

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

Monday, 13 October 1958,
at 3.10 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 39:	
Question of South West Africa (<i>continued</i>):	
(a) Report of the Good Offices Committee on South West Africa	
General debate (<i>continued</i>)	59

Chairman: Mr. Frederick H. BOLAND (Ireland).

AGENDA ITEM 39

Question of South West Africa (*continued*):

(a) Report of the Good Offices Committee on South West Africa (A/3900)

GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

1. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) said that when the Haitian delegation had welcomed the idea of establishing the Good Offices Committee on South West Africa, it had hoped that that new approach to the problem of South West Africa would make it possible to put an end to a painful chapter in the relations between the United Nations and the Government of the Union of South Africa. He regretted that that Government had not seen fit to study the suggestions contained in paragraphs 17 to 22 of the Committee's report (A/3900), which, through an adaptation of the Mandates System, would have enabled the United Nations to exercise some supervision over the administration of the Territory. The failure of the Union Government to do so was all the more regrettable in that the Committee, unsuccessful in its efforts in that direction, had then given the impression of recommending to the United Nations the idea that a possible solution might be the partitioning of the Territory. After seeming, in paragraphs 23 and 24 of its report, to reject the possibility of partition, the Committee had stated, in paragraphs 51 and 52, that the possibility of partition could be considered in principle. It was because the partition proposal involved thousands of human beings, the promotion of whose political, economic and social advancement was specifically called for under Article 76 of the United Nations Charter, that the Haitian delegation has pressed for consideration of the report of the Good Offices Committee within the general context of the question of South West Africa. It was hard to see on what basis the Government of the Union of South Africa could claim that the division of the Territory and the dispersion of its indigenous population were the only available means by which it could perform the sacred duty entrusted to it by the League of Nations. He therefore had difficulty in understanding how the Good Offices Committee could have put forward the idea that the possibility of partition should be considered and, if found practicable, could constitute the basis for an agreement. The Haitian delegation was opposed to the very principle of partition because par-

tion was contrary to the Charter and would have disastrous consequences for the indigenous population.

2. The Union Government had also declared that even if it accepted some arrangement with regard to South West Africa that arrangement should not concern the international status of the Territory, but should simply recognize its international character. It had further stated that it would not undertake to present an annual report to the special organs envisaged by the Good Offices Committee. All the arguments advanced by the Union Government in favour of the partition proposal were aimed against the United Nations: it had pointed out that the International Court of Justice had agreed in its 1950 advisory opinion^{1/} that the Union could not be compelled to place the Territory under the Trusteeship System established by the Charter; and it had spoken of the resentment which would be felt by all sections of the population of the Union of South Africa at United Nations interference in its internal affairs. However, the actions of the Government of the Union of South Africa concerned the United Nations in so far as they affected the population of a Territory which was not under the sovereignty of the Union Government and the material and moral well-being and social progress of which the latter had undertaken to promote under the terms of the Mandate. Its actions were also of concern to the United Nations because, as shown by the various reports of the Committee on South West Africa, they constituted a flagrant violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

3. He drew attention to the statements in paragraph 41 of the report of the Good Offices Committee, according to which the Union Government regarded South West Africa as essential to the security of the Union of South Africa and considered that the interests of the Union of South Africa and South West Africa were inextricably bound up with each other. It was thus apparent that the Union Government saw in the idea of partition only an opportunity to achieve its own ends, since the rich southern portion would be simply annexed, while the northern portion, to which the majority of the indigenous population would be driven, would continue to be administered as an integral part of the Union. Accordingly, the United Nations could not encourage the Union Government to consider the possibility of partition when it knew already that the sole aim of that Government was to appropriate South West Africa once and for all, whether legally or otherwise, and that the laws applied to the peoples of the Territory did not promote their political advancement, their economic progress, their social progress, or their educational development.

^{1/} International status of South West Africa, Advisory Opinion: I.C.J. Reports 1950, p. 128. Transmitted to Members of the General Assembly by a note of the Secretary-General (A/1362).

