for the stake that the international community has in this issue.

23. In the light of these developments and the continued intransigence of the South African Government, the question arises as to what further action the

United Nations can now usefully take. My delegation continues to hold the view that the resolution [2248 (S-V)] approved by the fifth special session of the Assembly was not the most effective or practical action that the United Nations could take.

24. We continue to hold the view with regard to the administration of the Territory that the United Nations General Assembly must take practical political considerations into account and adopt a realistic approach which has a chance of giving the international community a really effective role in bringing the South West African people to self-determination and independence. We continue to believe that in its search for a solution the Assembly must keep paramount both the interests of the people of South West Africa themselves and the interests of the United Nations, and we must at all times take into account in whatever we do the capacities and resources of our Organization. We believe in the importance of establishing effective contact between the United Nations and the people and administration of South West Africa. Pending a solution to the problem as a whole, it seems to my delegation also that we should not overlook intermediate steps which will help pave the way to self-government for the people of South West Africa. It is with this consideration in mind that my Government has decided to make available a number of scholar to the United Nations education and training programme for South West Africa.

25. It seems to me we should also seek the maximum of common ground in mobilizing public opinion on this issue in this great world forum. I venture to suggest that it is apparent from the reports of the Committee of Twenty-Four and of the Council for South West Africa that there is almost unanimous agreement on the unacceptability of the so-called "Homelands proposal"; there is almost unanimous grave concern, too, about the trial of South West Africans in Pretoria; and I believe that there would also be unanimous disapproval of further constitutional changes which would have the effect of integrating South West Africa even more closely with South Africa. I would hope, therefore, that even though there may be difficulty in agreeing on further United Nations action, some way will be found of giving voice to the almost unanimous weight of opinion of the world community on the future destiny of South West Africa in the manner I have suggested.

26. In conclusion, I wish to stress that what Canada is concerned about is the human state and the human problem as it has been revealed to us, not only in regard to the people of South West Africa but especially with regard to those who are on trial in Pretoria. Believing profoundly in the United Nations as a means of communicating among nations, especially when they do not see eye to eye, we believe that a further appeal should be made to the Government of South Africa in the name of humanity, as well as in the name of the human rights enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, in order to get the Government of South Africa to take heed of the opinion of mankind, as expressed in this family of nations. It is important that this opinion should be heeded if this world is to become a fit and safe place for men and women of different races and religions to live together.

27. Mr. MAKONNEN (Ethiopia): When last year, following the inconclusive procedural decision of the International Court of Justice, my delegation introduced in this Assembly for discussion the question of South West Africa, we stated [1414th meeting] that:

"All told, the issues involved have forced themselves to the fore more sharply than ever. Nobody can say with conviction and validity that there are elements that remain to be clarified, or other avenues that have to be explored. The fact of the matter is that the only voice that echoes from South Africa is a defiant and deafening 'No'."

28. But despite an overwhelming indication that there was no prospect of a change of heart on the part of South Africa, we were told throughout the past year—perhaps not in so many words but in terms which suggested it—that if we waited a little longer the collective will of the international community might perhaps start to work on South Africa and might influence its attitude towards change and co-operation vis-à-vis the United Nations. Frequent intimations were also made to us in unmistakable terms by those with great potential power to persuade South Africa that if they could only get a little time they might perhaps use to full advantage their power of persuasion.

29. Now that we have waited a full year, what have we achieved? Not even the faintest signal of co-operation from South Africa could be heard by the most sensitive device, and the optimists of yesterday have chosen to remain mute. Encouraged no doubt by the success of Ian Smith in his defiance of United Nations authority, notably by his mockery of the half-measure sanctions imposed by the Security Council, South Africa has on the contrary escalated its own defiance.

30. Events in South Africa of the past year have also made it abundantly clear that the United Nations is not merely faced in that part of the continent with a political alliance of colonialism and racism, but with an alliance that is now being consolidated into a military pact. We have already had occasion during the past year to see this pact at work, notably in the military intervention of South Africa in Southern Rhodesia to assist the régime of Ian Smith to repress the freedom movement of that Territory; and, more recently, we have witnessed an attempt to invade the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo by means of mercenaries organized and trained in neighbouring Territories under present Portuguese control.

31. Thus South Africa's continuing defiance of the United Nations and its negative reply to the first approach by the United Nations Council for South West Africa needs to be considered not on its own, but within the South African context, if it is to be properly appraised and understood in the light of the historic responsibility that the United Nations has taken upon itself with regard to that international Territory and its people. For it is now clear for anyone to see that, if throughout last year we were asked to show cause why the international community should not wait a little longer in order to allow the full impact of its collective will to operate on South Africa, surely the same argument cannot be repeated today with any semblance of justification.



32. The burden of proof has irrevocably shifted. Those who maintained that argument last year now have to furnish proof that another offer of the benefit of the doubt will help the United Nations, either in the short or the long run, to assert its responsibility and authority. Otherwise, continuing the same argument when there is no indication to warrant hope, could only be considered an attempt to escape from having to face the inescapable. This seems to us the central message of the report of the United Nations Council for South West Africa, which is now before the Assembly. As is to be expected, that Council, which has been set up in accordance with resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V) of the fifth special session has been rudely rebuffed by South Africa in its initial request for co-operation in the discharge of its functions. Even the communication the Council sent to the Government of South Africa was not replied to directly. Apparently the South African Government believes that even so much as replying to the communication addressed to it by the Chairman of the Council on behalf of a council of the United Nations would be tantamount to giving official recognition to United Nations responsibility. Thus the South African Government has preferred the indirect route of letting its defiance be known through a communication addressed to the Secretary-General.

