

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Official Records



FIFTH SPECIAL SESSION

1518th
PLENARY MEETING

Friday, 19 May 1967,
at 4.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 7:

Question of South West Africa (*continued*) . . . 1

President: Mr. Abdul Rahman PAZHWAK
(Afghanistan).

AGENDA ITEM 7

Question of South West Africa (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has exhausted the list of speakers in explanation of vote before the voting. Since no new proposals have been received and since there are no other representatives who wish to speak before the voting, we shall proceed to the vote.

2. The only proposal formally before the Assembly is that contained in document A/L.516/Rev.1. Members are aware that the representative of Ethiopia proposed this morning [1517th meeting], on behalf of the sponsors of that draft resolution, that the United Nations Council for South West Africa, as mentioned in section II, paragraph 1, of the draft resolution, should comprise eleven Member States.

3. Before the vote is taken, I wish to remind the General Assembly of the note prepared by the Secretary-General [A/6653], in accordance with rule 154 of the rules of procedure, on the financial implications of the draft resolution.

4. Before putting to the vote the draft resolution contained in document A/L.516/Rev.1—and a roll-call vote has been requested—I should like to request the Under-Secretary for General Assembly Affairs to explain the voting procedure to the Members of the Assembly.

5. Mr. NARASIMHAN (Under-Secretary for General Assembly Affairs): In respect of the roll-call vote on this item, may I request representatives to be kind enough, at the same time as they call off their votes when their names are called—and not before—to press the corresponding button in the small panel on their desks: the green button, at the extreme left, for "Yes"; the red button, at the extreme right, for "No"; and the amber button, in the centre, for "Abstention". May I again request representatives, at the same time as they press the corresponding button, to call their votes orally.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

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

Against: Portugal, South Africa

Abstaining: Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Romania, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy.

The draft resolution was adopted by 85 votes to 2, with 30 abstentions.

6. The PRESIDENT: Section II, paragraph 1 of the resolution just adopted provides that the United Nations Council for South West Africa, comprising eleven Member States, should be elected during this session. Unless I hear any suggestion to the contrary, I shall put this matter before the Assembly not later than Tuesday afternoon, 23 May.

7. I shall now give the floor to representatives who wish to explain their votes.

8. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I wish to make a short statement in explanation of my abstention from the vote on the resolution. My statement can be short because twice on this issue I have made the position and policy of my Government clear in this Assembly.

9. My delegation did not vote for resolution 2145 (XXI), for reasons which I have already fully explained. We have constantly in mind our obligation not only to the people of South West Africa, but also to the United Nations itself. We have consistently argued that we have an obligation not to raise false hopes, not to deceive ourselves or anyone else, and not to believe that we can overcome real barriers by words

alone. We were convinced that resolution 2145 (XXI) was likely to lead not to advance but to dissension and deadlock. But that did not mean that we were negative; far from it. We stated and advocated the practical and constructive course which we considered the right one. Let me state again the aim we set, the decision we took, and the method we proposed.

10. The aim was to enable all the people of South West Africa to proceed to free and full self-determination and independence. The conclusion which I stated last October in the General Assembly was that the South African Government had forfeited the right to administer the Mandate over South West Africa. As to method, our contention throughout has been that, having reached that vital conclusion, we should together thoroughly study all questions relevant to the advance which we wish to achieve and then act, not by words alone but by considered and deliberate action within our clear capacity.

11. We greatly regret that the pledge we gave to play a full and constructive part in considering methods and means and working out tactics and strategy and examining all legal and other aspects of the problem was not welcomed and accepted by others, and that the possibility of going forward in full agreement was therefore lost.

12. We were moreover prepared to support the practical action proposed in the Ad Hoc Committee by a number of countries, including Canada, Italy and the United States [A/6640, para. 84]. And again it is a matter for regret to us that the practical proposals then put forward were not accepted.

13. Two courses were proposed. We believe that the course we advocated could have opened the way to effective progress. We cannot see that resolution 2145 (XXI) and the resolution now adopted will do so. So, in abstaining from the vote today, I reaffirm the aim and the decision and the method which we have throughout consistently supported.

14. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): The Hungarian delegation has participated in the general debate on the question of South West Africa with the sincere intention to add its useful contribution to the cause of the freedom and independence of the people of South West Africa. We were guided by the same purpose in the course of the consultations which took place among different groups of Member States before the voting.

15. My delegation would like to express its appreciation for the kind words used by several delegations in commenting in the general debate, and privately as well, on the positive contribution of the socialist countries to the struggle against colonialism and imperialism in general and against the minority racist régime of South Africa in particular.

16. This special session of the General Assembly has just adopted a resolution on South West Africa sponsored by seventy-nine Member States. My delegation, as is known, abstained from the vote. We consider it most unfortunate that a situation should have arisen in the United Nations in which my delegation, acting on the basis of principle, has found it impossible to vote in favour of a draft aiming at the liquidation of colonial rule in Africa. I should like

to explain briefly the reasons for my delegation's attitude.

