

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



**1645th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Monday, 29 April 1968,  
at 10.30 a.m.

**NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 64:</i>	
<i>Question of South West Africa (continued) . . .</i>	<i>1</i>

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

AGENDA ITEM 64

Question of South West Africa (continued)

1. Mr. OTEMA ALLIMADI (Uganda): Mr. President, when you assumed this important role, my delegation had the pleasure of expressing to you our thanks and good wishes. We also expressed our belief that the qualities of statesmanship that you brought to your office would make the work of the General Assembly a lot easier. Your handling of the matters dealt with in the first part of this session demonstrated that our hopes and beliefs were well founded. We resume our work in the full knowledge that your many qualities will help this part of the session find answers to the important questions before it.

2. We heard last Friday a statement from the President of the United Nations Council for South West Africa [1644th meeting]. The message was clear and simple. It was a sad message. It was an account of that Council's frustrating attempts to carry out the mandate which this body entrusted to it. Allow me, Mr. President, to express my delegation's thanks to the members of that Council for their dedication. It was a difficult assignment. The problems were almost insuperable; they were enough to discourage even the most optimistic. My delegation hopes that the Council's courage and willingness to accept and shoulder difficult undertakings will inspire us all. The Council has the unreserved support both of my delegation here and of my Government at home. We hope that the United Nations and all its subsidiary organs will resolve to make the Council's task lighter.

3. The question of South West Africa has been the subject of discussion by the General Assembly since 1946. It is as well documented as any question that this body has ever dealt with. United Nations resolutions on it defy enumeration. It has been the subject of four references to the International Court of Justice. On three occasions the Court has, in its Advisory Opinions, upheld the United Nations legitimate role in shaping the destiny of the Territory. Except for South West Africa, all the seven Territories in Africa which were under the League of Nations Mandate were, without difficulty, placed under the Trusteeship System by the administering Powers at the time the United Nations came into being. All, except South West Africa, have since achieved self-determination and independence.

4. This body's commitment to help the people of that Territory attain independence is as old as the United Nations itself. South West Africa and the United Nations are irrevocably bound together. For over twenty years the United Nations has persistently and painfully sought to get the Government of the Republic of South Africa to fulfil its obligations in respect of the administration of South West Africa and to ensure moral and material well being and security for the people of that Territory. For years the United Nations has sought to dissuade South Africa from exporting its iniquitous policy of apartheid to the Territory. The system of apartheid and all that it represents has been condemned by this body and declared to be a crime against humanity. But United Nations efforts to get the Pretoria régime to face up to its obligations to secure for the people of the Territory the basic right of self-determination have been matched not only by the intransigency of that régime, but also by that régime's determined effort to impose on the people of South West Africa the apartheid system that the whole world has so vehemently condemned.

5. The contest between the United Nations and South Africa continues, to the disadvantage of the people of South West Africa and to the disadvantage of the world community and world atmosphere. There can be no doubt about who must be the eventual winner. The question is not who will win. It is when the battle will be won. In the view of my Government, the time is now.

6. The turning point in the United Nations consideration of the question of South West Africa came on 27 October 1966. On that day, the General Assembly [1454th meeting], by a resounding vote of 114 to 2, with only 3 abstentions, adopted resolution 2145 (XXI) whereby it terminated the Mandate for South West Africa. By this action, the United Nations reaffirmed, in very strong terms, its commitment to the people of South West Africa. It renewed its pledge not only to the South West Africans but to all colonial people everywhere. It concluded that the Government of the Republic of South Africa was incapable of fulfilling its obligations to the people of that Territory, and it decided to take over the administration of the Territory. It demonstrated that its role was more than that of mere persuasion.

7. Determined to live up to its pledge, the General Assembly, in resolution 2248 (S-V), set up an eleven-member United Nations Council for South West Africa to:

"(a) Administer South West Africa until independence, with maximum possible participation of the people of the Territory;

"(b) Promulgate such laws, decrees and administrative regulations as are necessary for the administra-

tion of the Territory until a legislative assembly is established following elections conducted on the basis of universal adult suffrage;

"(c) Take as an immediate task all the necessary measures, in consultation with the people of the Territory, for the establishment of a constituent assembly to draw up a constitution on the basis of which elections will be held for the establishment of a legislative assembly and a responsible government."