33. Another report now before the Assembly—the report of the Committee of Twenty-four [A/6700/Rev.1, chap. IV] makes the increasing consolidation of the policies and institutions of apartheid in South West Africa all too clear. A number of apartheid legislative acts and enforcement measures connected with them have been expanded in the course of the past year by the South African authorities to include South West Africa as well. Under one of those repressive laws—the so-called South African Terrorism Act of 1967—thirty-seven South West Africans have been arrested and deported by the South African authorities from their homeland in South West Africa and are now facing trial in Pretoria. The law under which they are being tried—or, should I say, being terrorized—is said to have retroactive effect to a date prior to the time the alleged offences are supposed to have been committed.

34. That so-called trial, which, like many practices of the South African Government, is nothing more than a mockery of justice, purports that—to quote from The New York Times of 9 December 1967:

"A person arrested under that act is guilty unless he can prove his innocence 'beyond a reasonable doubt.' The penalties for conviction are the same as those for treason, including death. The range of 'terrorist' activities is so sweeping that a man can be convicted if his alleged offense is adjudged 'to embarrass the administration of the affairs of state'."

The New York Times called this action of the South African white minority Government "the last act of an outrageous offense against civilized behavior, social and legal justice and international law".

35. Again referring to the circumstances of the trial, which the paper describes as "monstrous", The New

York Times, referring to the persons deported to Pretoria, writes:

"These men are not South Africans and have committed no offense in South Africa. They were seized in Ovamboland in South West Africa, hauled some 2,000 miles by train to Pretoria, then held incommunicado—many for more than a year—while the South African Parliament passed the 'Terrorism Act', under which they were to be tried, and made it retroactive to 1962.

"...

"Any police officer can arrest anyone without warrant and detain him indefinitely if he has reason to believe the person is a 'terrorist'. There is no habeas corpus, no bail under any circumstances, no right to consult an attorney until arraignment. No outsider, not even his wife, can have access to the person arrested or any information about him."

36. This open and deliberate violation of the norms of justice and of the rules of international law is but part of the sinister design that the South African Government has in store for the international Territory of South West Africa. Implementation of the recommendations of the so-called Odendaal Commission is proceeding post haste. It will be recalled that the Odendaal Commission had recommended the transfer back to South Africa of the major portion of the government functions now in the hands of the white territorial governing bodies. The creation of a so-called self-government for national units, which are invariably sub-tribal groups, centres around native chiefs sprung up for that purpose, and has now reached a stage of actual implementation. Under that plan, each so-called homeland would be restricted to one such sub-group, and others would have to move to areas defined as their homeland. Transplantation of populations from one area to another has now started and, no doubt, will be accelerated in the course of the coming year.

37. The policy of so-called self-determination for sub-tribal units has a perverse logic of its own. Stripped to its bare essentials, by putting the accent on what divides people rather than on what unites them this plan is designed, purely and simply, to bring about the dissolution and final dislocation of the corporate identity of the people of South West Africa.

38. This is the background, a background darkened by the cloud of defiance, of rebellion and of repeated acts of injustice perpetrated by South Africa and the other white minority régimes in southern Africa, that we have to bear in mind when we turn our attention once again to the urgent problem of how best we can ensure the implementation of the historic United Nations decision with regard to South West Africa [resolution 2145 (XXI)]. For, when everything is said and done, the central issue remains that of honouring the pledge which we have made together. The question is, therefore, whether we, as responsible Members of this Organization, having made a decision, will live up to our word, or whether by our hesitation and our indecisiveness we will allow this international territory, for which our Organization has accepted direct responsibility, to be slowly and systematically divided, weakened and finally incorporated in the Union of South Africa.

39. To me, as I am sure to all those who have supported the historic decisions contained in General Assembly resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V), the answer is clear and without alternative: the United Nations has made a decision and that decision has to be honoured. It is no mere affirmation of wishful thinking or of empty idealism but represents the only responsible stand which can ensure the continuity and credibility of the United Nations Organization and of the rule of law for which it claims to stand.

40. I submit that the collective responsibility of this Organization with regard to South West Africa is one from which there can be no escape, be it for the smaller nations or the major Powers. In fact, as the saying rightly goes, "the greater the power, the greater the responsibility". Those who maintain trade and economic relations with South Africa have a special and obvious responsibility since South Africa is misusing their investments and efforts to bolster up its capacity to defy international authority and to disregard the rule of law. There can therefore be no justifiable excuse on anyone's part for hiding behind the transparent curtain of self-interest. Nor can there be any plausible cause for invoking unrelated constitutional issues which can only help to delay the decisive action that the situation requires. This is a matter which is as important as the life and future of the Organization, and for anyone to play games with this grave situation is to play with the very life of the United Nations itself.

41. Turning now more specifically, with your permission, Mr. President, to the report submitted by the Council for South West Africa [A/6897], I must say that my delegation views the result of its sincere efforts with appreciation and understandable sympathy. We sympathize with the Council for the difficult time in which it had to operate during the past year. As the Assembly is only too well aware, the past year has been a period of continued crisis, during which attention has been diverted, and concentrated on problems which appeared to have immediate bearing on problems of war and peace. Problems like those of South West Africa, though potentially as explosive and dangerous, have had to occupy the back stage.

42. This habit of neglecting potentially dangerous problems and of being exclusively preoccupied with them only when they assume uncontrollable proportions is of course, becoming an unfortunate characteristic of international relations in our time. It helps create an illusion of false calm and a passive attitude towards problems and situations which, in actual fact, contain the seeds of international conflict and insecurity.

