



Monday, 20 May 1968,
 at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Address by Mr. Habib Bourguiba, President of the Republic of Tunisia</i>	1
<i>Agenda item 64:</i>	
<i>Question of South West Africa (continued) . . .</i>	3

President: Mr. Corneliu MANESCU (Romania).

Address by Mr. Habib Bourguiba, President of the Republic of Tunisia

1. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I have great pleasure in welcoming His Excellency Mr. Habib Bourguiba, President of the Republic of Tunisia, and in inviting him to address the General Assembly.

2. Mr. HABIB BOURGUIBA, President of the Republic of Tunisia (translated from French): It has been nearly twelve years since I had the privilege of speaking before this Assembly [590th meeting] on behalf of Tunisia, whose admission to membership in the Organization brought the number of African Member States in the Organization to six. In speaking from this rostrum again today, I am happy to bring Tunisia's greetings to an Assembly of 124 Members, more than half of whom belong to the Afro-Asian group and more than a third to the African continent alone.

3. That successful evolution, accomplished in a relatively short time, corresponds to the extraordinary changes that have occurred in our world and to the profound transformations in international relations and in the concerns of this Organization, of which not the least role is faithfully to reflect the state of the relations between human communities. Thus, today I shall not revert to the subjects about which I spoke in 1956, since the problems with which we were then concerned have either been resolved satisfactorily or have made substantial progress, whether it be a question of the cold war, of the liquidation of the phenomenon of colonialism, or of a better international organization of economic and social co-operation.

4. Unfortunately, one problem seems to have survived intact—and even to have grown worse—with time, and to have defied the efforts, albeit intermittent, of the international community, thereby increasing the danger of explosions and posing a permanent threat to international peace and security, and thus compromising the progress and well-being of tens of thousands of human beings: I am speaking of the problem of Palestine, which has not been solved either by the very precarious arrangement of 1948 or—even less—by that of 1956, arrangements designed rather to establish a modus vivendi in the area.

5. Today, however, the cold war has given way to peaceful coexistence, and even to some forms of co-operation, and already we can foresee an era of interdependence. The purpose of this Assembly's meeting, at this time, is a striking illustration of this.

6. The draft treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons submitted by the Soviet Union and the United States^{1/} undoubtedly represents an important milestone on the road to disarmament. I am aware of the objections and criticisms to which that text has given rise in many countries that are friends of Tunisia and, like Tunisia, do not possess atomic weapons, and I must say that I understand and share to a large extent the concern and the motives that inspire them, and that I fully appreciate the significance of their arguments. We realize all the importance of those objections—particularly those concerning nominal relinquishment of sovereignty without a sufficient counterbalance on the part of the nuclear Powers.

7. But it is here that a distinction has to be made between what is important and what is essential. I believe that the essential thing is still to get the two super Powers to take the path of real disarmament; any step in the right direction, however modest, must be encouraged, even at the price of certain sacrifices which are, besides, more apparent than real. Between that text—which is the fruit of long and arduous negotiations and whose imperfections and omissions we all recognize—and no treaty at all—in other words the uncontrolled proliferation of the nuclear Powers—the choice is clear. For that reason, Tunisia will support the draft treaty and will put its signature to that document whose positive aspect outweighs its many defects; among those defects, and not the least of them, the lack of consent on the part of France and People's China, confirmed nuclear Powers, is a serious cause for concern.

8. The fact that People's China is absent from all that is being done at the United Nations is in itself a cause of anxiety. The consequences, on the disarmament level, are obvious; but they are also obvious on other levels and particularly on the psychological level, because the isolation of that great country cannot fail to compromise the relaxation of international tension and international co-operation, to which the whole world aspires and which are beginning to come within the scope of realities. It is for the United Nations to discover the formula that will enable that great people, now in the process of ridding itself of the complexes and domestic crises that have been agitating it for several months, to play the part that belongs to it in this Organization; but the People's Republic of China must also help towards this end by

^{1/} Official Records of the Disarmament Committee, Supplement for 1967 and 1968, Doc. DC/230, and Add.1, Annex I.

refraining from laying down conditions or raising obstacles that would be difficult to overcome.