8. These statements produced by the General Assembly were not just an exercise in demagoguery. They were not merely high-sounding words signifying nothing. South Africa may have interpreted them in that way. Indeed, its subsequent actions, as I shall soon point out, show that it believed that they were worth even less than the paper on which they were inscribed. It is the task of this session of the General Assembly to prove to the Pretoria régime that it was wrong. It is the task of this Assembly to make it absolutely clear to that régime that the United Nations does not intend to abandon the people of South West Africa. No Member of this Organization can find any justification whatsoever for advocating that the United Nations should go back on its word to take over the administration of the Territory. If there is such a Member, let that Member come here and say so publicly.

9. As if to challenge the United Nations, as if to test whether the words of these Assembly resolutions had any muscle in them, the Pretoria régime arrested thirty-seven citizens of South West Africa, a territory outside its jurisdiction, and announced on 21 June 1967 that it was going to try them in Pretoria under the South African Terrorism Act of 1967 and the Suppression of Communism Act of 1966, both notorious laws.

10. This foolhardy action of the Pretoria régime was an insult and a challenge to the world body. It was condemned by all juridical and humanitarian organizations throughout the world as a denial of fundamental human rights and as a violation of the international and independent status of that Territory. The General Assembly, in its resolution 2324 (XXII), condemned the illegal trial and called upon the Government of South Africa to discontinue it forthwith. When the Pretoria régime disregarded the call, the Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 245 (1968) in which it condemned the trial, and also called on that Government to discontinue it and to repatriate the South West Africans.

11. Despite the world-wide condemnation of the trial, and despite the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, the Pretoria régime on 9 February 1968 convicted the South West Africans under its repressive laws. The Security Council adopted yet another resolution, resolution 246 (1968), in which it censured the Government of South Africa and demanded the release and repatriation of the prisoners.

12. These are only a few of the resolutions that this body has passed in respect of South West Africa in the last two years. They make the commitment and pledge of this body abundantly clear. They make the intentions of the United Nations very clear. In the view of the Uganda Government, they represent a point of no return; it is an ultimatum to South Africa. We have

called, we have appealed, we have requested, we have condemned and we have censured. No doubt the ingenuity of the learned lawyers amongst us can devise a new way of saying what we have already said. But I doubt whether it would bring results. Forty-five days have passed since the Security Council demanded in its latest resolution the release and repatriation of those concerned, yet thirty South West Africans are still in a South African gaol.

13. It is now two years since the Mandate for South West Africa was terminated, yet South Africa still remains and continues to consolidate its position in the Territory. A year has passed since the United Nations Council for South West Africa was empowered under resolution 2248 (S-V) to proceed to South West Africa, to base itself in that Territory, to take over the administration of the Territory, to ensure the withdrawal of South African police and military forces, and to ensure the withdrawal of South African personnel. Yet the fact is that the Council was not allowed to set foot on South West African soil, the soil of a Territory which should be independent of South Africa and for which legally the United Nations is the administering Power.

14. On 16 December 1967, this body adopted resolution 2325 (XXII). In its operative paragraph 8, it requested:

"... the Security Council to take all appropriate measures to enable the United Nations Council for South West Africa to discharge fully the functions and responsibilities entrusted to it by the General Assembly".

15. These are the contradictions to which we Members of this Assembly must address ourselves. They are the questions to which we must provide answers. The answers cannot and must not be verbal. Too many verbal answers have already been given. We must not, this time, hide behind resolutions and demagoguery. Resolutions alone will not enable the Council for South West Africa to enter that Territory, nor will resolutions alone get thirty South West Africans out of gaol. The time has come for Member States to indicate very clearly what they intend to do to turn their appeals and requests into practical and effective measures. My delegation would wish to see all the influence and all the powers of the office of the Secretary-General mobilized to enable the Council for South West Africa to carry out its mandate. South Africa, like most countries of the world, cannot live in isolation. It needs the co-operation of others in order to prosper. Member States, during this session, must decide to isolate the Pretoria régime diplomatically as well as economically. Let us see then how long South Africa will survive. This should serve as the first stage in the United Nations long and painful confrontation with South Africa.