43. Thus, with the United Nations attention turned to other problems in other regions, the rulers of South Africa have perhaps been tempted to assume that international interest in South West Africa would be on the decline and that they could use the interlude for further consolidating their control over this international territory. If this is the calculation that has encouraged them summarily to reject the Council's first approach, the South African authorities could not have been more mistaken. This is a commitment of the United Nations which we are prepared never to give up. It is a struggle which the peoples of South

West Africa, and with them the entire continent of Africa, will continue to wage to the very end, until the case is rectified and the people of this international Territory gain their rights to a life in freedom.

44. After a careful review of the situation and after considering the reply of the South African Government, the Council has now reached the inescapable conclusion that:

"the refusal of the Government of South Africa to co-operate in the implementation of General Assembly resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V) makes it impossible for the Council to discharge effectively all of the functions and responsibilities entrusted to it by the Assembly. The Government of South Africa is not only defying the United Nations but is continuing to act in a manner which is designed to consolidate its control over South West Africa." [A/6897, para. 18.]

45. Now, the question to be asked in this connexion is whether anybody has any information to suggest that there is still some hope, however faint that hope may be, to justify somewhat different expectations. If anyone is in possession of even a minuscule bit of information on this score, then I suggest that he is in duty bound to inform the Assembly. In the absence of such information and such indication the alternative is equally clear. Surely we cannot simply assign to blind fate the whole future of a people for whom the United Nations has a unique and great responsibility. The usurpation of its responsibility by South Africa has to be met squarely. In the circumstances of continued defiance by South Africa the Council recommends to the General Assembly that it should take the necessary measures, including addressing a request for appropriate action on the part of the Security Council in accordance with section IV, paragraph 5 of resolution 2248 (S-V), to enable the Council for South West Africa to discharge all its functions and responsibilities effectively.

46. It cannot be too strongly emphasized in this respect that after terminating the Mandate of South Africa with respect to South West Africa, and after having declared South Africa as having henceforth "no other right to administer South West Africa" [resolution 2145 (XXI)] and after having assumed responsibility for the administration of the Territory, the United Nations should now give effect to this special responsibility.

47. It is also to be emphasized that by adopting resolution 2248 (S-V) the General Assembly has also accepted direct responsibility for the welfare of the people and for their immediate advancement to independence. The Council which the Assembly created for the administration of the Territory is only a machinery for the direct exercise of this responsibility.

48. It is obvious therefore that having thus come a long way towards meeting the legitimate demands of the people of South West Africa, the United Nations cannot go backwards; on the contrary it can only go forward, forward in removing all obstacles that may block the proper discharge of its responsibilities.

49. Bearing in mind the heavy responsibility and the historic commitment of the United Nations in the

matter, and hoping, perhaps against hope, that the Council's efforts and present efforts, could yield some hopeful results, my delegation considers that the Assembly should in its present session renew the Mandate of the Council, reaffirming at the same time the principles and decisions contained in the two previous resolutions. I refer of course to resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V).

50. Rearmed with a strengthened mandate, the Council should continue its efforts aimed at the quick and orderly transfer of the Territory of South West Africa from South African occupation to effective United Nations responsibility, and on to independent and sovereign status.

51. The Security Council should likewise discharge its heavy responsibility in this regard by taking all appropriate measures to enable the United Nations Council for South West Africa to carry out the functions and responsibilities entrusted to it by the General Assembly. The subsequent and necessary actions that the General Assembly or, as the case may be, the Security Council needs to take will depend on the progress of the Council's efforts and on the extent to which it can fulfil the Mandate entrusted to it by the Assembly under the terms of the two resolutions which I have referred to above. Thus this present extension of the Mandate can be regarded as one more attempt, as a final try, to ensure transfer of authority in accordance with the decisions already made.

52. In the meantime both the General Assembly and the Security Council should keep a constant, consistent and continuous watch over the situation, backing the Council for South West Africa all the time and all the way.

53. Finally, I wish to return to a matter which I referred to earlier. This relates, of course, to the pending trial of the South West Africans in Pretoria under the so-called Terrorism Act. In this connexion I need not labour the point about whether the law under which these people are being tried is humane, or whether it is in accordance with the basic principles of law and justice. I have already quoted sufficient evidence to show that this so-called trial is but a mockery of justice. Besides, the fact of the matter is, of course, that since the adoption of the two resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V) and the termination of its Mandate South Africa has no right to administer justice, since the administration of justice is a responsibility of the United Nations Council for South West Africa. The trials of South West Africans now under way in Pretoria cannot therefore be legal as they are based on the exercise of power illegally acquired and defiantly maintained.

54. This is the legal position as we see it, and I have no doubt in my mind that this is the position which is also maintained by this Assembly. But, unfortunately for those freedom fighters who are facing the imminent prospect of execution in Pretoria, the legality of their case or the righteousness of their cause can have no immediate bearing on the terrible predicament in which they find themselves. The time factor is such that it is a matter of saving the lamb from the tiger's jaws. It is a matter literally of life and death.

55. The General Assembly, it seems to my delegation, is duty bound to exert all its power and influence, as the depository of the international will and morality and as the guardian of human rights as well as the highest expression of world public opinion, to save the lives of these unfortunate victims of illegal action by calling in the most urgent and serious terms on the Government of South Africa to discontinue the trials and to repatriate the South West Africans concerned. My delegation urges that this should be done without delay and with the united voice of the General Assembly.

