



**Friday, 21 December 1956,
 at 10.50 a.m.**

New York

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 13:	
Report of the Trusteeship Council (<i>continued</i>)	
Hearing of the President of the Tanganyika African National Union (<i>concluded</i>)	163
Agenda item 37:	
Question of South West Africa: report of the Committee on South West Africa (<i>continued</i>)	
Consideration of draft resolutions (<i>continued</i>)	165

Chairman: Mr. Enrique de MARCHENA
 (Dominican Republic).

*In the absence of the Chairman, Miss Brooks
 (Liberia), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

AGENDA ITEM 13

Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/3170)
 (*continued*)

**HEARING OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE TANGANYIKA
 AFRICAN NATIONAL UNION (*concluded*)**

*At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Julius K.
 Nyerere, President of the Tanganyika African National
 Union, took a place at the Committee table.*

1. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) asked to what extent the people of Tanganyika were aware that their country was a Trust Territory and, as such, enjoyed a special status. He also asked what was the people's attitude to the United Nations.
2. Mr. NYERERE (Tanganyika African National Union) replied that the Administration had done little to educate public opinion on that point. The Tanganyika African National Union had taught the people most of what they knew about their country's status. The people hoped that the United Nations would help them to achieve their aspirations.
3. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) asked how the Africans and Europeans had reacted to the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in East Africa, 1954 (T/1142).
4. Mr. NYERERE (Tanganyika African National Union) replied that the Europeans had opposed the Visiting Mission's main recommendations, while the Africans had been in favour of them.
5. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) asked whether the petitioner felt that the Committee should set a target date for the Territory's independence and, if so, what date.
6. Mr. NYERERE (Tanganyika African National Union) was strongly in favour of fixing a target date. That would dispel the people's fears about the country's future and make it possible to intensify the Territory's

development. It was difficult to specify a date in such cases, but he thought that Tanganyika should be independent in about ten years' time.

7. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) asked for further particulars concerning the Tanganyika African National Union, its origin, size of membership and number of branches.

8. Mr. NYERERE (Tanganyika African National Union) explained that the Union had its origins in the former Tanganyika African Association. The Association had been set up in 1929 and had been both political and social in character. In 1953, as President of the Association, he had suggested that it should be transformed into a purely political movement, and that had led to the establishment of the Tanganyika African National Union in 1954. The Union had 100,000 members scattered throughout the Territory and thirty branches registered pursuant to the Societies Ordinance. Under that Ordinance, organizations had to apply for registration and their applications had to be approved by the authorities. The Union was also concerned with social questions; it was, for example, financing the building of a school.

9. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) asked whether the duty to register tended to discourage the formation of branches of the Union.

10. Mr. NYERERE (Tanganyika African National Union) replied in the affirmative: many of the applications for registration submitted to the Administration by the approximately thirty branches that had been formed had not yet been approved.

11. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) asked what reasons the Administration gave for refusing to register a branch of the Union, and whether it was possible to appeal against such a refusal.

12. Mr. NYERERE (Tanganyika African National Union) explained that under the Societies Ordinance any application for registration could be refused if the competent official considered that the society would be used for purposes incompatible with law and order. In the case of a refusal, the applicant could appeal to the Governor. In practice, however, such appeals were of little use as the Governor would almost certainly act on his subordinate's advice.

13. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) asked whether the Administration had ever rejected an application for registration submitted by the Union before the branch in question had been formed.

14. Mr. NYERERE (Tanganyika African National Union) explained that in certain cases the Administration had refused to register former branches of the Tanganyika African Association which wished to be registered as branches of the Union. In such cases the Administration alleged that it had based its decision on experience. In other cases, however, the competent official had opposed the formation of a new branch on

the grounds that it might exploit the difficulties confronting the local authorities in the area in question.

15. In reply to a further question by Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala), Mr. NYERERE (Tanganyika African National Union) explained that the formalities provided for in the Societies Ordinance were simple. Nevertheless, even when those formalities had been complied with, the competent officials still had discretion to refuse registration.