4. The Union Government had stated that it felt itself responsible at most to the three remaining Principal Allied and Associated Powers: France, the United Kingdom and the United States. He therefore requested those States to take energetic action in defence of the rights of the indigenous peoples of South West Africa; in so doing they would vindicate the principles of the United Nations Charter and ensure the victory of international morality.

5. Mr. Krishna MENON (India) said that the issue at stake in the report of the Good Offices Committee was not points of detail relating to the good or bad administration of South West Africa by the Union of South Africa, but fundamental United Nations principles so far as they concerned a partition which was morally indefensible and legally inconceivable and which would have inhuman consequences. While paying a tribute to the members of the Good Offices Committee, he regretted that the Committee's report contained much that was unacceptable and that its concluding remarks were more favourable to the standpoint of the Union of South Africa than in conformity with the principles of the United Nations.

6. In the first place, the Union Government, even though, according to the 1950 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, it was still subject to the international obligations set forth in Article 22 of the League of Nations Covenant, refused to recognize the international status of the Territory, which nobody had ever questioned. In paragraph 52, sub-paragraph (2), of its report, the Good Offices Committee stated that it would have felt able to recommend to the General Assembly that arrangements such as those set forth under sub-paragraph (1) should be accepted for inclusion in an agreement to which the United Nations would constitute the second party; however, the Union Government did not accept the United Nations as a second party. The Committee also proposed, as a possible basis for agreement, a partitioning of the Territory, under which a small part of the latter would be placed under trusteeship and the remainder would be simply annexed—which was tantamount to abandoning any idea of mandate or trusteeship. Yet in sub-paragraph (5) of paragraph 52 the General Assembly was invited to agree to the idea of partition, which in fact amounted to giving its approval to an annexation proposal which would subject the population of the Territory to the authority of a country known for its racial policies. If it approved any such solution the United Nations would in effect be accepting the policy of apartheid, renouncing its sacred mission and placing a premium, as it were, on non-co-operation.

7. The Union of South Africa, considering that the Administration of South West Africa had been entrusted to it by the League of Nations, stated that it could accept no obligations other than those by which it was bound under the Mandates System. That argument was very debatable in view of the changes which had taken place in the world situation since the foundation of the League of Nations; but, in any event, the sacred civilizing mission entrusted under the Mandate to the Mandatory Power had to be discharged in the interest of the population with a view to promoting its progress towards autonomy and independence. That sacred mission essentially implied the responsibility of the Mandatory Power. South West Africa did not belong to the Union Government, which was responsible only for administering the Territory and had no powers other

than those entrusted to it by the League of Nations. The sovereignty belonged to the population of the Territory, over which the Union therefore did not possess unlimited powers. The laws applicable to South West Africa were those which had existed in 1920 and not those subsequently enacted, which were such as to subject the non-white population to intolerable living conditions.

8. It was that concept of responsibility, which was the very basis of the Territory's international status, that the Union refused to accept. In its view, it was not responsible to the population of the Territory, which was not free, and it would recognize only the authority of the League of Nations, which had disappeared. However, the disappearance of the League of Nations did not imply the disappearance of the Mandate or that of the Mandatory Power's responsibility; and sovereignty still really belonged to the population of the Territory. Moreover, the Union had repeatedly stated that it would continue to administer South West Africa with scrupulous regard to its obligations.

9. Another important principle was that people administered by a Mandatory Power should not be exploited for the benefit of that Power. Yet, according to the Good Offices Committee's report, the Union Government regarded South West Africa as indispensable to the security of the Union of South Africa. But surely the interests of the people were the primary consideration. The Union also asserted that its interests and those of South West Africa were inextricably linked. That was not an unusual situation; it often happened that two countries maintained close relations, had complementary economies and could develop only through continuous collaboration, but that did not entail the suppression of all freedoms in one country for the benefit of the other. According to the Union, South West Africa would not by itself be economically viable. That was not a new argument; but everyone realized that the Territory's economic development had been impeded by the exploitation to which it was subjected. The Union Government had also referred to the financial burden involved in administering the Territory. It was difficult to assess how much the Union had given the Territory and how much it had taken from it; in any event, other States had felt able to bear such financial responsibilities; and all those arguments were in flagrant contradiction with any idea of a sacred trust. Lastly, the Bantus were alleged to have indicated that they were satisfied with the Union's administration of the Territory. It might be asked why the indigenous inhabitants should be prevented from administering themselves and why they should be deprived of the right to freedom and independence when the Union admitted that they were competent to express views favourable to itself.