16. Uganda has no relations whatever with South Africa. Other Member States can sever all relations with Pretoria and still exist. The main trading partners of South Africa are also permanent members of the Security Council and are some of the most powerful economic and military nations today. On some issues, they speak the language that South Africa speaks. There is reason to believe, therefore, that South Africa will

take seriously those resolutions of the United Nations in which the voices of such nations are loudest. Let us hear their voices. Let them tell us what they intend to contribute towards the efforts of the United Nations to get South Africa to comply with the decisions of this body. Let them indicate to this Assembly what they have done to implement its past decisions and, in view of the defiant attitude so far held by South Africa, what effective line of action they propose to take.

17. The United Nations took practical measures when it set up the Council for South West Africa a year ago. It needs to take practical measures if that Council is going to be able to discharge the functions and responsibilities entrusted to it and if the thirty South West Africans are going to leave the South African gaol.

18. In conclusion, the Uganda delegation would wish to say the following. First, the United Nations must take action to assume direct administration. It must revise and reassert its authority over the Territory and prepare it for the speedy attainment of self-government and independence in accordance with the provisions of the Charter, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the pertinent resolutions, in particular resolutions 2145 (XXI) of 1966 and 2248 (S-V) and 2325 (XXII) of 1967. To this end we must strengthen and actively support the existing machinery so as to enable the Council for South West Africa to discharge its difficult task. All organs of the United Nations should render active support. Such action is imperative in the light of South Africa's conduct and its refusal to allow the Council to visit South West Africa.

19. Secondly, the Security Council must, in our view, seriously consider taking immediate action to enforce the decisions of this Organization. The time for recommendations is past, since South Africa has shown an unco-operative attitude and defied all decisions of the United Nations concerning South West Africa. If there is to be faith in the world body, the Security Council should invoke and apply enforcement measures so as to ensure observance of the United Nations decisions.

20. South Africa's attitude towards the United Nations in this case poses a serious challenge to the very principles on which the Organization is based. We must seek to restore faith in the Organization as an instrument of social justice and of peace and security. If we sacrifice these principles, we shall be doing irreparable harm to this body. This we must not do. We must mobilize and face the challenge. Time is of the essence and the cause of humanity summons us to act immediately and effectively.

21. Thirdly, we must seek to end all political, military and economic dealings with South Africa which is in standing violation of the decisions of the United Nations and international morality.

22. Fourthly, during this the International Year for Human Rights, we must seriously consider effective means which will bring about an immediate end to the policy of apartheid in southern Africa. We must avoid feeding the people of that region with mere words of hope or sympathy, we must strive to eradicate the cruel oppression to which they are subjected and seek

to restore their fundamental rights. Apartheid is a cancer on the body politic of the African continent and, indeed, of the world. We should save them from the hangman. The people of South West Africa are looking to us to help them out of their present plight. This we must do. My delegation reserves its right to speak again on this item at the appropriate time.

23. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): We are all fully aware of the political, legal and other considerations which led the United Nations to revoke South Africa's Mandate over South West Africa and to assume responsibility for the administration of the Territory until it attains independence. Resolution 2145 (XXII) of the General Assembly, which contained that decision, was adopted with almost complete unanimity. Significantly, none of the permanent members of the Security Council opposed it, and this is of particular importance since that organ, in the final analysis, possesses the ability and the power to carry out the decisions of this Assembly. It is unfortunate that the Council for South West Africa has not been able to report any progress towards achieving any of the goals which the United Nations set itself when it accepted responsibility for the administration of the Territory.

24. The situation before us now must be viewed with three major considerations in mind. First and foremost is the fact that, by a majority decision, the General Assembly established a Council to go to South West Africa, take over the administration of the Territory and do all in its power to enable it to attain independence by June 1968. To give force to its decision, the Assembly requested the Security Council to take measures to enable the new Council to discharge its responsibilities.

25. Our second consideration is that we are now faced with a situation, which cannot have come as a surprise to anyone, in which the South African Government has ignored the decisions of the international community and has displayed attitudes and carried out actions which are in flagrant defiance of the General Assembly and an outright rejection of the resolutions of the United Nations with regard to the Territory. These attitudes and actions can be summarized as follows.

26. The South African Government has refused to enter into a dialogue with the Council for South West Africa on the question of the transfer of the administration of the Territory and has chosen, instead, to describe the General Assembly's decision to terminate the Mandate as illegal and unrealistic.