16. Ato YIFRU (Ethiopia) referred to the petitioner's request (579th meeting) that the Administration should officially declare that Tanganyika should be developed as an African State. As the overwhelming majority of the population was African, would such a declaration make much difference in practice?

17. Mr. NYERERE (Tanganyika African National Union) said that it would: the Africans feared their country would be dominated by minority elements, and such a declaration would dispel their fears.

18. Mr. LOIZIDES (Greece) asked what was the Administration's attitude towards the political movements seeking independence.

19. Mr. NYERERE (Tanganyika African National Union) replied that on 27 October 1956 the Governor had made a significant remark in that connexion. Speaking about nationalism, he had said that in Tanganyika he did not think that at the present time nationalism could be described as a good thing.

20. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) asked whether the Administration was doing anything to explain the nature of the Trusteeship System to the people of the Territory.

21. Mr. NYERERE (Tanganyika African National Union) replied that what knowledge the people of Tanganyika had concerning the purposes of the Trusteeship System they had acquired through his organization's efforts. The Administration had done very little to enlighten the inhabitants of the Territory or to show them the difference between the status of Tanganyika and that of the other territories administered by the United Kingdom. Only one Governor, Sir Donald Cameron, who had always been aware of his responsibilities, had explained the situation clearly to the people. Otherwise, it had been entirely due to the questions raised by the Tanganyika African National Union and to the Visiting Missions' reports that the people had received any enlightenment whatsoever.

22. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) asked who were the members of the multi-racial councils in places where there were no white or Asian settlers.

23. Mr. NYERERE (Tanganyika African National Union) explained that as a rule the members were white missionaries or officials or Asian tradesmen. His organization was not opposed to the existence of the multi-racial councils as such but to the fact that an attempt was being made to make them compulsory throughout the Territory.

24. In reply to a question by Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia), Mr. NYERERE (Tanganyika African National Union) said that the cost of educating European children at secondary schools in Kenya or the United Kingdom was defrayed partly by the parents and partly out of the Territory's budget.

25. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) asked whether the land which the Government intended to alienate in the Kilombero Valley belonged to African farmers or whether it was Crown land.

26. Mr. NYERERE (Tanganyika African National Union) explained that most of the land in Tanganyika was public land and was owned, not by individuals, but by the tribe. But to the Africans, whether the land in question was actually occupied was irrelevant. They needed it for future use and would oppose its alienation unless they were associated with the scheme in the manner he had indicated in his statement at the 579th meeting.

27. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said he had gathered that the Asians did not particularly favour parity of representation of the three races and that they would be more inclined to support the Africans' claims.

28. Mr. NYERERE (Tanganyika African National Union) reminded the Committee that the Asian Association had submitted a memorandum to the Government calling for elections on the basis of universal suffrage and stating frankly that a system of voting which would give virtually universal suffrage to the minority of the inhabitants without giving it to the majority too would jeopardize the Territory's harmonious development. He had not heard of any opposition to the memorandum on the part of Asians. His organization's impression was that any opposition to progress did not come from the inhabitants of the Territory, and he thought that the Government should take advantage of the favourable atmosphere now prevailing.

29. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) inferred accordingly that the question of tripartite representation no longer arose and that there were only two groups involved, the Europeans on the one hand and the Africans and Asians on the other. The requests of the Tanganyika African National Union were extremely moderate; he asked whether the Union would accept tripartite representation as a temporary step if the Administration expressly stated that the Territory would be developed as an African State.

30. Mr. NYERERE (Tanganyika African National Union) said that there was no question of conflict between the Europeans and the Africans. The only desire of most of the Europeans settled in the Territory—who did not form a coherent group since they represented many different nationalities—was to be able to live in peace in Tanganyika. His organization did not oppose them, but opposed the policy of the United Kingdom Government. The Union had agreed to parity of representation as a temporary measure, and hoped that the Government would indicate the course that it would follow in the future. But the Government refused to be specific or even to give the assurance that the number of African representatives would be increased later. For the time being, the Tanganyika African National Union was requesting only that Africans should be given twenty-four seats out of sixty-five in the Legislative Council. In acceding to that request, the Government would be making a symbolic gesture, in token of its genuine intention to allow Tanganyika to evolve as a democratic State. That was not asking too much.

31. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) thanked the petitioner for his encouraging account of relations between the different racial groups of Tanganyika. A country

with political leaders of such quality was assured of a great future.

32. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) said that, having listened with great interest to the statements and replies of the petitioner, he wished to congratulate him on his statesmanlike viewpoint.

33. The CHAIRMAN thanked the petitioner and said that the Committee would take his statements into account when debating the report of the Trusteeship Council (A/3170).

Mr. Julius K. Nyerere, President of the Tanganyika African National Union, withdrew.

AGENDA ITEM 37

Question of South West Africa: report of the Committee on South West Africa (A/3151 and Corr.1, A/C.4/338, A/C.4/L.445/Rev.2, A/C.4/L.446, A/C.4/L.447/Rev.1) (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.445/Rev.2, A/C.4/L.446, A/C.4/L.447/Rev.1) (continued)

34. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of LIBERIA, said that her delegation had taken into account the comments made by the Philippine representative at the 581st meeting and was presenting a new text of the first paragraph of the preamble in its revised draft resolution (A/C.4/L.445/Rev.2). It had, however, been unable to accept the other Philippine amendments (A/C.4/L.449 and Corr.1).

35. The amendments proposed by Thailand (A/C.4/L.450) might distort the very meaning of the draft resolution. The Liberian delegation considered that certain essential clauses had to stand. The deletion of paragraphs 2 and 3 would radically affect the purpose of the draft resolution.

36. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) observed that the latest version of the first paragraph of the preamble to the Liberian draft resolution still did not correspond exactly to the facts, for at the time of the League's dissolution Palestine had still been a mandated territory. That was why the text proposed by his own delegation (A/C.4/L.449 and Corr.1, para.2) was the only correct one.

37. Ato YIFRU (Ethiopia), noting that the Philippine delegation had proposed amendments to the Liberian draft resolution, asked if it intended to withdraw its own draft resolution (A/C.4/L.447/Rev.1).

38. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said that he had not formally withdrawn it. If the Committee adopted the amendments to the revised Liberian draft resolution which he had proposed he might not press for a vote on his delegation's draft resolution.

39. Mr. MUNK (Denmark) renewed, with some slight alterations, the suggestions he had made at the previous meeting. The Secretary-General should be asked to seek a solution, and, in order to leave him greater latitude, all the draft resolutions should stand. Accordingly, he proposed that the text of those drafts should be reproduced in the Committee's report to the General Assembly and that a passage should be inserted in the report to the effect that the Committee had decided not to take a vote on the three draft resolutions before it, on the understanding that the Secretary-General would, in the exercise of his normal functions,

give the matter his serious attention and that, when he deemed it appropriate he might submit to the General Assembly his comments and suggestions as to the ways and means which might be conducive to a satisfactory solution of the question of South West Africa. He added that the Government and people of Denmark were following the development of the question closely, and were keenly interested in its eventual solution.

40. The CHAIRMAN said that the formal proposal made by the Danish representative was in effect a motion for adjournment of the debate.

41. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) supported the Danish representative's proposal.

42. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) said it was the consensus in the Committee that new ways of settling the problem of South West Africa had to be devised quickly; any differences of opinion related only to the methods to be employed. Since the Danish representative's proposal tended to delay a settlement, the Guatemalan delegation would be obliged to vote against the motion. The Indian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.446), by contrast, invited the Sixth Committee to give an opinion concerning what legal remedies were open to the organs of the United Nations, or to the Members of the United Nations, or to the former Members of the League of Nations, to ensure that the Union of South Africa fulfilled the obligations assumed by it under the Mandate, pending the placing of the Territory of South West Africa under the International Trusteeship System. In other words, that text was concerned with a legal solution, and that new idea had received the tacit approval of the Committee members. There again, opinions had differed only in respect of practical details; for example, one point had been whether the Sixth Committee would have time to give its opinion within the time-limit specified. In the light of the opinions expressed, the Guatemalan delegation, together with the delegations of Ecuador, El Salvador, Peru, Venezuela and others, would introduce amendments to the Indian draft resolution at the next meeting.