17. First, we firmly maintain that every people has the right to self-determination and independence. We understand self-determination to mean that every people should decide itself everything concerning its internal matters; these should not be decided from the outside. Thus, an indigenous population should exercise the power within the borders of its own country. In dealing with the problem of South West Africa our guideline has been the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In paragraph 5 of that historic resolution the General Assembly declared:

"Immediate steps shall be taken, in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories or all other territories which have not yet attained independence, to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories, without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire, without any distinction as to race, creed or colour, in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom."

18. Many speeches, resolutions, exhortations have been voiced in this hall. I do not wish to repeat them, but we think that this passage in the Declaration says clearly that immediate steps should be taken. "Steps" mean concrete measures to achieve the aim—that is, independence for the people of South West Africa; and "immediate" means that we should not postpone in any way a decision or the taking of these steps. In requesting immediate independence for South West Africa we are acting in full observance of the Declaration contained in resolution 1514 (XV).

19. Secondly, many delegations have called attention to the present realities of the situation in South West Africa. In discussing the realities, we cannot ignore the most important aspect of the problem; the political, economic and strategic reasons for the close co-operation of the NATO Powers with the white minority régime in South Africa. Unfortunately, no reference was made in the resolution to this stumbling-block on the road leading to the independence of South West Africa. Instead, tact, politeness and a deference to the interests of those Powers and to their opinions have been expressed.

20. My delegation maintains that without putting an end to this heinous and criminal co-operation, carried out in spite of many United Nations resolutions, we cannot effectively help the people of South West Africa to gain genuine independence. How long will those Powers abuse our patience and, above all, abuse the patience of the people of South West Africa? It would seem to be a mere illusion to expect the major NATO Powers to co-operate in deeds in achieving that goal. The aggressive activities of the United States in South-East Asia, among others, clearly indicate the true nature of imperialism and colonialism. It uses force to oppress the freedom-loving people of Viet-Nam, in spite of the mounting indignation of world public opinion, and is prepared to commit similar crimes elsewhere if its vested interests or ambitions for power meet opposition.

21. Thirdly, during the existence of our Organization every year tremendous efforts have been made to persuade the racist minority régime of South Africa to abandon its illegal occupation of the Territory of South West Africa and its cruel policy of apartheid. Considering the aggressive attitude of the minority racist régime of South Africa, on what basis can we count on the co-operation of that régime in the future? That reasonable question is still waiting to be answered. Why is a dialogue needed? On what grounds and how is it to be carried out? We had an opportunity of hearing an answer from representatives of South Africa. They have been present in our hall, not only their Ambassador but also special emissaries from that régime—high officials. Did they have any contacts with the African people or with delegations that are interested in solving the problem of independence for South West Africa? Did they express any intention to satisfy the rightful demands and to execute the resolutions adopted by our Organization? We have only heard one word from them during this session of the General Assembly, and that is the word they spoke during the voting: "No". That is their answer to the whole resolution and to all the attempts for a dialogue for the settlement and solution of this problem. Thus, in the view of my delegation, any attempt to create contacts with them or to start a dialogue with them is only delaying the independence of South West Africa. Instead of raising false hopes, we ought to condemn that régime for its illegal occupation of the Territory, which as a result of the acceptance of resolution 2145 (XXI) came under the direct responsibility of the United Nations.

22. Fourthly, in the view of the Hungarian delegation, no outside administration should be imposed on any territory in the world, on any people that is striving for independence. Any such outside administration has inherent dangers of abuse of power. It would have danger that the situation might get out of the hands of the Organization, that a bureaucracy might be established and that the problem might not be properly settled. It might give an opportunity for personal ambitions and not promote the true interests of the local people. We have already in the past had very bitter and bad experiences. We cannot delay the independence of the Territory by making experiments, especially in a situation where uncertainty prevails over the outcome of the experiments.

23. Fifthly, by the assumption of administrative functions, such power is given to the proposed council that it calls for the utmost precaution. I am referring to the power to promulgate laws, decrees and administrative regulations up to the time of the establishment of the legislative assembly and the taking of necessary measures for the maintenance of law and order. We cannot ignore the fact that in such a council the members might have different approaches to the solution of the same problems. Each member might differ according to his background and interests, and these conflicting interests might result in bad resolutions and not in promoting the genuine interests of the local population. Besides, such a council would need an administrative staff which would also be composed of foreigners. They would constitute a link between the council and the action in the field, and through this particular means

they might even modify or change the meaning of correct decisions, as has happened on other occasions. In our view, these powers must be exercised by the representatives of the indigenous peoples. The functions of the United Nations in this respect should be restricted solely to promoting activities of this kind by the local government of the people.

24. Sixthly, according to section V of the resolution, the Council is to report to the General Assembly at intervals not exceeding three months on its administration, and there is no provision for the control and direction of the Council in the period of time between the sessions of the General Assembly. I think that even the sponsors of the draft resolution did not have the intention to establish a self-governing body, in the form of this Council in the Territory, whose activities would be very difficult to control.

25. During the consultations no explanation was given regarding the situation that would arise when an urgent consideration of a particular problem would be necessary in order to decide how to guarantee the best interests of the South West African people. The Council might very frequently meet such a situation when advice and direction would be needed. Judging the problem of South West Africa objectively, the chances for the co-operation of the minority white régime in the implementation of the United Nations resolution on South West Africa are not greater now than they were before; that is, they are practically nil. The resolution does not give a clear answer regarding that very possible outcome. Thus we are again losing valuable months without bringing nearer the independence of the Territory. In order to avoid such a development, the socialist countries, including Hungary, have suggested giving an organic role to the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and to the Organization of African Unity in the carrying out of the provisions of this resolution.