56. Mr. AIKEN (Ireland): As the Assembly has very few days left in which to discuss this subject and as the views of the Irish delegation were fully explained by me on 4 May last [1513th meeting], this intervention will be very brief.

57. In an age when the old colonial Powers have generally abandoned their domination of subject peoples, the attempt by the Republic of South Africa in defiance of the United Nations Charter to annex the Trust Territory of South West Africa is an anachronism and fraught with the gravest consequences. It presents a challenge to the United Nations, and particularly to the Security Council upon which has been conferred the primary responsibility to take prompt and effective action on behalf of the United Nations to maintain peace and suppress aggression. World opinion as represented by the General Assembly has already been made clear and, we hope, is far too strong to tolerate in the twenty-second year of the United Nations the seizure of a neighbour's territory.

58. At the Fifth Special Session on 4 May, I stressed that if the United Nations was successfully to carry out the decision of the General Assembly, assuming responsibility for bringing the people of the Territory to independence, any steps which we decided to recommend would have to pass the twofold test of practicability and effectiveness. It was because the Irish delegation considered that the proposals embodied in resolution 2248 (S-V) did not measure up to these requirements that we were unable to support the proposals. Previous experience had pointed up the futility of the General Assembly with its limited powers attempting to tackle the problem, particularly in view of the intransigent attitude of the South African authorities.

59. It is, therefore, with regret, but not with surprise, that my delegation notes the conclusion by the United Nations Council for South West Africa, in its report to the General Assembly, that:

"the refusal of the Government of South Africa to co-operate in the implementation of General Assembly resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V) makes it impossible for the Council to discharge effectively all of the functions and responsibilities entrusted to it by the Assembly" [A6897, para. 18],

and that:

"the Council has had no opportunity to undertake in South West Africa the administrative responsibilities conferred upon it in resolution 2248 (S-V)." [Ibid., para. 16.]

60. Following this report from the Council, I wish to reaffirm the opinion of my delegation that the Assembly is in no position to ensure that its decision be respected, and must clearly place the responsibility for carrying out resolution 2145 (XXI) on the Security Council—the only organ of the United Nations which has the necessary authority and power to give effect to the terms of that resolution.

61. Time is running out on us. The determination of the Government of South Africa to partition South West Africa, as expressed by the South African Minister of Bantu Administration at Oshakati on 21 March 1967, the abduction to South Africa of the thirty-seven prisoners from Ovamboland and the widening implementation of the abhorrent policy of apartheid in the Territory—all those illegal and inhuman developments serve to aggravate what is already a highly dangerous situation in the African continent.

62. I submit that the time has arrived for the Assembly to confront the realities of the situation and to recommend practical and effective measures to bring South West Africa to independence.

63. I would suggest that as a first step the Assembly should recognize that the Council it appointed for South West Africa is incapable of carrying out its Mandate and, consequently, that no useful purpose can be served by continuing either the Council or the Commissioner for South West Africa.

64. The Assembly should also, I suggest, declare that the continued occupation of South West Africa by the South African Government is in its opinion an act of international aggression and that primary responsibility for ending it rests with the Security Council under the Charter.

65. The Assembly should then, as the sole authority legally responsible for South West Africa, decide to request the Security Council to act up to its responsibilities and take all measures necessary to ensure that the Government of South Africa shall co-operate with the United Nations in bringing the Territory to independence in a peaceful and orderly manner.

66. Among the measures which my delegation envisages the Security Council might take is the appointment of a special representative for South West Africa on the nomination of the Secretary-General. On his appointment by the organ of the United Nations that has the authority to take action, the special representative would be in a strong position to enter into talks with the South African Government and the people of the Territory with a view to reaching agreement on a programme for the peaceful and orderly transfer of administration to a freely-elected Government.

67. The special representative would of course in the normal way report through the Secretary-General to the Security Council on all matters pertaining to his work and in view of the Assembly's responsibilities the Security Council should be requested to keep it informed as to progress made in implementing its resolution to bring South West Africa to independence.

68. In order to give the greatest possible support and encouragement to the Security Council, I also suggest that the Assembly might decide to call upon

all Member States to join in pledging whole-hearted co-operation and assistance to the Security Council in bringing the people of the Territory to independence and in enabling them to develop their economy after independence.

69. It is the hope of my delegation that the Government of South Africa may soon come to a realization that all ethnic groups in all parts of Africa would be best served by a speedy recognition of each other's rights and of their common interest in reconciliation and development.

70. Mr. LÖRINC (Hungary): After nearly two decades of discussion over the policies of apartheid of South Africa, the United Nations has now reached an important, complicated and decisive stage in the debates on the question of South West Africa. To put it plainly, we have now to get down to brass tacks.

71. The present stage is important because it is, more than ever before, of direct concern to the life of the people of South West Africa. The trial of the "thirty-seven" in Pretoria is a bitter reminder of that fact.

72. The present stage is complicated because, despite the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), depriving South Africa of its Mandate over South West Africa and deciding to take over direct responsibility for the Territory's fate with a view to arranging for its immediate independence, the United Nations is not now in a position to carry out the duties it has set itself in this respect. This is where we have come to the crossroads.

73. The present stage is decisive because now we have to choose between further ineffective debates and the only possible road that is bound to lead eventually to the independence of South West Africa and its people.

74. My delegation would like to offer its contribution towards finding the right solution. To that end, in view of the complex nature of the issues before us, it is unavoidable that I should go back a little in order to throw light upon the background of the stage we have now reached.