43. Mr. TAZHIBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, at the 579th meeting, the Committee had approved a draft resolution proposed by Liberia (A/C.4/L.443) to the effect that the Territory of South West Africa should be placed under the International Trusteeship System. Similar resolutions had been approved by the Assembly at previous sessions. Thus, other draft resolutions should be kept in conformity with the decision expressed in those resolutions and should be designed to provide ways and means to put the territory under the Trusteeship System.

44. The proposal submitted by the Danish delegation was unacceptable since it was aimed at preventing the Committee from taking any decision and it did not give the Secretary-General any recommendations or directions. If the Secretary-General was asked, without specific suggestions, to work out a solution, the question might remain unresolved for a long time. The Soviet delegation would therefore vote against the Danish representative's proposal.

45. His delegation could not support, and would abstain in the vote on, the Indian draft resolution, which also tended to delay a settlement.

46. Of the two remaining draft resolutions, submitted by Liberia and the Philippines respectively, the Liberian

draft seemed more acceptable. However, the revised version of that draft (A/C.4/L.445/Rev.2) was a step back because it asked the Secretary-General to study the question, not only in line with the principles of the Charter but with something else as well, and thus opened the way for a possible solution of the question outside the Trusteeship System. The Soviet delegation would find it possible to vote for the Liberian draft resolution if its author excluded the words "and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice" from paragraph 2 of its revised draft. Some of the amendments proposed by the Philippine delegation (A/C.4/L.449 and Corr.1) improved the original text but others weakened it. The second Philippine amendment was unrealistic: mandated territories no longer existed; he therefore proposed that the word "former" should be inserted between the words

"eleven" and "mandated" in that amendment. Lastly, the Soviet delegation would vote against the amendments proposed by Thailand (A/C.4/L.450), which in no way improved the draft resolution submitted by Liberia.

47. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines), speaking on a point of order, said that the Danish representative's proposal was not in effect a motion for the closure of the debate. He moved that the meeting should be adjourned, in order to give the delegations of Guatemala and Denmark time to circulate the text of their proposals.

The Philippine motion was adopted by 19 votes to 5, with 24 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.

with political leaders of such quality was assured of a great future.

32. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) said that, having listened with great interest to the statements and replies of the petitioner, he wished to congratulate him on his statesmanlike viewpoint.

33. The CHAIRMAN thanked the petitioner and said that the Committee would take his statements into account when debating the report of the Trusteeship Council (A/3170).

Mr. Julius K. Nyerere, President of the Tanganyika African National Union, withdrew.

AGENDA ITEM 37

Question of South West Africa: report of the Committee on South West Africa (A/3151 and Corr.1, A/C.4/338, A/C.4/L.445/Rev.2, A/C.4/L.446, A/C.4/L.447/Rev.1) (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.445/Rev.2, A/C.4/L.446, A/C.4/L.447/Rev.1) (continued)

34. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of LIBERIA, said that her delegation had taken into account the comments made by the Philippine representative at the 581st meeting and was presenting a new text of the first paragraph of the preamble in its revised draft resolution (A/C.4/L.445/Rev.2). It had, however, been unable to accept the other Philippine amendments (A/C.4/L.449 and Corr.1).

35. The amendments proposed by Thailand (A/C.4/L.450) might distort the very meaning of the draft resolution. The Liberian delegation considered that certain essential clauses had to stand. The deletion of paragraphs 2 and 3 would radically affect the purpose of the draft resolution.

36. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) observed that the latest version of the first paragraph of the preamble to the Liberian draft resolution still did not correspond exactly to the facts, for at the time of the League's dissolution Palestine had still been a mandated territory. That was why the text proposed by his own delegation (A/C.4/L.449 and Corr.1, para.2) was the only correct one.

37. Ato YIFRU (Ethiopia), noting that the Philippine delegation had proposed amendments to the Liberian draft resolution, asked if it intended to withdraw its own draft resolution (A/C.4/L.447/Rev.1).

38. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said that he had not formally withdrawn it. If the Committee adopted the amendments to the revised Liberian draft resolution which he had proposed he might not press for a vote on his delegation's draft resolution.