26. This proposal was prompted by the experience that in recent years that Committee has proved its efficiency in handling colonial issues, including the question of South West Africa. Also well known is the extent to which the Organization of African Unity, by its resolutions on different colonial issues and by other practical means, has contributed to the solution of many problems at the United Nations.

27. The involvement of the Committee of Twenty-four and the Organization of African Unity in the implementation of the present resolution, therefore, would not lessen the responsibility of the United Nations, but would raise it to a higher level, would increase its control and efficiency, and would at the same time accelerate the process of decolonization in South West Africa. I am still wondering why this aspect of the problem was not given the necessary attention by the sponsors.

28. Seventhly, turning to the financial implications of the implementation of the resolution, my delegation maintains that the United Nations should hold responsible the colonial and other Powers which are usurping the human and material resources of the territory. They should cover such expenditures. The United

Nations should in no way contribute to their continuing role. Otherwise, we would create a very dangerous precedent which would rather encourage than discourage the colonial Powers to continue the exploitation of the remaining colonies, including South West Africa. To independent South West Africa, on the other hand, my country will gladly render economic and other assistance in a selfless way.

29. My delegation has always paid very significant attention to the struggle of peoples for self-determination and independence. The Hungarian Government, in accordance with its modest possibilities, has extended and is extending political, economic and all other assistance to peoples fighting against imperialism and colonialism.

30. We appreciate very much the endeavours of the Afro-Asian and Latin American countries to find a solution for the independence of South West Africa by the presentation of the resolution on South West Africa. Although my delegation has expressed some reservations in connexion with certain parts of the resolution, I should like to assure the co-sponsors that in the genuine efforts and positive steps they undertake for the independence of South West Africa and to help the people of South West Africa to overcome the nefarious attempts of the colonialist and neo-colonialist Powers, and in intervention to prevent this development, they can always count on the co-operation of my delegation and my country.

31. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway): When General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) was adopted last year, the majority in favour of that resolution was impressive. But, still, concern was felt because two permanent members of the Security Council were unable to vote for the resolution and two other members made their affirmative votes contingent upon various verbal reservations.

32. It seems to us that the experience of the intervening months has proved that this concern was not unfounded and that the General Assembly should proceed with the greatest caution in subsequent efforts to implement the resolution.

33. The resolution changed the status of South West Africa within this Organization. The South African presence in the Territory is no longer based legally on the Mandate, but forms a purely factual situation without any basis in the law of the United Nations. This factual situation is henceforth in conflict with the law of the Organization, and must therefore be changed. It is the task of the Organization to make the actual circumstances conform to the legal situation and to spare no effort which could realistically be made to bring this about.

34. It is true that support of the major Powers was important last year, when the General Assembly settled some basic principles with regard to South West Africa, and it is even more true today that the support of the major Powers is absolutely essential for the implementation of that resolution.

35. Before the vote was taken today, it was quite clear that the resolution could not command the kind of majority which was obtained in favour of the resolution of last year. Of particular importance,

to our mind, is the fact that two of the permanent members of the Security Council who voted in favour of the resolution last year found themselves forced to abstain this year. Yet, it is quite clear that, in the last resort, the Security Council may be asked for enforcement measures. It is open to doubt whether the permanent members will uphold in the Council what they have been unable to support in the General Assembly.

36. Furthermore, it seems to our delegation that the resolution goes beyond what is justified by political realities, in so far as it envisages an immediate presence in the Territory is no longer based legally opposed—without in any way indicating how this presence will come about. Nor are we convinced that the provisions for a United Nations administration for the Territory, as set out in the resolution, represent the most practical solution to the problems that would follow the withdrawal of the present *de facto* administration. The United Nations would be faced with organizational difficulties of unprecedented magnitude in attempting to discharge a responsibility which would cover all governmental activity in the Territory. We believe that this enormous task would require, in addition to universal support, much more study and planning than has so far taken place.

37. It seems to us, therefore, that the adoption of this resolution will raise false hopes and indicate to the peoples of the world that the Organization is able to take steps which at present are not possible.

38. If this resolution does not achieve its goals, it may weaken the Organization without having helped the people of South West Africa. Therefore, the Norwegian delegation was not able to vote in favour of the resolution which was just adopted. This does not mean that we have changed our position of last year. We voted in favour of resolution 2145 (XXI), which was a resolution of principle, and my Government is ready to vote for new resolutions implementing that resolution, provided they have a reasonable chance of being executed and will bring effective help towards the freedom of South West Africa.

39. Mr. TOMOROWICZ (Poland): If I take the floor at this late stage of the proceedings on the present point on our agenda, it is because I deem it my duty to explain as briefly as possible the motives which prompted my delegation to abstain from voting on resolution A/L.516/Rev.1, much as we wished to be together with our Afro-Asian friends also in this procedural act. I can be brief—indeed I feel compelled to be brief—in explaining our position on this matter because elaboration at this stage would tend to be repetitious, especially since I trust that, on the basis of our statements in the general debate, and in the bilateral and multilateral discussions we had the opportunity to have, there can be no room now for any doubts whatsoever as to our firmness and devotion to the struggle for the full implementation of the important aims given to all of us by resolution 2145 (XXI). I am pleased to say that we have also had here ample testimony of the full understanding of our position in that respect, in the interventions of a number of important African representatives.