27. The South African Government has refused to accept the international status of South West Africa as affirmed by resolution 2145 (XXI) and has proceeded with a plan to partition the Territory into homelands based on tribal considerations, and to arrange their social, political and economic structure so as to facilitate their absorption into the South African State.

28. On the economic side, the South African Government has continued to intensify the exploitation and usurpation of the Territory's wealth, with the active collaboration of foreign economic interests, employing practices and policies that have been repeatedly condemned by this Assembly.

29. The application of political and social discriminatory policies based on race continues unchecked in the Territory, in contradiction of the purposes of the United Nations Charter and of the Declaration on Human Rights. It is particularly disturbing that the policy of apartheid, which has been condemned as a crime against humanity, prevails in a Territory for which the United Nations has assumed direct responsibility.

30. Finally, the Assembly cannot disregard the type of measures which the South African Government has taken to suppress political expression within the Territory. The notorious Terrorism Act is but one example. Recently the United Nations was obliged to remain powerless in the face of the illegal arrest, deportation to South Africa and trial there of thirty-seven freedom fighters—nationals for whom this Organization had accepted responsibility—and the sentencing of the majority of them to long terms of imprisonment in violation of the international status of the Territory. Furthermore, 200 more South West Africans are in South African custody, awaiting the same treatment.

31. Our third consideration must now be the positive measures which the United Nations has to take if its authority, its dignity, and indeed the reason for its existence, are not to be seriously threatened. I do not think that it will serve any purpose for us to go back over our tracks and to argue now that a commissioner or a special representative would have been better than a council, or that preliminary contacts should have first been established with the South African Government before any definite procedures were formulated. Those are now all academic questions. Having assumed responsibility for the Territory, the United Nations was obliged to establish some sort of machinery for attempting to carry out its responsibility, by whatever name that machinery was called or under whatever form it was constituted. Again, once the United Nations had decided to revoke South Africa's Mandate over the Territory, negotiation was not a legal necessity. And in any event, the peaceful and constitutional attempt of the Council for South West Africa to establish contacts with the South African Government has met with no success. This we have seen from the preliminary report which the President of the Council presented to this Assembly last Friday [1644th meeting].

32. My delegation is convinced that the measures so far taken by the Assembly to assume its responsibility for South West Africa were proper and were necessary. But it seems clear that no purpose will be served by continuing along those lines of action at the present time, since the Government of South Africa has unequivocally closed the door to the possibility of any kind of dialogue over its withdrawal from South West Africa and for the orderly transfer of the administration of the Territory to the United Nations. This is clearly demonstrated in the letter of 27 March 1968<sup>1/</sup> to the Secretary-General from the South African Foreign Minister. In that communication the South African Foreign Minister not only stated that his Government refused to accept General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) as legally valid, but added that his Government's view applied with equal force

to all resolutions, including resolutions of the Security Council, which were based on or which flowed from that resolution.

33. We could, of course, continue to go through the motions of trying to make contacts with the South African Government, but in the opinion of my delegation such action would be fruitless in view of the present circumstances. The proposal by the Council for South West Africa to make an entry into the Territory, however symbolic its nature, however tenuous and however temporary, will have the merit of bringing about a direct confrontation between this Organization and South Africa. No doubt this would take the whole issue to the Security Council, where it will have to be resolved. In its three major resolutions on the question of South West Africa—2145 (XXI), 2248 (S-V) and 2325 (XXII)—the General Assembly requested the Security Council to take effective steps to enable the United Nations to fulfil the responsibility it had assumed with respect to South West Africa. It did so because its Members were alive to the fact that it would eventually become necessary for the United Nations to resort to those means which it is entitled to deploy, under the Charter, to enforce its decisions in the interests of international peace and security.

34. My delegation will await the report of the Council for South West Africa<sup>2/</sup> before commenting further on this aspect of the problem. We feel, however, that serious consideration should now be given by this Assembly to the suggestion made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ireland during the debate on this question in the General Assembly on 11 December 1967. He suggested that:

"The Assembly should... 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.

"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."  
[1624th meeting, paras. 64, 65.]

35. Should the South African Government display the same defiance of the Security Council that it has shown in the past, we should expect the Security Council to take enforcement action against South Africa under the Charter. To remain impassive in the face of such open defiance would be tantamount to the abandonment of our collective responsibility towards the people of South West Africa, and to a tacit endorsement of the continued usurpation of their rights and their land by the South African Government.