39. Mr. MUNK (Denmark) renewed, with some slight alterations, the suggestions he had made at the previous meeting. The Secretary-General should be asked to seek a solution, and, in order to leave him greater latitude, all the draft resolutions should stand. Accordingly, he proposed that the text of those drafts should be reproduced in the Committee's report to the General Assembly and that a passage should be inserted in the report to the effect that the Committee had decided not to take a vote on the three draft resolutions before it, on the understanding that the Secretary-General would, in the exercise of his normal functions,

give the matter his serious attention and that, when he deemed it appropriate he might submit to the General Assembly his comments and suggestions as to the ways and means which might be conducive to a satisfactory solution of the question of South West Africa. He added that the Government and people of Denmark were following the development of the question closely, and were keenly interested in its eventual solution.

40. The CHAIRMAN said that the formal proposal made by the Danish representative was in effect a motion for adjournment of the debate.

41. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) supported the Danish representative's proposal.

42. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) said it was the consensus in the Committee that new ways of settling the problem of South West Africa had to be devised quickly; any differences of opinion related only to the methods to be employed. Since the Danish representative's proposal tended to delay a settlement, the Guatemalan delegation would be obliged to vote against the motion. The Indian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.446), by contrast, invited the Sixth Committee to give an opinion concerning what legal remedies were open to the organs of the United Nations, or to the Members of the United Nations, or to the former Members of the League of Nations, to ensure that the Union of South Africa fulfilled the obligations assumed by it under the Mandate, pending the placing of the Territory of South West Africa under the International Trusteeship System. In other words, that text was concerned with a legal solution, and that new idea had received the tacit approval of the Committee members. There again, opinions had differed only in respect of practical details; for example, one point had been whether the Sixth Committee would have time to give its opinion within the time-limit specified. In the light of the opinions expressed, the Guatemalan delegation, together with the delegations of Ecuador, El Salvador, Peru, Venezuela and others, would introduce amendments to the Indian draft resolution at the next meeting.

43. Mr. TAZHIBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, at the 579th meeting, the Committee had approved a draft resolution proposed by Liberia (A/C.4/L.443) to the effect that the Territory of South West Africa should be placed under the International Trusteeship System. Similar resolutions had been approved by the Assembly at previous sessions. Thus, other draft resolutions should be kept in conformity with the decision expressed in those resolutions and should be designed to provide ways and means to put the territory under the Trusteeship System.

44. The proposal submitted by the Danish delegation was unacceptable since it was aimed at preventing the Committee from taking any decision and it did not give the Secretary-General any recommendations or directions. If the Secretary-General was asked, without specific suggestions, to work out a solution, the question might remain unresolved for a long time. The Soviet delegation would therefore vote against the Danish representative's proposal.

45. His delegation could not support, and would abstain in the vote on, the Indian draft resolution, which also tended to delay a settlement.

46. Of the two remaining draft resolutions, submitted by Liberia and the Philippines respectively, the Liberian

draft seemed more acceptable. However, the revised version of that draft (A/C.4/L.445/Rev.2) was a step back because it asked the Secretary-General to study the question, not only in line with the principles of the Charter but with something else as well, and thus opened the way for a possible solution of the question outside the Trusteeship System. The Soviet delegation would find it possible to vote for the Liberian draft resolution if its author excluded the words "and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice" from paragraph 2 of its revised draft. Some of the amendments proposed by the Philippine delegation (A/C.4/L.449 and Corr.1) improved the original text but others weakened it. The second Philippine amendment was unrealistic: mandated territories no longer existed; he therefore proposed that the word "former" should be inserted between the words

"eleven" and "mandated" in that amendment. Lastly, the Soviet delegation would vote against the amendments proposed by Thailand (A/C.4/L.450), which in no way improved the draft resolution submitted by Liberia.

47. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines), speaking on a point of order, said that the Danish representative's proposal was not in effect a motion for the closure of the debate. He moved that the meeting should be adjourned, in order to give the delegations of Guatemala and Denmark time to circulate the text of their proposals.

The Philippine motion was adopted by 19 votes to 5, with 24 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.