40. My delegation is deeply convinced that the resolution contained in A/L.516/Rev.1 should have contained such provisions as would enable fulfilment in practice of all the basic aims of resolution 2145 (XXI), and we wanted to see those provisions made effective to eliminate all loss of time and to make use of all ways and means available to our Organization in that respect.

41. I trust that here we are in full agreement with the Afro-Asian group. Where we differed in our discussions was in the realm of methods to be adopted.

42. With all regrets and hesitation, after making a thorough and honest analysis of the resolution which has just been adopted, we have to admit that we have serious doubts about whether it will lead to a speedy fulfilment of the aforementioned aims.

43. To make the resolution effective, we wanted it to leave no doubt whatsoever as to our total condemnation of the position taken by the Government of South Africa, to exercise pressure upon all those Members which have important economic, political and diplomatic relations with South Africa to discontinue all their activities in those fields—activities which, in the final analysis, have strengthened the position of the Pretoria régime—and to make them use their weight to crush the obstinacy of the South Africans. We believe that it is for this Organization to collaborate fully with the African States to help the people of South West Africa to enter directly into the administration of their own territory, and not to be a replacement for their administration, which may only slow down the process of the emancipation and liberation of the people of South West Africa.

44. May I take this opportunity to look for a moment into the future, which in this respect, we trust, is most important, and once again to reiterate our full readiness and resolution to continue to co-operate with our Afro-Asian friends in the struggle for a free, independent and sovereign South West Africa.

45. Mr. PATRICIO (Portugal): Mr. President, as this is the first time I have had the opportunity to speak from this rostrum, I wish, in the name of the Portuguese delegation, to offer our felicitations on your election to preside over the deliberations of the fifth special session of the General Assembly.

46. When on 27 October 1966, the General Assembly, at its twenty-first session, adopted resolution 2145 (XXI) on the question of South West Africa, the Portuguese delegation made clear the reasons, which were mainly juridical, why we could not support its provisions. The present resolution [A/L.516/Rev.1] is intended to implement those provisions. Consequently, the Portuguese delegation could not do anything other than assume the same position as last year and cast a negative vote this time also. We may add that the misgivings which we had reason to voice on the former occasion remain and that no new elements have arisen to alter that basic position.

47. Mr. DE BEUS (Netherlands): When my delegation voted for resolution 2145 (XXI) on South West Africa during the twenty-first session of the General As-

sembly, it made it clear that it considered the decision to terminate the Mandate exercised by South Africa entirely justified in view of the non-compliance by that country with the provisions of the Mandate Agreement. At the same time, my delegation made equally clear its reluctance for the United Nations to assume immediately a direct responsibility for the administration of the Territory, convinced as it was that that provision not be carried out in practice.

Mr. Rossides (Cyprus), Vice-President, took the Chair.

48. On 27 October 1966 my delegation stated:

"My delegation has, from the beginning, however, been reluctant to accept a resolution or a stipulation which cannot be carried out in practice in the foreseeable future. Accepting resolutions which we know in advance cannot be implemented devalues the resolutions of the General Assembly which can be only to the ultimate harm of the United Nations and to all of its Members. It is for that reason that my delegation still harbours a reservation with regard to ... the final provision of operative paragraph 4 of the resolution... Under the present wording of this section of paragraph 4, the United Nations would be obliged to assume immediately a direct responsibility itself for the administration of the Territory. Such a stipulation could, in our opinion, not be carried out in practice..." [1454th meeting, para. 98].

49. Nevertheless, my delegation stated that, while maintaining its reservation with regard to operative paragraph 4, it did not wish to withhold its support from the resolution as a whole.

50. Since then, nearly half a year has elapsed and no progress has in fact been made on the way to the assumption of the direct responsibility for the Territory which the United Nations then undertook. The Ad Hoc Committee for South West Africa, notwithstanding valiant efforts by its members, has been unable to come to a common recommendation for the "practical means" by which that should be done according to resolution 2145 (XXI).

51. The vote which has just been taken on the latest resolution concerning South West Africa has brought no change in the basic attitude of my delegation, nor has it decreased our misgivings about adopting resolutions when we know that they cannot be implemented in the foreseeable future. And we do know that the resolution just adopted can neither be implemented nor enforced without the active participation and support of those who have the power to do so. The adoption of a decision without their support, as has just been done, means merely adding another paper resolution to the long list of unexecuted resolutions regarding South West Africa. In the view of my delegation, it was not wise to take a further step on the road towards the creation on paper of an administration for South West Africa without first trying to secure implementation of the first and most vital part of the resolution of October 1966, namely to obtain access to South West Africa.