10. The problem was not only to determine what were the relations between the League of Nations and the various countries. The signers of the United Nations Charter had accepted certain obligations. The Charter superseded all previous agreements. The United Nations was the successor to the League of Nations in all international questions, and the Trusteeship System which it had instituted clearly superseded the previously existing Mandates System. Article 73 of the Charter was perhaps not perfect, but it applied to all Non-Self-Governing Territories, including the Territory of South West Africa; the Union was therefore bound to accept supervision by the United Nations in one form or another.

11. The Union of South Africa had argued that on the admission of the International Court of Justice it was under no obligation to place the Territory of South West Africa under the Trusteeship System. However, while there was no legal obligation deriving from an agreement in the strict sense of the term, there were obligations deriving from the Charter, and there was absolutely no ground for preventing the Territory from being placed under the Trusteeship System. A trusteeship agreement with the Union might be different from the agreements which had been concluded with other Powers, but the status of the Territory could in no way be modified by the Union acting alone. Yet the Union had already unilaterally modified that status by refusing to recognize its responsibility to the United Nations. If the Union wished to maintain the *status quo*, it could not but accept responsibility for its administration to an organ exercising some form of supervision. That organ could not be made up of the three remaining Principal Allied and Associated Powers.

12. The Indian delegation would oppose any solution which would in effect mean turning the clock back, would constitute a violation of the Charter, would infringe the principle of the universality of the United Nations and would not ensure that the people of South West Africa were granted all the rights to which they were entitled.

13. Mr. SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia) drew attention to the contradictions in the report of the Good Offices Committee, and said that by advocating the idea of partitioning the Territory the Committee had overstepped its terms of reference. The question of South West Africa had been before the United Nations for twelve years; it had been the subject of several General Assembly resolutions and three advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice, which had confirmed that South West Africa was still a mandated territory with international status. If the United Nations now admitted the possibility of partition it would be repudiating all the resolutions it had adopted since 1946 and abandoning the supervisory duties in which the International Court of Justice had confirmed it in the advisory opinion of 1950. If part of the Territory were to be annexed and withdrawn from international supervision, the United Nations would be powerless to prevent new discrimination and repression; the whole Territory, therefore, should be placed under the Trusteeship System. It was inconceivable that a country which had always formed a single entity and had always been inhabited by a predominantly indigenous population should now be divided into two parts only one of which would enjoy the benefits of the Trusteeship System.

14. After retracing the history of South West Africa since the arrival of the Europeans, he recalled the many criticisms which the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations had levelled against the Territory's administration by the Union of South Africa, criticisms relating for example to the inadequacy of the educational facilities and social services made available for the indigenous inhabitants, and of the funds earmarked for the Territory's economic development. The Commission had also repeatedly deplored the relations existing between the European minority and the indigenous majority, relations which were contrary to the principles enunciated in Article 22 of the League of Nations Covenant.

15. After the disappearance of the League, the Union of South Africa had refused to place South West Africa under United Nations trusteeship, and in 1946 had proposed the annexation of the Territory,^{2/} although there had been no provision in the Mandate which could justify such annexation. The Mandate had been designed to safeguard the interests of the indigenous inhabitants; and the latter would certainly derive no benefit from the annexation of their Territory by a country practising a policy of segregation and discrimination against all non-Europeans. Moreover, South West Africa was a relatively under-developed country, and laws adapted to an economically more advanced country such as the Union of South Africa would not necessarily accord with its interests.