9. Such a formula should in no way prejudice the future of the Taiwan Government's presence in the United Nations.

10. The establishment of peace in Asia is at that price, and the efforts being made today to put an end to the distressing Viet-Nameese conflict would run the risk of failing to achieve a lasting peace throughout South East Asia, if China were to continue to be subject to the upheavals which it is undergoing at present.

11. Meanwhile, we can hope that the negotiations that have just been opened in Paris will make rapid progress towards a settlement that will enable the peoples of Viet-Nam, which has been devastated by one war after another for twenty years, at last to exercise their right to self-determination, in accordance with the 1954 Geneva Agreements and the United Nations Charter.

12. The right to self-determination remains the creed of the small nations, for, whatever one may say, a still significant part of mankind is still deprived of it.

13. Despite the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and notwithstanding the energetic positions adopted by the United Nations, colonialism is today rampant in several areas of the world, and especially in the southern part of the African continent, where several million men are still being subjected to colonial occupation and racial discrimination. The phenomenon of colonialism, which was our principal concern twelve years ago, has indeed diminished in scope, but the struggle for the complete achievement of the objectives of your Declaration on independence is still a difficult one, for we are dealing with the most stubborn of the colonial systems: colonialism by settlement. South Africa's dominion over South West Africa, that of Mr. Smith's racist régime over Southern Rhodesia, and Portugal's dominion over several African territories have all been condemned by the conscience of the entire world. They are doomed to disappear, but it is clear that the subjugated peoples have a decisive part to play in their own liberation which cannot come from brother and friendly countries, or from the United Nations, or even from the Organization of African Unity, whose joint efforts can nevertheless serve as a valuable contribution in the material, diplomatic and political fields; but that contribution can only be supplementary, although its absence was sorely felt by those who preceded them on the path to freedom during the 1950's.

14. Finally, another people, dispossessed of its land and its homeland by European emigrants, is confronting the same kind of colonialism, accompanied by a basically religious and racial fanaticism. The Palestinian people, whose cause has frequently been confused sometimes with political intrigues and sometimes with the ambitions for leadership that prevailed in the Middle East, is today showing its vitality and its ability to put up an increasingly effective resistance to an occupier who is no longer even taking the trouble to disguise his intentions. For the first time in many

years, the Palestinian problem is being posed in clear terms: it is no longer a question of the clash of exacerbated national ambitions, but of the right of the Palestinian people to recover its homeland and to determine its own future. Does that mean that today the Middle East crisis is entering a period of lengthy struggle that will show the Tel Aviv leaders that by unleashing a victorious six-day war they may have started a war of ten years or more, the outcome of which is less certain than they might think? The answer to that question will depend on the attitude of the Israeli leaders. There can be no doubt that so long as Israel refuses to recognize unequivocally the Security Council resolution [242 (1967)] of 22 November 1967, the only way out for the Arab people will be a struggle in all its forms. The Governments of the Arab countries for their part have as a whole accepted that resolution; they affirm that they are prepared to accept the consequences and responsibilities of a solution which, unfortunately, goes far beyond what I myself suggested in April 1965, during my tour of Middle East countries.

15. But this is neither the time nor the place to recall past mistakes; on the contrary, it is the time for all Arabs to combine their efforts and their resources to bring about a solution that, to be realistic, must none the less be just and honourable. In any case, and whatever that solution may be, it can only be conceived with the participation and with the agreement of the principal party concerned: the Palestinian people.

16. For my part, I still believe that the present crisis can be overcome, that a peaceful path can be opened up, and that Ambassador Jarring's mission can still meet with success. For if Israel is at all prepared to co-operate with the United Nations within the framework of the Security Council resolution, a solution can be found to the question of which of the two principles set forth in paragraph I of the resolution should be applied first.