52. For somewhat less than half a century South Africa has been the administering Power over South

West Africa, and its administration there continues. That is contrary to resolution 2145 (XXI), but no purpose is served by ignoring the fact. Having terminated the Mandate, the United Nations should, in our opinion, now concentrate its efforts on the first practical steps to carry this decision into practice, rather than formulating new and more far-reaching decisions which cannot be carried out for the moment. The first step should, we believe, be to obtain a United Nations presence in South West Africa. It is that step that was central in the proposal made earlier by Canada, Italy and the United States, which my delegation would have been able to support because it would, in our view, have been a realistic attempt to implement resolution 2145 (XXI).

53. It would be idle to suppose, in the circumstances as they present themselves, that practical means to assume responsibility over South West Africa will be easily found. But it would be even less realistic to suppose that a resolution of a more stringent nature than resolution 2145 (XXI) will bring a solution merely by the force of its language. Instead of furthering the implementation of resolution 2145 (XXI), the newly adopted resolution will—we are reluctantly forced to state—create new and vaster problems for the near future.

54. The resolution that has now been adopted foresees that possibility, true enough, by requesting the Security Council to take "appropriate measures" to make possible the assumption of United Nations administration in South West Africa. This reference to the Security Council implies that some time in the near future the Council may be asked to address itself to the matter in order to enforce the relevant decision of the Assembly. It is our feeling that the provisions of the Charter concerning enforcement action, which were designed with a view to enabling the Council to restore peace once it had been disturbed, were not intended to cover a situation such as that now prevailing in South West Africa.

55. The resolution that the Assembly has adopted today will—we fear—remain a dead letter and will, in addition, break the near-unanimity that prevailed seven months ago.

56. For those reasons my delegation was not able to vote for this resolution.

57. Mr. WALDHEIM (Austria): In its intervention before the General Assembly on 27 October 1966 [1453rd meeting], the Austrian delegation made clear its position on the question of South West Africa. Our attitude on this burning problem is therefore well known to this Assembly. Resolution 2145 (XXI), which was supported by my delegation, opened a new chapter in the history of this Organization and paved the way for the solution of one of the most urgent problems of our time. It established special responsibilities for the United Nations which now have to be discharged.

58. Our attitude on the question of South West Africa has not changed since last October. We were and we are firm supporters of the principle of self-determination and of the right of colonial countries to decide freely on their future and to accede of their own free will to full independence.

We now have to give evidence that we are willing to carry out what we eloquently idealize. We must, therefore, find ways to discharge the responsibility we have taken upon ourselves under resolution 2145 (XXI) of the twenty-first session of the General Assembly, however difficult that might be. Although there has been general agreement on the final aim, the suggestions for action by the United Nations made in this Assembly are, as you all know, widely different.

59. The draft resolution originally submitted by the Afro-Asian delegations [A/L.516] called for an administrative body to proceed to South West Africa to take over the administration of the territory; in the original proposal by the Latin America delegations [A/6640, para. 93], the council to be created was to enter into contact with South Africa; in the proposal by Canada, Italy and the United States [A/6642, para. 84], the council was to have no administrative function, but to co-operate with a special representative, who was to establish the necessary contacts with all representative elements in the Territory.

60. Whereas it was possible, after a series of consultations between the sponsors of the Afro-Asian and the Latin American draft resolutions, to work out a common text, it was unfortunately not possible to reconcile the proposals contained in this document with the suggestions made by the delegations of Italy, Canada and the United States. We have to note that the complexity of the problem prevented the Assembly from reaching unanimous agreement. That was indeed regrettable.

61. The Austrian delegation is fully aware of the difficulties that stand in the way of achieving the goal set out in last year's resolution. We have reason to fear that it cannot be achieved in the time in which we should like to see it achieved. Shocking as it may be, the present reality cannot be overlooked. In our approach to the question of replacing the *de facto* administration by a new administration which draws its legitimacy from the decision of the United Nations, we have to take this reality into consideration.

62. There is wide agreement that contact has to be established with the *de facto* administrator in order to lay down the procedure for transferring the Territory with the least possible upheaval. This attempt, in the opinion of my delegation, has to be made in order to explore all the possibilities for a peaceful solution and to set the stage for further actions of the United Nations. Considerable progress was made in this respect during the consultations which took place between the sponsors of the original draft resolutions and which led to the introduction of document A/L.516/Rev.1.

63. I should like to express to the sponsors of this resolution our appreciation for their tireless efforts, for their patience and perseverance in trying to work out through mutual concessions a compromise text which should serve as a basis for further actions of this Assembly. We had hoped that those efforts would lead to a draft resolution acceptable to all. We are sorry to note that this could not be achieved. The historic resolution 2145 (XXI) is followed by a resolution enjoying less support. It does not have

the backing of the permanent members of the Security Council. We sincerely believe that only a resolution which has the full and active support of those Powers also can enable the United Nations to achieve, without delay, the goal set out in resolution 2145 (XXI).

64. We have to continue on the road of last year's decision, which found such broad agreement in the General Assembly. The fact that the resolution just adopted does not have the full support of the membership, especially of the permanent members of the Security Council, leads us to doubt the practical possibility of implementing the decision just taken. I do not want to elaborate in this context on the provisions setting up the council for South West Africa and giving its terms of reference, nor on the question of how to define the tasks of the Security Council in this connexion. I wish to stress, however, that we fully recognize the need for adequate and efficient machinery to implement last year's decision. Any action of this kind would, in the view of my delegation, require the support of the permanent members of the Security Council.