36. To sum up, the General Assembly in our opinion has no alternative but to declare that the continued presence of South African authorities in South West Africa is a flagrant violation of its territorial integrity and sovereignty as well as of the decisions of the General Assembly. It has no alternative but to call on

<sup>1/</sup> Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-third Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1968, document S/8506, annex I.

<sup>2/</sup> Subsequently circulated as document A/7088 and Corr.1.



the Security Council to take effective steps to enable the United Nations to fulfil the responsibilities which it has assumed in respect of South West Africa and to appeal to all Member States, especially those with the closest economic ties with South Africa, to co-operate to this end. Failure to do this would be, in the opinion of my delegation, to bow in the face of open defiance and would seriously threaten the authority of the United Nations in all fields.

37. Mr. Endalkachew MAKONNEN (Ethiopia): Mr. President, allow me to begin my statement by saying how pleased and reassured we all feel to see you back in the high place which you so ably and fittingly occupy. Your leadership has already been tested by the formidable problems that we have had to face in the regular session of the Assembly, and now, in the present resumed session, we are given yet another opportunity to reap the benefit of your wisdom and wide experience which we have already sampled in the admirable manner in which you have conducted our affairs during the first difficult days of this meeting. We are confident that your wise and able leadership will make of this highly significant resumed session, a worthwhile and fruitful endeavour which will enable the Assembly to record meaningful achievements on the burning questions figuring on its agenda.

38. I do not intend to make a lengthy statement on the item of South West Africa; in fact, I do not see the need for a lengthy statement. The debate on South West Africa has long been over. The United Nations has now passed from the phase of long and exhaustive debate to the moment of decision. Anyone who expected an avalanche of debate and discourse from this resumed session is bound to be disappointed. The debate on South West Africa ended on that historic date—27 October 1966—when the General Assembly [1454th meeting] terminated the League of Nations Mandate conferred upon His Britannic Majesty to be exercised on his behalf by the South African Government and decided that South Africa had no other right to administer that international Territory.

39. That historic decision by which the General Assembly assumed direct responsibility for South West Africa was not an impulsive conclusion hastily arrived at. It was the outcome of almost two decades of patient and fruitless effort by the United Nations, and by its different organs, to induce South Africa to bring that international Territory under the Trusteeship System of our Organization. South Africa had made it absolutely clear from the very beginning that it had no intention, either of carrying out the sacred trust of the Mandate, or, indeed, of accepting any kind of accountability to the United Nations Organization as the rightful successor to the League of Nations.

40. Already as early as 1945, we find South Africa asking, with audacity, the founders of the United Nations to allow South Africa to annex the Territory outright. The fact that this request was turned down did not prevent South Africa from following its sinister policy of systematic expansion and annexation, with all that that implies in terms of the introduction of the cruel system of racial oppression that is known by the cursed name of apartheid.

41. During the period between 1945 and the historic date of 27 October 1966, this Assembly and other organs of the United Nations have passed so many resolutions with respect to South West Africa that it would require, in itself, a very lengthy presentation in order to enumerate and analyse them in full detail. Suffice it to point out that in addition to the many resolutions and recommendations that have been adopted here and in other bodies of the Organization, there have been the Advisory Opinions of the International Court of Justice and the Court's Judgement of 1962<sup>3/</sup> which have all resulted in the establishment of a body of rules and of jurisprudence concerning the international status of that Territory—a status which General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) has confirmed and reaffirmed beyond any shadow of doubt.

42. And so the point of departure for the Assembly at the present moment is resolution 2145 (XXI), which has to be the principal basis for all action to be taken by the United Nations—now and in the future. That resolution has been completed and complemented by resolution 2248 (S-V), which is but the instrument by which the General Assembly decided to follow up its historic decision taken in resolution 2145 (XXI).