17. United Nations intervention can introduce a sort of simultaneity and thus evade the snag which serves as a pretext for the Israeli authorities to avoid the putting in gear of the peace machinery. For instance, one can imagine a plan in the first phase of which Israel would withdraw its armed forces from all the territories occupied since the conflict of 5 June 1967, without any exception whatsoever. Simultaneously, and still in the first phase, United Nations troops would be stationed in those areas. In a second phase, the Secretary-General's special representative would enter into appropriate negotiations with the parties concerned to make sure of the implementation—and of the methods of implementation—of all the other provisions of the resolution. The third phase would consist of a Security Council decision which, based on a report by the Secretary-General and his representative, would consider that the resolution had been sufficiently implemented and would thus withdraw the United Nations troops so as to enable the countries concerned to resume control of their respective territories.

18. Those are just a few ideas which I put forward. Their implementation would raise important problems the extent of which we fully realize. Nevertheless, I

believe that the size of the stakes involved justifies some sacrifices and an effort of imagination.

19. Moreover, some Powers, such as France, have already stated that they are prepared to take part in a possible United Nations operation. Sweden, Canada, India, Yugoslavia and Senegal, besides some other countries, could be sounded, which would not refuse the United Nations their co-operation for the success of that undertaking or of any other similar action which, without introducing any new principle, would make possible the application of a text which seems to have the approval of the great majority of Members of the United Nations, including most of the Arab States.

20. Of course, the implementation, even to the fullest extent, of the Security Council resolution will not solve all the problems raised by the creation of the State of Israel. But if the implementation of the Security Council decision of 22 November last could be achieved—along the lines I have just suggested—it would be possible to separate the basic problem from all the side issues that have helped to complicate it, and even to distort it. The fundamental problem—that of two nationalisms coexisting in one territory—Palestinian nationalism and Jewish nationalism—will fully come to light again at last and can find its solution, with time of course, in a compromise reached between the interested parties themselves and with the blessing of the four great Powers, formulated in concrete guarantees, in an honourable compromise based not on the victory of one and the humiliation of the other, but on both parties' dignity—in other words, on each party's recognition of the other's right to existence, to security and to development. That is why Tunisia considers that the appearance on the scene of the Palestinians and their determination to take over what is basically the real problem of Palestine is a positive element likely to contribute to a lasting and just settlement of the problem of peace in the Middle East.

21. That successful outcome will, I repeat, call for time, determination and the uniting of all the Palestinian resisters around an over-all strategy in order to avoid rivalries which would be fatal in the circumstances; above all, it will require an unshakable faith in that strategy, whatever the internal and external vicissitudes and obstacles that may drive some to adopt easy and ultimately sterile all-or-nothing positions.

22. Thus perhaps there will be a revival of the hope, at present so wavering, of seeing peace prevail again in one of the world's most sensitive regions, a region of the world which has not been unworthy of mankind, in that Middle East where once resounded the threefold message of the One God, calling men to peace and brotherhood.

23. Mr. President, Tunisia takes this opportunity to express once again its satisfaction at your election as President of this Assembly, both on account of the friendship that links our country with yours and because of the deep significance attaching to the choice of an eminent statesman of socialist Romania as the first representative of Eastern Europe to assume that high office.

24. Tunisia wishes also to express its appreciation of the work accomplished by the Secretary-General, U Thant, whose devotion to the cause of peace is equalled only by the ability and efficiency he has placed at the service of our Organization.

25. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): On behalf of the General Assembly, I thank the President of the Republic of Tunisia for the important statement he has just made.

AGENDA ITEM 64

Question of South West Africa (continued)

26. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): Comrade President, allow me on this occasion to express my delegation's deep satisfaction that you, as representative of the brotherly socialist Republic of Romania, are occupying the high post of President of our resumed session. We are convinced that under your able guidance our work will reach a successful conclusion and that the appropriate decisions will be adopted on the items on our agenda.