75. To begin with, I shall try to sketch in briefly the political and economic background. On the face of it, this is a matter of the United Nations versus the Republic of South Africa. The United Nations—its Security Council and General Assembly—has been going on its way year after year, step by small step, demanding for South West Africa, for its people and the Territory as a whole, the same rights which are due to any and every other people and State that is already represented in this Organization. There was, however, never a dialogue with South Africa; there never could be one: why not?

76. The reason is that in spite of the allegations and the carefully woven fabric of mystification, it is now quite clear to the United Nations also that a powerful minority is working hand-in-glove with the champions of apartheid for the purpose of thwarting the progress of history. In other words, there are some here who speak as if they were taking part in our efforts to promote a dialogue, but who act differently so as to destroy the very possibility of such a dialogue.



77. This is in fact a problem of many facets, but I shall try to clarify the main points to make the picture as complete as possible. First, there is South Africa itself, as a geographical unit. Its Government openly practises something that has a special name of its own—apartheid. This policy was not only fought against but condemned by humanity when it bore another name under Hitler and Mussolini: racism, the theory of racial superiority. I do not think I need go into fuller details to prove this. Also, it is almost needless to recall the fact that the present Prime Minister of South Africa, Vorster, is known to have declared himself openly a pro-Nazi. It is also an undeniable fact that, despite many United Nations resolutions, demands and appeals, the apartheid régime is being established in South West Africa as well.

78. The existence of the unholy alliance in the southern part of the African continent is also as real as is the fact that its bulwark is South Africa. The completely interwoven fabric of the political, economic and military complex in southern Africa has recently been manifested repeatedly in the support given by South Africa to Southern Rhodesia in all fields, ranging from oil deliveries to financial aid. All this made it possible for Prime Minister Vorster to make, on 24 September 1967, the following statement on the presence of South African troops in Southern Rhodesia:

"It [South Africa] must protect its interests in the manner it deems fit. South Africa has carefully considered the matter before it has decided on this action." [A/6864/Add.1, para. 312.]

Again, I wish only to point to the naked aggressiveness of the Republic of South Africa against the independent African countries.

79. After a number of separate studies on Southern Rhodesia, the Portuguese colonies and South West Africa, another study<sup>1/</sup> has been prepared on the activities of monopoly interests in the whole of southern Africa. The first year of investigation has already uncovered the existence of a maze of close and complicated connexions that are not simply revealing but are the only plausible explanation for the deadlock the United Nations has reached by employing the present methods.

80. I wish to deal with this subject very briefly. For the sake of expediency I shall resort to a few short quotations. Let us first take those of an economic and financial nature.

"Foreign investment clearly plays an important role in the economy of South Africa. In 1965 the total of foreign assets in the country was estimated at \$4,802 million. The principal 'creditor' countries are the United Kingdom, whose holdings are the largest for any one country, and the United States. The two countries together accounted for about 70 per cent of foreign investment in South Africa in 1965. . . .

"By the yardstick of earnings on foreign investment, the attraction of South Africa to foreign investors is quite understandable. Payments by South Africa on investment account in recent years have

ranged from over \$260 million to more than \$300 million annually. Earnings on United Kingdom and United States private direct investments in South Africa have amounted to \$173 million and \$101 million respectively in the most recent year for which data are available."<sup>2/</sup>

81. These investments, however, are not of a "simple business nature". They clearly have a very marked, sharp political content. One has only to look into developments of the past few years.

"In March 1960, the world had witnessed the brutal massacre of innocent Africans at Sharpeville, followed by general political unrest both in South Africa and Namibia. . . .

"Following these events South Africa underwent a severe financial crisis involving much flight of capital. It was obvious that, had the trend continued, had the Western Powers withdrawn their investments and suspended their huge trade with South Africa, the racist régime would have fallen. . . .

"At the time of the economic crisis the Western Powers had come to South Africa's rescue before the innocent African victims of Sharpeville and Windhoek had been properly buried. An Italian bank consortium had extended a three-year loan of \$9.8 million; the Federal Republic of Germany had followed with another \$9.8 million loan from the Deutsche Bank. A United States banking consortium, including the First National City Bank of New York and the Chase Manhattan Bank, had made a generous loan of \$40 million. A United Kingdom banking consortium had had no small part in the rescue operation which had saved South Africa from complete downfall." [A/6700/Rev.1, chap. IV, paras. 148-150.]

82. This proves the political nature of western financial operations and explains the inability of the Governments of the countries involved to control their own nationals.

83. Let me now turn to the military aspect of the problem. The story started with the well-known pressure brought to bear upon the Governments of the main economic partners of South Africa not to sell their arms, ammunition and war material. The words of denial of the transgressors caught red-handed on several occasions still reverberate in these halls. But let again the United Nations documents bear witness to the facts:

"The increasing financial involvement of the Federal Republic of Germany in South Africa and South West Africa was well known. The threat of the resurgence of fascism in the Federal Republic of Germany was also clearly to be seen in South West Africa, and, of course, in South Africa. There were many German experts in South Africa and South West Africa, including the Caprivi Strip, among them many military experts. The threat of that base to independent Africa, and especially independent Zambia, need hardly be stressed. The Federal Republic of Germany had also helped South Africa in building the huge military and naval base at Walvis Bay, in the mandated Territory of South

<sup>1/</sup> Foreign Investment in the Republic of South Africa (United Nations publication, Sales No.: 67.II.K.9).

<sup>2/</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 18.

West Africa, which had been made part of South Africa and was under the complete control of the South African Navy. . . ." [Ibid., para. 134.]