65. What we have to avoid under all circumstances is a split in our approach to this problem. What we need under all circumstances is unity. If we are unable to achieve this unity, we run the risk of doing harm not only to the people of South West Africa but also to our Organization.

66. We sincerely hope that this unity can be reached in the course of our further efforts, and I wish to assure this Assembly that my delegation is ready to co-operate fully to this end.

67. It was in the light of those considerations that the Austrian delegation cast its vote on the resolution just adopted.

68. Mr. JAKOBSON (Finland): In explaining the abstention of my delegation in the vote on the resolution which has just been adopted by the General Assembly, I wish to recall what I said in my statement at the beginning of this debate on 25 April [1503rd meeting]. I expressed the hope of my delegation that a determined effort would be made to maintain the grand coalition of nations that had supported the historic decision of the twenty-first session of the General Assembly on the future of South West Africa. Of course, maintaining that coalition could not be an end in itself. It was the view of my delegation from the outset that any decision taken by this special session not only would have to be based on resolution 2145 (XXI), which irrevocably terminated the Mandate of South Africa over South West Africa, but also would have to carry us forward from that point and represent a real advance towards the goal of enabling the people of South West Africa to achieve self-determination and independence.

69. We all know that a determined effort was in fact made to find a solution that would combine the two qualities I just mentioned: maintaining the near unanimity achieved last October and carrying us forward to the goal that we set for ourselves. It is now clear that such a solution could not be found. The sponsors of the resolution just adopted obviously came to the conclusion that any further concessions on their part for the sake of maintaining the coalition

of last October would have defeated the purpose to which, in their view, all those who voted for resolution 2145 (XXI) were committed. At the same time, those delegations that could not support the resolution, for a variety of reasons, felt that it failed to pass the test of what in present circumstances was practicable.

70. The fact that the majority of last October has now fallen apart—a fact that so many speakers have deeply regretted—is not due to any lack of effort or time. The patient and persistent negotiations carried out between different groups—and no one could have more sincerely or ably striven for genuine compromise than the spokesman of the sponsors, the representative of Nigeria—clearly demonstrated that there is at present an irreconcilable difference over the means by which the purpose of resolution 2145 (XXI) can be carried into effect. It is not a difference that could be resolved by a form of words. It reflects a real difference of interests and convictions. This fact, though regrettable, must be faced.

71. As far as my delegation is concerned, we stated in the Ad Hoc Committee on South West Africa that, in our view, the logic of resolution 2145 (XXI) establishing direct United Nations responsibility for South West Africa pointed to the desirability of a direct United Nations administration for the Territory. Unfortunately, the logic of the resolution on which we have voted does not correspond to the prevailing facts of power. The course of action mapped out in the resolution requires the co-operation of the great Powers, which alone have the means and the responsibility for carrying it to a successful conclusion. Yet the great Powers, the permanent members of the Security Council, each for different reasons, have withheld their support.

72. In these circumstances, my delegation regretfully came to the conclusion that it could not vote for the resolution, which, while it is an impressive expression of the convictions of a great majority of the General Assembly, could not in practice be carried out. This should not be taken to imply any weakening of our commitment to the aims and purposes of resolution 2145 (XXI). The United Nations has assumed direct responsibility for South West Africa and must continue its efforts to find ways of discharging that responsibility.

73. Mr. ASTROM (Sweden): The Swedish delegation, acting on instructions of the Swedish Government, abstained from voting on the resolution just adopted. The reason we did so was not that we waver in our determination to work on the basis of last year's historic decision or to continue on the road indicated by that decision. Nor was the reason that we hesitate to support the legitimate demands of the people of South West Africa for self-determination and national independence. In fact, several leaders of the liberation movement are honoured guests of Sweden. We were compelled, to our deep regret, to abstain from voting because we did not feel that the various provisions of the resolution, taken in their totality, would constitute at this stage "the concrete and constructive decisions for a just and peaceful solution of the problem" of which the Swedish delegation spoke in the debate [1507th meeting, para. 12].

74. In arriving at this conclusion, the Swedish Government was guided by two interrelated considerations. The first was that a new resolution, in order to contribute effectively to the solution of the problem, had to obtain the same kind of support that was forthcoming for last year's resolution. We knew that this would not be the case and that many countries whose collaboration was essential for the successful realization of the objectives of the United Nations, as determined by last year's resolution, including four of the permanent members of the Security Council, would not find it possible to vote for the resolution.

75. The second consideration, which, as I said, is closely related to the first one, was that we had doubts whether the various elements of the resolution were balanced in such a way as to provide a firm basis for further United Nations action. The Swedish delegation, for its part, has not taken the position that the possibility of a provisional United Nations administration should be excluded; nor are we opposed to the idea of an appeal or a request to the Security Council using language at least as strong as the corresponding provision in last year's resolution. We also favour the suggestion to establish contact with the South African Government, while continuing to hold strongly that the terms of last year's resolution are not negotiable.