27. The present debate very clearly reflects the growing impatience of the international community with the stubborn and cruel colonial rule enforced by South Africa over the people of South West Africa. During the past two decades the General Assembly has exposed in seventy-eight resolutions and in voluminous documents the undeniable fact that the Pretoria régime, resorting to the most brutal violence and arbitrariness, has deprived the people of South West Africa of its fundamental rights and liberties and has subjected the African population to the most cruel racial discrimination, which constitutes a crime against humanity. Not a single delegation has tried to mitigate the criminal responsibility of South Africa and nobody has taken its side before in this august Assembly. This shows an almost general understanding that the constant defiance displayed by the white racist clique there increases the danger to peace in Africa.

28. It is no secret that in violation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)] and of specific General Assembly resolutions, for example resolution 1805 (XVII) and resolution 2074 (XX), military bases and other military installations have been established in South West Africa which are directed against the national liberation movements of the Territory and of the other parts of the African continent, in collusion with the infamous Portuguese colonialists and with the henchmen in Salisbury. The extent of the risk to the security of the whole of mankind becomes even more horribly clear when we take into serious consideration the fact that South Africa is very near to achieving the capability to manufacture nuclear weapons. The awareness of this danger cannot but make everyone—and first of all the African nations—press for the earliest conclusion of the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in order to prevent the spread to the African continent of this most devastating means of killing.

29. A further examination of the record of South Africa at the United Nations, as well as in South West Africa, gives a warning signal to all of us who are

concerned with justice and the future of peoples still under colonial rule and exploitation. The white settler régime in Pretoria has refused to comply with General Assembly resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V) which provide for granting the people of South West Africa an opportunity to exercise its inalienable right to freedom and independence. The General Assembly rightly condemned this attitude of the Pretoria régime in resolution 2325 (XXII) of 16 December 1967.

30. The white settler clique, in violation of the international status of the Territory and in complete disregard of human rights and fundamental freedoms for the overwhelming majority of the population in South West Africa, is holding this Territory under its own military and colonial domination. In spite of the expressed will of the overwhelming majority of its population of South West Africa, the minority régime has intensified its measures to annex Namibia in its entirety and to repress any popular move for the liberation of that country. The Security Council, in its resolutions 245 (1968) and 246 (1968), only a few months ago condemned Pretoria for putting on trial and imprisoning many heroic fighters among the Namibian people.

31. The policy of annexation by South Africa has been clearly manifested on many occasions; I shall refer to only a few recent events. In his opening speech to the so-called Legislative Assembly on 11 March 1968, Mr. W. C. Plessis, the illegally functioning administrator of South West Africa said that important steps would be taken "to put into execution the reorganization of financial and administrative functions between the Republic and South West Africa". This appeared in The Windhoek Advertiser of 12 March 1968.

32. On 14 March 1968 the so-called Deputy Minister of South West African Affairs, Mr. J. G. H. van der Wath, introduced in Parliament the "South West Africa Constitution Bill". As is known, the measures envisaged in the Bill will have a disruptive effect on the territorial integrity and unity of South West Africa. In the opinion of my delegation, the Bill was practically designed to annex South West Africa to South Africa.

33. The authorities of the Pretoria régime have already started to implement the new administrative measures against the African population of the Territory. Ovamboland is being set up as a separate "homeland". Some 500 Namas have been moved to their so-called "homeland". As long ago as October 1967, the illegal Commissioner-General for South West Africa, the representative of the white settler régime, threatened some fifty leading Hereros, saying that his "Government" would "raise its fist" to those Hereros who refused to co-operate in the implementation of the plan to create a separate homeland for them. The Pretoria régime has openly declared its intention to take over the Territory's financial affairs. A decision to that end appeared in the Cape Times on 15 March 1968.