I am quoting again:

"In spite of the arms embargo, South Africa has continued to obtain equipment from abroad for its defence forces. An estimate of 38.4 million rand (\$US53.8 million), or 9 million rand over the estimate for 1966-1967, has been included in the 1967-1968 budget for aircraft, aircraft stores, services and equipment." [A/6864/Add.1, para. 257.]

"According to press reports in March 1967, the South African Army and Air Force were interested in an American executive aircraft and a Canadian De Havilland Twin Otter which had been demonstrated in South Africa. On 15 June 1967, the Minister of Defence, members of the Parliamentary Select Committee on Defence and Air Force officers watched a demonstration flight of an 11-seater turbo-engine Swiss aircraft, the Pilatus Turbo Porter, which is used in some countries for reconnaissance." [Ibid., para. 262.]

84. However, those anxious to defend their holdings have gone one step further in defying the United Nations and world opinion. In order to avoid being accused of selling war material to South Africa and preparing that country for every eventuality, they have undertaken the task of building up the war industry proper of South Africa. In this way, once that industry has been established, they can—like Pontius Pilate—wash their hands of the whole affair. But let the United Nations documents speak again:

"The South African Minister of Agricultural Technical Services and of Water Affairs, opening the Nationalist Party congress in Windhoek on 8 November 1966, emphasized that South Africa would stand with South West Africa to the utmost of its ability and would not give the area to the United Nations. . . . The Minister, who had previously been Minister of Defence, explained that on his return from overseas he had brought back 128 licences to manufacture armaments in South Africa. 'From a .22 cartridge to the newest in armoured vehicles, from the smallest item to the latest in bombs—today everything can be manufactured locally', he said." [A/6700/Rev.1, chap. IV, para. 19.]

85. On 10 May 1967 the South African Minister of Defence, Mr. P.W. Botha, said that:

"the Council on Scientific and Industrial Research and the Defence Force had also been doing research for a number of years on rockets and guided missiles, which were 'absolutely essential for South Africa'. Noting that budget allocations for research had 'increased from 29,000 rand (\$US40,600) a few years ago to 10 million rand (\$US14 million) this year', he added. . . 'South Africa's safety will be in good hands, and we can become a very important ally to the Free World. . . .' [A/6864/Add.1, para. 252.]

86. An admission of this fact was hidden in a brief news item published by The New York Times on 9 November 1967:

"Bonn, West Germany, Nov. 8 (Reuters)—. . . A Foreign Ministry spokesman said a scientific station

at Isumeb, South West Africa, run by the West German Aeronautics Institute in Lindau, launched sounding rockets to study the ionosphere."

87. The nature and extent of those manoeuvres can be measured by the following statement, which is my last quotation from a United Nations document:

"The manufacture of arms, ammunition and military equipment in South Africa has continued to expand. Brigadier J. J. Stapalberg of the South African Defence Force declared on 20 April 1967 that South Africa would soon export arms and accessories to foreign countries, including African countries." [Ibid., para. 251.]

88. That is the state of affairs with which we are confronted at present. That is the situation the United Nations is facing, especially as concerns the implementation of the provisions of General Assembly resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V).

89. At this point I may draw a few conclusions. I will make them as concise as I possibly can. First set of conclusions: (a) Instead of complying with United Nations resolutions South Africa defies them one after another; (b) South Africa has built South West Africa into a military stronghold of its own instead of giving it up and letting its people accede to independence; (c) As has been accurately predicted by several delegations, including mine, the United Nations Council on South West Africa cannot proceed to the Territory. Second set of conclusions: (a) The reasons for this brazen refusal are to be found in the active support given to South Africa, in the economic, military and political fields and in every other respect, by the monopoly interests and the Governments under their influence, first of all, those of the United States, the United Kingdom and West Germany; (b) As regards military support, in view of the unpleasant consequences of arms shipments being denounced as well as for the sake of expediency, the shipments of arms have been partly—only partly—substituted by the sale of licences and the building of a war industry on the spot in South Africa proper.

90. The last part of my analysis leads up to the answer to the question: What is to be done now? To dispel any doubt, let me state solemnly once again that, as is proved by words and deeds inside and outside the United Nations, my country is a firm supporter of the people of South West Africa and favours immediate independence for them, if necessary, with the help of their brothers in the Organization of African Unity.

91. I come now to the third and last set of conclusions I wished to draw: (a) The question of South West Africa cannot be separated from that of South Africa, and consequently the problem of South Africa versus the United Nations cannot be solved without pressure being exercised on the principal partners of the South African Government; (b) The only solution to the problem requires, therefore, the carrying out of a whole range of measures. Let me recall here the fact that the Security Council in 1965 [resolution 191 (1964)] delegated an Expert Committee to seek a solution to the problem of apartheid. That Committee, with the Western Powers present, could not come to a uniform conclusion.

92. The Soviet and Czechoslovak members of the Expert Committee, however, have drawn up a set of conclusions which, in my delegation's opinion, provide for the only realistic solution to our present problem too. I do not wish to quote them in full. They are contained in the records of the Security Council.<sup>3/</sup>

93. Those conclusions can be summed up as follows: (a) Sanctions can result in the abandonment of apartheid only if they are complied with by everybody—I underline "everybody"; (b) Those sanctions should comprise a total embargo on trade, exports, military equipment and petroleum, as well as the boycott of all South African goods; (c) Economic and military assistance should be stopped and all foreign investments discouraged; (d) All labour export should cease; and (e) Diplomatic, consular and other relations should be severed.

94. I submit that without the application of these measures we shall not succeed in solving the problem of the people of South West Africa who are already fighting with arms in hand. We have to give them all and every support.