76. The manner, however, in which these three essential elements have been combined in the new resolution makes us doubt whether the resolution will in fact carry the question forward and increase the influence that world opinion, as expressed in the United Nations, could exercise towards the liberation of the people of South West Africa and towards the replacement of the de facto administration by a new administration which draws its legitimacy from the decisions of the General Assembly and from the demonstrated support of the people of South West Africa.

77. The Swedish delegation wishes to express its appreciation to the various delegations and groups of delegations with which it has been privileged to consult on this important matter. We have not given up hope that through continued consultations and co-operative efforts amongst Member States it will prove possible to bring the great task undertaken by the United Nations to a successful conclusion.

78. Mr. BANZAR (Mongolia) (translated from Russian): As everyone knows, the Mongolian People's Republic, which has been consistently pursuing a policy of supporting the struggle of colonial and dependent peoples for their freedom and national independence, and which is a member of the Afro-Asian Group, has always supported the Group's wise proposals aimed at eliminating the shameful system of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations.

79. Our delegation has repeatedly stated in the General Assembly its position on the question of South West Africa.

80. We continue to advocate the immediate granting of independence to the people of South West Africa. At the twenty-first session of the General Assembly, my delegation co-sponsored resolution 2145 (XXI),

by which the General Assembly took away from the Republic of South Africa the Mandate for South West Africa and placed the Territory under the direct authority of the United Nations.

81. Nevertheless, my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/L.516/Rev.1.

82. In our opinion, the prime prerequisite for the exercise by the people of South West Africa of its right to self-determination is the removal of the South African armed and police forces and the South African administration from the Territory. The resolution should have severely condemned the Government of the Republic of South Africa, which has been so obdurately refusing to comply with General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), and should have insisted on an unconditional withdrawal of all its armed and police forces.

83. The resolution should also have contained an appeal to all States, and primarily to those countries which have important economic and financial interests in the Republic of South Africa and which for that reason encourage the racists as a matter of policy, to end their collaboration with that country and to take effective measures against it in order to make it release its hold on the Territory.

84. So long as the racist authorities of the Republic of South Africa continue to remain in the Territory, my delegation doubts that the creation of various supplementary organs, including the Council which is mentioned in the resolution, can serve any useful purpose.

85. Being guided by these fundamental considerations my delegation, to its regret, was unable to support the resolution just adopted by the General Assembly.

86. In conclusion, my delegation would like to emphasize that the Mongolian People's Republic will in the future continue to give strong support to the just struggle of the people of South West Africa for its right to self-determination and will do all it can to help that people to achieve complete freedom and national independence as soon as possible.

87. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (translated from French): During the discussion of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee for South West Africa [A/6640], the Algerian delegation had occasion [1505th meeting] to remind the Assembly of its position on paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI). It will be remembered that Algeria abstained in the vote on that paragraph as it considered that the setting up of an Ad Hoc Committee would in no way bring us nearer to a solution of the problem before us.

88. The nature and the conclusions of the Ad Hoc Committee's report have, we believe, confirmed our misgivings. Despite the need to find an appropriate solution, certain measures likely to strengthen the position of the South Africa authorities have been included while means of bringing pressure to bear on Pretoria have been left out. On the one hand, talks with Pretoria are recommended, although, to be sure, it is stated that such contacts are to be limited in scope and duration. In this connexion, my delegation would have preferred part V of the resolution we have just adopted to be more explicit and to specify

clearly the time-limit for such contacts. On the other hand, no provision is made for the measures needed to achieve the objectives we all agreed upon in resolution 2145 (XXI). The reasons given for this do not seem convincing to us, for it is obvious, and has been obvious for a long time, that only by vigorous action will we be able to overcome the stubborn resolve of the South African authorities, which continue to ignore the decisions of the United Nations.

89. However, the Algerian delegation voted in favour of the draft which was submitted by a very large number of African, Asian and Latin American delegations. We did so in a spirit of solidarity, but we continue to believe that the measures set forth in it are an adequate response neither to the actual state of affairs nor to the known attitude of Pretoria.

90. Algeria's position, however, is certainly that of the sponsors of the resolution we have adopted. It was not without some hesitation that Algeria finally decided to vote in favour of that resolution despite its reservations with regard to the provisions of part IV, paragraph 2. We can see two possibilities: either South Africa accepts the terms of resolution 2145 (XXI), and there is a sound basis for a dialogue, or South Africa refuses—as is actually the case—to recognize the legality of that resolution or to implement either it or the resolution we have just adopted. In that case, what is the use of this recommendation to the Council? The importance of part IV, paragraph 2, is obvious. It defines and describes the executive duties of the United Nations Council. We voted in favour of the resolution out of feelings of natural solidarity which rightly take precedence over a judgement which we regard as fundamental.

91. Mr. GAUCI (Malta): My delegation supported and stands by the provisions of resolution 2145 (XXI) on South West Africa.

92. We read the report of the Ad Hoc Committee and followed the subsequent debate on that report with the care merited by this serious question, and bearing constantly in mind our obligations to the United Nations.

93. Until the very end, we entertained hopes that the lengthy consultations between the various groups would result in a formula which could command the support of the vast majority of the Members of the United Nations, including the permanent members of the Security Council. Our hopes, and a modest, last-minute effort on our part to bridge the gap, were unavailing.