34. On 27 October 1966 the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI) in which it decided that the Mandate was terminated, that South Africa had no right to administer the Territory, and that henceforth the Territory would be under the direct responsibility

of the United Nations. The Pretoria régime, therefore, has no right to promulgate laws, decrees and regulations for the administration of the Territory. Consequently, all such measures are invalid. The land of South West Africa belongs to the people of Namibia. The Pretoria régime has no right whatsoever to separate people in their own land.

35. General Assembly resolution 2074 (XX), in full consonance with a resolution adopted as long ago as May 1963 by the Summit Conference of Independent African States in Addis Ababa, declared that "any attempt to annex a part or the whole of the Territory of South West Africa constitutes an act of aggression".

36. Our Organization, as is clear from the records, has made great efforts to remedy the situation. Who, then, should take the blame for the failure of all those efforts? No matter in what direction we search for an answer, political, economic or military—and we have heard a great deal on this score—the conclusion will always be more or less the same: it is the major allies of South Africa—namely, the United Kingdom, the United States, West Germany and other Western countries—which provide the Pretoria régime with substantive military and economic co-operation and encourage it to continue to defy the United Nations and world public opinion.

37. My delegation holds them equally responsible for the situation which has arisen in Namibia. Their representatives here and in other forums express all kinds of good intentions, but their actions do not match their words. The lofty ideals of human rights, liberty, and so on, which they have advocated are superseded by selfish business interests aimed at the exploitation of the human and natural resources of Namibia.

38. Their common interests are accentuated these days by the fact that South West Africa is now on the eve of the most comprehensive search for minerals in its history and South African and foreign companies have been trying to rob the people of the Territory of its natural wealth. The United Nations is therefore faced with the problem, not only of making an effective contribution to the early achievement of the independence of South West Africa but also helping the people of that Territory to get rid of the dual exploitation by South African and other foreign monopolies.

39. A United Nations report on foreign investment in South Africa reveals that foreign investment plays an important role in the economy of South Africa, which, of course, includes the economy of Namibia as well. I quote from that report:

"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."

The same United Nations report also points out:

"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."^{2/}

40. The increasing financial and military involvement of the Federal Republic of Germany in South Africa and South West Africa is also well known. A United Nations document points out that

"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 ... Territory of South West Africa, which had been made part of South Africa and was under the complete control of the South African Navy."

41. On 21 March 1968, Klöckner and Company of Duisburg, one of the largest industrial concerns in the Federal Republic of Germany, was reported to have acquired the majority shareholding in the South West Africa Lithium Mines. This company has planned to build a special lithium beneficiation plant at the mine near Karibib. This plant is considered to be the largest of its kind in the world. As is known, lithium is the lightest metal and it can play an ever-increasing role in many modern industries, including those concerned with rocketry and atomic energy. The foregoing was published in The Windhoek Advertiser on 21 March 1968.

42. My delegation fully understands that the majority of Member States would like to remedy the situation in South West Africa as soon as possible, and Hungary joins them in their efforts. We also share the justifiable impatience of many countries at the fact that very little progress has thus far been made in this matter. My delegation, however, does not believe that we can accelerate a just solution of the problem by blaming equally those who always advocate the liquidation of colonialism, neo-colonialism and racial discrimination, and have taken practical steps to that end, and those who have pursued a policy of friendly and very lucrative co-operation with the racist Pretoria régime. In my delegation's view, such an assessment of the situation would do a great deal of harm to the cause of the South West African people, and such untrue assertions would spread the seeds of division at a moment when we keenly need unity among all anti-colonial and anti-imperialist forces in order to give more effective assistance to all peoples fighting for their independence, including the people of Namibia.