95. However, it is common knowledge that the application of these measures has been thwarted in the Security Council by the friends of South Africa. It is also beyond the least shadow of doubt—I repeat, beyond the least shadow of doubt—that they will do exactly the same if the problem is again put on the agenda of the Security Council.

96. Therefore it is now the turn of the General Assembly to demand that the friends of South Africa apply these measures of their own free will, thus proving to the world that they are really enemies of apartheid and really want independence for the people of South West Africa. It is here that we will be in a position to see the difference between hypocritical lip-service and action on their side.

97. In the interest of the people of South West Africa we have to demand, from the friends of South Africa, the measures I recalled above, in a resolution, together with a strong denunciation of the help they have given to South Africa thus far.

98. Now it is the turn of the friends of South Africa. It is on them that the issue of more bloodshed in South West Africa and the whole southern part of Africa hinges. There can be no doubt that the people of South West Africa will enforce their right to statehood and independence. It is up to the friends and allies of South Africa how many more thousands of lives it will cost them and the world.

### 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)\*

99. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The Members of the General Assembly will recall that

item 23 of the agenda was allocated to the plenary Assembly so that it could consider the question of the implementation of the Declaration in general. All the chapters of the Special Committee's report on specific territories were sent to the Fourth Committee.

100. So far, the General Assembly has examined reports by the Fourth Committee on Southern Rhodesia (A/6884) and Aden (A/6920). It will examine the reports on the other territories at a later stage.

101. The Assembly will now begin its consideration of item 23 as a whole, and any matters relating to that question may therefore be raised. However, to facilitate the discussion, it would be better if representatives who wish to make observations regarding specific territories would make them at a later stage, when the Assembly takes up the draft resolution on the Territory concerned.

102. I now call on the Rapporteur of the Special Committee to present the Committee's report on item 23.

*Mr. Esfandiary (Iran), 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, presented the report of that Committee, and then spoke as follows:*

103. Mr. ESFANDIARY (Iran), 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: This report [A/6700/Rev.1], which relates to item 23 of the agenda, is submitted in accordance with operative paragraph 17 of resolution 2189 (XXI) of 13 December 1966, which requests the Special Committee "to continue to perform its tasks and to seek suitable means for the immediate and full implementation of the Declaration in all Territories which have not yet attained independence".

*Mr. Zollner (Dahomey), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

104. The complete report of the Special Committee covering its work during 1967 is contained in documents A/6700/Rev.1 and A/6868 and Add.1, totalling over 2,000 pages. It is necessarily lengthy as it deals with the Committee's examination of the situation in some sixty Territories and contains a special study concerning foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration in the Territories under colonial domination. With respect to the special study, Members will recall that the Fourth Committee, following its consideration of item 24, has already submitted its report, and the Assembly, on the recommendation of the Fourth Committee, adopted a resolution on the item [resolution 2288 (XXII) of 7 December 1967].

105. It will be recalled that, with regard to agenda item 23, the General Assembly, at its 1564th plenary meeting on 23 September 1967, decided that the question of the implementation of the Declaration in general should be considered in plenary meetings and that the chapters of the Special Committee's report relating to specific Territories should be referred to the Fourth Committee for consideration and report.

<sup>3/</sup> Official Records of the Security Council, Twentieth Year, Special Supplement No. 2, document S/6210 and Add.1, annex IX.

\*Continuation of the debate at the 1613th meeting.

106. The Fourth Committee has already submitted its reports on Southern Rhodesia [A/6884], on the hearing of petitioners concerning the question of South West Africa [A/6907], on the Territories under Portuguese administration [A/6908] and on Aden [A/6920]. Reports of the Fourth Committee on the other Territories covered by the Special Committee's report will be submitted to the plenary as they become available.

107. In 1967, the Special Committee considered all the Territories on its list of Territories to which the Declaration applies with only 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.

108. The Special Committee, having regard to the relevant provisions of the General Assembly resolutions 2160 (XXI), 2189 (XXI) and 2232 (XXI), initiated, in 1967, a study of the role of military activities and arrangements by colonial powers in Territories under their administration which may be impeding the implementation of the Declaration. The Committee expects to complete the study during its next session.

109. In the context of General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVI) of 27 November 1961 and in particular, operative paragraph 5 of resolution 2189 (XXI) of 13 December 1966, the Special Committee, availing itself of the invitations extended to it by the Governments of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Zambia and the United Republic of Tanzania, held a further series of meetings away from Headquarters during May and June this year at Kinshasa, Kitwe and Dar es Salaam. The Committee also accepted in principle similar invitations extended by five other Member Governments but it decided that, subject to their convenience, it should take advantage of their invitations at a future date. In the light of the important results achieved by these meetings, the Special Committee was firmly convinced that the holding of its meetings away from Headquarters was most desirable and necessary, for it not only reflected the resolute determination of the international community to effect without delay the total emancipation of the oppressed peoples of the Territories from colonial exploitation and domination, but it also strengthened the Committee's own capacity to assist these peoples in their struggle for freedom and independence.

110. The Special Committee was profoundly grateful to the Governments and the people of these countries for their invitations, for providing the Committee with the necessary facilities for its meetings and for their generous and kind hospitality. To this effect, the Special Committee unanimously adopted a resolution on 21 June 1967 [A/6700/Rev.1, chap. II, para. 751]. An account of the Special Committee's work in Africa is set out in chapter II of the report [A/6700/Rev.1], as well as in the chapters relating to the specific Territories which were considered by

the Special Committee during the year. In this connexion, I would also draw attention to the general resolution [*ibid.*, chap. II, para. 744] adopted by the Special Committee on 20 June 1967 concerning the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) with regard to the colonial Territories considered during its meetings in Africa.