94. We fear that the resolution which has just been adopted harms the United Nations more than it helps the people of South West Africa, and it could not therefore command our support. In view of the present international climate and the actualities of the situation in South West Africa, we are not convinced that other more practical approaches towards a solution of the problem were fully explored. It is evident that what is and what is not practical must be seen against the background of the general international situation and the views of the major Powers.

95. We are seriously concerned at the adverse consequences which the unlikelihood of the imple-

mentation of this resolution will have on the prestige of the United Nations and hence on its capability to effect peaceful change. This lack of capability for practical action will, in turn, gravely affect the interests of small countries which, in the United Nations, have a forum where their voices and influence are out of proportion to their real power in the world.

96. Mr. LIATIS (Greece): In casting its vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted jointly by the Afro-Asian and Latin American groups, the Greek delegation has acted in accordance with the general line of policy followed all along by Greece on the question of South West Africa.

97. We would, of course, have very much preferred a resolution which, as we earnestly hoped and wished, also commanded the support of Powers whose co-operation would be necessary in a matter which in the last resort may require appropriate action by the Security Council.

98. In the present circumstances, however, we thought it essential that a clear and positive step forward in relation to resolution 2145 (XXI) should be taken by this special session of the General Assembly as a result of the work of the Ad Hoc Committee for South West Africa and of our deliberations on this problem, long pending before the United Nations.

99. May I also stress that my delegation has not been unheeding of the counsels and exhortations for caution and prudence and diligence in dealing with this delicate and difficult matter which we heard from many quarters, especially those coming from some of our closest and best friends in this Assembly.

100. Nevertheless, thanks to the fruitful co-operation of the initiators of the resolution with our Latin American friends, we feel that those elements of caution and prudence and diligence were instilled in the original Afro-Asian draft. As a matter of fact, the text we have just approved duly opens ways and provides for possibilities of contacts with the South African authorities with a view to reaching a peaceful solution of the problem in conformity with the fundamental principles and tenets of the Charter, as we all most ardently hope and strive for.

101. It is in this spirit that my delegation welcomes the outcome of the vote taken this afternoon in this Assembly, and we feel confident that it will mark another milestone in the progress our Organization has to make in the discharge of its duties and responsibilities on behalf of the people of South West Africa.

102. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): We of the United States were heartened last October when the General Assembly achieved, in the adoption of resolution 2145 (XXI) by the overwhelming vote of 114 to 2, an auspicious unity of action on this most difficult issue. In spite of wide differences in initial approach, we managed to unite in a historic decision that South Africa had forfeited its right to administer South West Africa, that South Africa's Mandate over the Territory was at an end, that Territory was now under the direct responsibility of the United Nations, and that an Ad Hoc Committee should recommend practical means by which the Territory should be administered so as to

enable its people to exercise their right to self-determination and to achieve independence.

103. My country served on that Ad Hoc Committee. Throughout its meetings, and again at this special session of the Assembly, we laboured long and hard with all schools of thought in search of a common approach. Our hope was to achieve agreement on a resolution which would carry resolution 2145 (XXI) a further step forward, perhaps not as big a step as we might wish, but at all events a step which would be taken with the unanimity necessary to make it solid and effective.

104. Now, for the time being, we must candidly accept the fact that our efforts have not succeeded. The draft resolution, just voted upon, for reasons which we made clear to the sponsors from the outset, could not be supported by my Government. I have no desire whatever to engage in long explanations, and certainly not in recriminations. I entirely respect the motives of those who put forward the draft resolution and I wish to express appreciation for the attentive consideration which was given to the views of my delegation during our common attempts to reconcile our different approaches.

105. Lest there be any misunderstanding, and because the issue, regrettably, is still a long way from being resolved, I wish to restate at this time as succinctly as possible my country's position concerning South West Africa.

106. First, we continue our full support of resolution 2145 (XXI). This historic resolution stands as the virtually unanimous decision of the United Nations on this issue.

107. Secondly, we shall continue to support the United Nations in its search for practical means

by which its responsibility with respect to South West Africa, pursuant to resolution 2145 (XXI), can be discharged.

108. Thirdly, we believe that further progress in this matter will inevitably require a good faith effort to advance the purposes of resolution 2145 (XXI) through a dialogue with the Government of South Africa, which still remains in physical control of the territory.

109. Despite our differences, let us not forget how wide our agreement has been and still remains on this important issue. We are agreed in our abhorrence of apartheid and racism. We are agreed in our determination to see the people of South West Africa enjoy their full rights under the Charter. And we are agreed in our affirmation of the responsibilities of the United Nations in this regard.

110. In resolution 2145 (XXI), not quite seven months ago, we closed the door on a chapter of history nearly fifty years in duration, the chapter of South Africa's rights in South West Africa under the Mandate. The next chapter is still being written. Although we were unable to support the resolution which has been adopted today, we nevertheless pledge that the United States, faithful to its vote in support of resolution 2145 (XXI), will do whatever it can, by all appropriate and peaceful means, to implement the terms and purposes of that resolution. My country's tradition concerning universal freedom is such that wherever any people come forward to claim it as their equal birthright, the United States must and will support them. We shall, therefore, faithfully support the people of South West Africa in their just aspirations by every effective and peaceful means until those aspirations have been attained.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.