43. The Hungarian Peoples Republic, like all other socialist countries, including the German Democratic Republic, is entirely in solidarity with the people of Namibia in their fight for independence and self-determination, just as we support many other peoples fighting for their independence, including the Vietnamese people in their heroic struggle against the United States invaders and the Arab peoples in their just struggle against the Israeli invaders. The Hun-

garian delegation firmly supports the appeal of the United Nations for moral and material assistance to be given to the African population of South West Africa for their legitimate struggle against the illegal presence of the Pretoria régime. At the same time, my delegation deeply deplores the attitude of the major allies of the white-settler régime—namely, the United Kingdom, the United States, Western Germany, and others—for refusing to comply with relevant United Nations resolutions and for refusing to promote, by effective measures, the immediate and unconditional independence of the people of Namibia.

44. My delegation has studied with great attention the report of the United Nations Council for South West Africa [A/7088 and Corr.1]. We appreciate very much the Council's endeavour to find a just solution to the problem which was so eloquently presented by the President of the United Nations Council for South West Africa, the representative of Yugoslavia, at the 1649th plenary meeting. The firm determination and untiring efforts of the Council must serve as an encouragement to our Organization to find and carry out appropriate collective measures that must lead to the immediate discontinuance of the illegal presence of the Pretoria régime in South West Africa.

45. Because of the extremely dangerous situation that has developed in Namibia as a result of the expansionist policy of the white-settler régime in Pretoria, my delegation maintains that the Security Council should be requested to reaffirm the former position of the General Assembly, namely, that any attempt to annex South West Africa by the Pretoria régime constitutes an act of aggression, and that we have, accordingly, to request the Security Council to take the necessary measures. In the opinion of my delegation, those measures should include the application of comprehensive sanctions against the Pretoria régime. It is also necessary for the Pretoria authorities to release and repatriate all political prisoners who have been illegally arrested, and to allow the free return of the African exiles who were forced to leave their country because of the brutal police terror of the white-settler régime.

46. We hold that the General Assembly is bound to declare unambiguously the responsibility of the major allies of the Pretoria régime, namely the United Kingdom, the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, Portugal, and other Western Powers for the present situation prevailing in Namibia. Consequently, instead of paying taxes, profits, royalties, to South Africa and financing its expanding economic and military programmes, they should pay these amounts to cover the bill for all United Nations measures required for the achievement of Namibia's independence.

47. My delegation maintains that it serves the interests of the people of Namibia to grant independence to that Territory without delay. We also maintain that such a step will be entirely in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)], and with General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V) which decided that the Territory must become independent by June 1968.

^{2/} Foreign Investment in the Republic of South Africa (United Nations publication, Sales No.: 67.II.K.9), p. 18.

48. After expelling the minority white settlers of South Africa from Namibia, the United Nations and the independent African States will have to lend their assistance to the national leaders of Namibia in the establishment of their free and democratic government with the participation of all the groups of the African population who fought for the independence of Namibia.

49. My delegation is studying carefully the other proposals which were made during our present debate, and is willing to give its support to the constructive suggestions which will bring about genuine and unconditional independence and the self-determination of the South West African population, and remove the illegal presence of the Pretoria régime from Namibia.

50. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): I am very pleased once again, on behalf of my delegation, Mr. President, to welcome your presence in the Presidential Chair. It is a continuing assurance that our present debates will be conducted with objectivity and fairness, which characterized your conduct of this most important office during our first session.

51. This debate on South West Africa and the report of the United Nations Council for South West Africa testifies to the deep concern which the overwhelming majority of the nations of the world feel because of the continuing injustice inflicted upon the people of South West Africa. The United States fully shares that concern and continues to seek both inside and outside the United Nations ways by which this injustice can be redressed. It may be useful at the outset to recall the road we have travelled on this issue since the fall of 1966. In the Assembly's general debate that year, South West Africa was a leading topic. Speaking for the United States, I made clear the depth of my country's opposition to South Africa's policy in the Territory, and of our commitment to a just solution. I stated that continued violation by South Africa of its plain obligation in this matter would necessarily require all nations, including my own, to take such an attitude into account in their relations with South Africa.