111. The Special Committee, in accordance with its mandate set out in General Assembly resolution 1970 (XVIII) of 16 December 1963, examined during 1967 information on Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter. Details of its consideration of this topic are contained in chapter XXIV of the report [A/6700/Rev.1]. The Fourth Committee is expected to take this up shortly.

112. Under the terms of General Assembly resolution 2189 (XXI) in operative paragraph 14 of which the Assembly requested the Special Committee:

"to apprise the Security Council of developments in any Territory examined by the Committee which may threaten international peace and security and to make any concrete suggestions which may assist the Council in considering appropriate measures under the Charter of the United Nations",

the Special Committee in 1967 drew the attention of the Security Council to the situation existing in 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 295 to 299 in document A/6700/Rev.1, chapter I.

113. In operative paragraph 15 of resolution 2189 (XXI), 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".

In its consideration of specific territories, the Special Committee took account of this provision.

114. In operative paragraph 16 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".

In arriving at its conclusions and recommendations concerning the small Territories, details of which are contained in the relevant chapters of the present report, the Special Committee took this provision into consideration.

115. Owing to the negative attitude of the administering Powers towards the acceptance of visiting groups to the Territories for which they are responsible, the Special Committee was unable to dispatch any visiting groups this year.

116. 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 expectations of the people, in order to assist it in the implementation of the Declaration. Accordingly, the Special Committee has set out its recommendations with regard to visiting missions in section VI, chapter I of document A/6700/Rev.1 and in many of the chapters of the present report relating to specific Territories. The Special Committee intends to pursue its recommendations with the utmost vigour and to continue to seek the co-operation of the administering Powers to enable such visits to take place during the forthcoming session.

117. In operative paragraph 4 of resolution 2189 (XXI), the General Assembly approved "the action taken and envisaged by the Special Committee for the year 1967 with respect to the list of Territories to which the Declaration applies". In 1967, the Special Committee considered two reports transmitted by its Working Group concerning this question. An account of the Special Committee's consideration of these reports is set out in section VII, chapter I of document A/6700/Rev.1.

118. On the question of the implementation of General Assembly resolutions 2151 (XXI), 2184 (XXI), 2189 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V) and pertinent resolutions of the Special Committee with respect to requests and appeals addressed to specialized agencies and international institutions, the Special Committee noted that the General Assembly, at its current session, had allocated to the Fourth Committee for consideration and report an item [97] entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations". With a view to assisting the General Assembly in its consideration of this item, the Special Committee decided to draw attention to two notes [A/6700/Rev.1, chap. 1, annex III and chap. V, annex I] prepared by the Secretariat for the Special Committee on this subject. These notes are appended to the report of the Special Committee and are currently before the Fourth Committee in connexion with its consideration of item 97.

119. Finally, in order to assist it in carrying out its tasks in 1968, the Special Committee offered a number of recommendations which the General Assembly may wish to consider in connexion with its examination of the implementation of the Declaration. These are set out in section XII, chapter I of document A/6700/Rev.1, entitled "Future work".

120. Subject to any further directives that the General Assembly may wish to give at its twenty-second session, it is the intention of the Special Committee in 1968 to continue to examine the situation in each of the Territories which have not yet attained independence, with a view to assisting in the speedy and effective application of the Declaration. In this connexion, the Special Committee recommends that the General Assembly renew its appeal to administering Powers to take all the necessary steps for the im-

plementation of the Declaration and the relevant United Nations resolutions.

121. Furthermore, subject to any directives that the General Assembly at its twenty-second session may wish to give in connexion with the question of the small Territories and of deadlines for the accession of Territories to independence, the Special Committee will continue to be guided by the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2189 (XXI) in this regard.

122. In conclusion, the Special Committee has recommended that the General Assembly request the administering Powers to co-operate with the Committee by facilitating visits to Territories in accordance with the decisions previously taken by the Special Committee or with any other decisions in that connexion which the Committee may find it appropriate to adopt in 1968.

123. The Special Committee has also recommended that the Assembly request the administering Powers to co-operate with the Secretary-General in promoting the large-scale dissemination of the Declaration and of information on the work of the United Nations and in particular of the Special Committee in the implementation of the Declaration.

124. Further, the Special Committee recommended that the General Assembly, in approving the programme of work outlined in the section of the report referred to above, should also make appropriate financial provisions to cover the activities of the Committee during 1968, including, *inter alia*, the cost of visiting groups which may be dispatched to the Territories in the Caribbean, Indian and Pacific Oceans and to certain of the Territories in Africa. Included also in such provisions should be the cost of any meetings of the Special Committee which, in the context of operative paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVI), may be held away from Headquarters whenever and wherever such meetings are required for the effective discharge of the mandate entrusted to the Special Committee by the General Assembly.

125. Finally, the Special Committee has recommended that the Assembly request the Secretary-General to continue to provide the Special Committee with all the facilities and personnel necessary for the discharge of its mandate.

126. I commend this report to the General Assembly.

127. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the Rapporteur of the Special Committee. This afternoon we shall hear the statement of the Chairman of the Special Committee, Mr. Malecela of the United Republic of Tanzania, on this item. Before closing the meeting, I should like to ask those representatives who wish to speak on item 23 to see that their names are placed on the list of speakers as soon as possible, so that the Assembly can organize its work on this item.

*The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.*