43. In resolution 2248 (S-V) the General Assembly reaffirmed its resolution 2145 (XXI) and decided to establish a United Nations Council for South West Africa with the mandate to discharge on its behalf the following responsibilities and functions in the Territory. I wish, with your permission, to quote from that resolution the principal directives given to the Council:

"(a) To administer South West Africa until independence, with the maximum possible participation of the people of the Territory;

"(b) To promulgate such laws, decrees and administrative regulations as are necessary for the administration of the Territory until a legislative assembly is established following elections conducted on the basis of universal adult suffrage;

"(c) To take as an immediate task all the necessary measures, in consultation with the people of the Territory, for the establishment of a constituent assembly to draw up a constitution on the basis of which elections will be held for the establishment of a legislative assembly and a responsible government;

"(d) To take all the necessary measures for the maintenance of law and order in the Territory;

"(e) To transfer all powers to the people of the Territory upon the declaration of independence;"

44. To this end, the Assembly requested the Council to enter immediately into contact with the authorities of South Africa in order to lay down procedures in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V) for the transfer of the administration of the Territory with the least possible upheaval.

45. Accordingly, the Council has used the good offices of the Secretary-General to request the South African

<sup>3/</sup> South West Africa Cases (Ethiopia v. South Africa; Liberia v. South Africa), Preliminary Objections, Judgement of 21 December 1962; I.C.J. Reports 1962, p.319.

Government to comply with the decision of the Assembly in laying down the necessary procedures and in making the arrangements for the said transfer of the Territory from the present *de facto* control of South Africa to United Nations administration in accordance with the aforementioned resolutions.

46. The fact of the matter is that South Africa has openly and defiantly refused even to talk to the Council for South West Africa, let alone allow it to carry out the mandate entrusted to it. The Council is to be commended for having made every effort, and for courageously continuing to make every effort to establish a presence in the Territory in order to be able to carry out the heavy responsibilities entrusted to it by the Assembly.

47. It is clear from the many reports we have received from the Secretary-General, as well as from the report we heard from the President of the Council for South West Africa during this debate [1644th meeting], that the South African Government has no intention of yielding to the decision of the Assembly but continues instead to follow its systematic and sinister policy of gradual annexation of the Territory to the so-called Union of South Africa.

48. This attitude on the part of South Africa was, of course, more than to be expected. When resolution 2248 (S-V) was adopted by the fifth special session, many delegations, including my own, doubted the effectiveness of a decision which in large measure depended for its implementation on the co-operation and goodwill which we know, and knew from experience, to be non-existent.

49. The Assembly itself was all too conscious of that impending defiance when, in Section IV, paragraph 5 of resolution 2248 (S-V), it requested the Security Council "to take all appropriate measures to enable the United Nations Council for South West Africa to discharge the functions and responsibilities entrusted to it by the General Assembly".

50. In the face of South Africa's defiance and the certainty that that defiance will continue in the future, the time has now come for the Security Council to take all appropriate measures in order to enable the Council for South West Africa to discharge the functions and responsibilities entrusted to it by the General Assembly. As the organ entrusted with the primary responsibility for international peace and security, the

Security Council must now sustain and supplement the efforts of the General Assembly in order to ensure that the decision of the United Nations Organization is implemented. A decision supported by the near unanimity of the membership must not remain unimplemented.

51. It is the view of my delegation that during its present resumed session, the Assembly should agree on a clear and strong resolution recommending that the Security Council take the appropriate steps and measures envisaged in the Charter in order to ensure the prompt implementation of the decisions that the General Assembly has taken with the backing of the very great and overwhelming majority of its membership. This is the urgent duty which the resumed session is called upon to fulfil as the organ of the United Nations that has rightly assumed direct responsibility for the future of this international Territory and the well-being of its people.

52. I have had occasion at other times to say that this august Assembly has a very special responsibility with regard to this international Territory, and that this problem is a test case for the United Nations. Here is a Territory whose international status is beyond any dispute—a Territory which has been under international status, in fact, from as far back as the end of the First World War. Here is a Territory for which the United Nations has assumed direct responsibility. Can the United Nations allow its clear and undisputable authority over that international Territory to be flouted without undermining its role, and impairing its prestige, and without in fact shaking the very foundations of its existence? That is the grave question which each and every one of us should put to himself. I feel, and feel very strongly, that in South West Africa, and indeed in the whole of southern Africa, the United Nations is coming to a showdown with itself. It is the duty and responsibility of us all to avoid that tragic showdown by living up to our responsibilities in taking the necessary action to honour the pledge we have made together.

53. I wish, with your permission, Mr. President, to reserve my right to intervene at a later stage when the Assembly examines the concrete proposals soon to be submitted for its consideration.

*The meeting rose at 11.50 a.m.*