52. A month later, on 27 October 1966, after intensive debate and negotiation, the Assembly took a decisive stand on this great issue when we adopted by an overwhelming vote resolution 2145 (XXI). In that resolution, we decided that the Mandate over South West Africa was terminated, that South Africa had no other rights to administer the Territory, and that henceforth South West Africa comes under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. We called upon South Africa to refrain from any actions that would alter the Territory's international status.

53. During the debate on resolution 2145 (XXI), I stated, on behalf of the United States, a view which found expression in that resolution, and which I believe remains valid today. It is still true that to be effective on this most important issue we need more than world opinion voiced by words in a resolution. We need world co-operation manifested by concrete action and by steps which can be practically implemented, and which lie within the capacity of the Organization. The action which the General Assembly takes should, therefore, be both intrinsically sound and widely supported. This is necessary for the sake of the people of South West

Africa who have a right to expect from us not only words but also concrete, helpful and meaningful actions.

54. I have also stated in this Assembly—and I now reaffirm—that the United States will do its utmost by all appropriate and peaceful means to help carry through to fruition the aims which are so broadly shared and which are embodied in resolution 2145 (XXI). Immediately upon the adoption of resolution 2145 (XXI) in October 1966, the United States made representations to the South African Government, calling its attention to the resolution and, particularly, to the provisions of paragraph 7 against any steps by South Africa to alter the international status of South West Africa, and urging that South Africa respond affirmatively to the resolution. The United States also promptly reacted when South Africa moved to apply its Terrorism Act to South West Africa. On 14 September 1967, our Ambassador delivered to the South African Government a protest against this action, and specifically against the arrest and detention of thirty-seven South West Africans, under the Terrorism Act, in clear violation of resolution 2145 (XXI).

55. We made a further démarche to the same effect on 11 October 1967. When the South African Government failed to give a satisfactory reply, the United States Government again approached that Government on 16 December 1967 and reaffirmed the protest of the United States Government against the continuing application of the Terrorism Act, as well as the Suppression of Communism Act, to the Territory of South West Africa and its inhabitants, and against the trial of the South West Africans then taking place in Pretoria. We stated our view that South Africa, in applying the Terrorism Act, as well as the Suppression of Communism Act, to the inhabitants of South West Africa was derogating from the obligations of the Mandate which it had assumed in 1920 as a sacred trust, namely, to promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and the social progress of the inhabitants, and was violating the rights of the inhabitants as created by the Mandate. We pointed out that the Terrorism Act had been passed in flagrant disregard of resolution 2145 (XXI) and that important parts of both Acts failed to meet even the minimal standards which international law imposes on any State in its dealing with nationals other than its own.

56. The United States again took diplomatic action when the Security Council, on 25 January 1968, adopted its resolution 245, calling upon South Africa to discontinue forthwith its illegal trial of the South West Africans, and to release and repatriate them, and inviting all States to exert their influence to gain its compliance. Pursuant to this resolution, we made further representations to the South African Government stating the view that the trial and sentencing of the South West Africans was contrary to the international obligations of South Africa and in violation of the international status of the Territory and the rights of the inhabitants. And we insisted that those convicted should be released and repatriated.

57. Again within the past few weeks, when the South African Government introduced in Parliament the miscalled Homelands Bill which is plainly designed

to fragment the Territory on apartheid principles, my Government reacted promptly in protest. On 4 May, just over two weeks ago, we presented to the South African Government a detailed criticism of this unjust bill. We pointed out, among other things, that the bill allocates the largest and richest part of the Territory of South West Africa, including the economic and industrial heartland, to the white minority and it consigns the non-white groups, who constitute the large majority of the population, to smaller and poorer lands; that it confers the real authority over the non-white majority on the State President of South Africa in whose election they will have no voice; that, in fact, it further entrenches in South West Africa the South African system of apartheid and that in the formulation of this legislation the non-white majority in South West Africa has had no real or meaningful voice. We pointed out that this bill, if enacted and applied to the Territory, would be in violation of South Africa's international obligations respecting South West Africa and in further contravention of the resolutions of the General Assembly. We adhere to the views expressed in this démarche.

58. In addition to these diplomatic efforts the United States has adhered scrupulously to the United Nations embargo on the supply of arms and military equipment to South Africa. My delegation appreciates the acknowledgement of our policy in this respect by representatives of several African countries during this debate, and we share their concern at the fact that some other countries are not fully meeting their obligations under the embargo.

59. Now, Mr. President, having recounted these efforts I must candidly agree that thus far the efforts of my Government, combined with those of other Governments and the United Nations itself, have been unavailing against the obdurate attitude of South Africa. Nevertheless we must persevere. When we adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), and thereby took upon the United Nations the responsibility for South West Africa, we embarked on a formidable undertaking in which easy or early success was not to be expected and in which we must, above all, refuse to give up or to become discouraged. My own Government still intends to do its utmost by all appropriate and peaceful means to help carry through to fruition the aims which are so broadly shared and which are embodied in resolution 2145 (XXI).

60. The question we must now determine is this: what should the United Nations do now in addition to its past efforts that will be practical and constructive? In making this determination, we must recognize the limitations inherent in a General Assembly of 124 sovereign nations attempting to draw up a realistic and detailed blueprint by which the United Nations, in face of South Africa's attitude, can discharge the responsibilities it has assumed in this important and difficult matter. We must avoid mere paper resolutions recommending action beyond the capacity of this Organization to achieve, for such resolutions can only raise false hopes among the people who look to us for help. Instead, we must continue our search for concrete and practical ways to bring relief and support to the people of South

West Africa so as to enable them to exercise their right of self-determination.

61. There are a number of fields in which action may be possible and fruitful. One of these is that of assistance to, and particularly education and training for, refugees from South West Africa. My Government agrees with Ambassador Akwei of Ghana who suggested earlier in this debate [1646th meeting] that the United Nations should help "to prepare these displaced persons for the task of national service". And we agree also with Ambassador Jakobson of Finland that this matter would be an appropriate subject for a separate resolution by the General Assembly. Furthermore, the United States, in response to your invitation, Mr. President, will be glad to serve on the proposed seven-nation committee to advise the Secretary-General on subventions to African institutions to enable them to enroll students under the United Nations educational and training programme for refugees from South West Africa and other parts of southern Africa. My country, which has several hundred refugee students from southern Africa in its own educational institutions, is glad to co-operate also with this United Nations programme which serves the same important end of preparing future leaders for that part of Africa.

62. Several delegations have also suggested, in the course of this debate, that at the present juncture the Security Council ought to be enlisted in our efforts to bring relief and support to the people of South West Africa, so as to enable them to exercise their right of self-determination. It will be recalled that Security Council involvement was foreshadowed in paragraph 8 of Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI). Last January for the first time the Security Council addressed itself to one aspect of the question, namely, the trial and sentencing of thirty-three South West Africans under the Terrorism Act. But thus far it has not addressed itself to the question as a whole. The United States would not be adverse to enlisting the Security Council in our efforts in an appropriate way.

63. We should not attempt, at this time, to prejudge what type of action the Security Council ought to take although it might well prove useful for the Council to concern itself with some of the other aspects of the South West African problem which I enumerated a moment ago. Nor can anyone forecast that there will be fewer difficulties in the Council than in the General Assembly in trying to reach a consensus on practical and peaceful action. But I think it is obvious that the existing injustice and deprivation of human rights in South West Africa, and the violation by South Africa of its international obligations with respect to the Territory cannot be ignored.

64. The United States pledges its co-operation in seeking to frame a realistic, peaceful and practical course of action that can command the necessary wide support and that can bring us nearer to the goals which this Assembly joined in proclaiming, in resolution 2145 (XXI), the self-determination, freedom and independence of South West Africa.

The meeting rose at 4.50 p.m.