16. It was clear too that any partition would enable the Union of South Africa to appropriate the richer part of the Territory and leave the indigenous inhabitants of the other part in a precarious economic position, not to mention the disastrous social consequences of the displacement of population which such partition would entail. Obviously, therefore, partition in any form would be contrary both to the United Nations Charter and to the welfare of the indigenous inhabitants, who had in any event on more than one occasion declared themselves opposed to any annexation of their Territory by the Union of South Africa. In the circumstances, and so long as the Union of South Africa refused to carry out the General Assembly's recommendations, the Members of the United Nations were in duty bound to do everything possible to ensure that South West Africa was placed under international supervision. Accordingly, the Indonesian delegation was fundamentally opposed to any inquiry into the possibility of a partition of South West Africa, which would be contrary both to the United Nations Charter and to the wishes of the people concerned. It would support any proposal aimed at placing the whole of the Territory under effective international supervision, i.e., under the Trusteeship System.

17. Mr. MACQUARRIE (Canada) recalled that his delegation had voted for the establishment of the Good Offices Committee, in the hope that it would find a solution to the problem. It had been particularly happy to welcome the return of the Union of South Africa to the Fourth Committee because it did not think that any solution was possible without the Union's co-operation. It regretted that after an acrimonious procedural debate, the Union of South Africa had felt obliged to withdraw and that the Fourth Committee was continuing the discussion in its absence. There was more to be gained by putting questions to the actual administrators of the Territory than by rehearsing once again the evidence of the petitioners.

18. His delegation had noted with satisfaction the Good Offices Committee's report, from which it appeared that the Committee and the Union had reached a measure of understanding on proposals which the General Assembly might agree to study. The proposals did not relate to the substance of the matter, and the possibility of partition was simply contemplated as one solution which the General Assembly might invite the Union to study at a later stage. For that reason his delegation would not for the present state its views on the principle of partition or on the attitude it might adopt with regard to any partition

^{2/} See A/123.

plan. No such plan existed, and no one had a clear idea where the boundary lines might be drawn or how large a part of the population might be placed under trusteeship. It should however be noted that the Chairman of the Good Offices Committee and the Minister of External Affairs of the Union of South Africa had both pointed out that there could be no partition plan and no partition of the Territory until the desires of the peoples of the Territory had been ascertained. That would, of course, have to be done in a manner satisfactory both to the inhabitants of the Territory and to the United Nations.

19. The future of the indigenous population was at stake and care should be taken not to adopt too inflexible a position which would prevent progress towards a solution, however far from ideal that solution might be. The Committee should take as sensible an approach as it had at the previous session and should conduct its debate in the same spirit that had been displayed at that time. He appealed to the members of the Fourth Committee, all of whom were anxious to improve the lot of hundreds of thousands of Africans, to consider well before rejecting any solution, regardless of its present prospects of success. The Canadian people were deeply devoted to the principles of the Charter and to the defence of human rights for all the peoples of the world; they deplored discrimination against any racial or minority group and protested vigorously against the subjection of any people in any part of the world. Canada firmly upheld that principle both for itself and for others. For that reason, it would make every effort to co-operate with the Good Offices Committee and the Assembly, so that the work undertaken by the Committee might continue and a solution might be found which would provide the Territory with a satisfactory international status and ensure the well-being of its inhabitants.

20. Mr. OSMAN (Morocco) recalled that his delegation had abstained from the vote on General Assembly resolution 1143 (XII) setting up the Good Offices Committee. It had shared the misgivings of those who had felt that that Committee was too small to represent all currents of opinion in the Fourth Committee and that the responsibilities assigned to it were too great. Nevertheless, the Moroccan delegation had hoped that the countries represented on the Good Offices Committee would exert their influence on the Union of South Africa so as to induce it to heed its international obligations and bring its policy into line with the general world trend of ideas and events. The notion that it was possible to live in an ivory tower at a time when all peoples, particularly those on the African continent, were yearning for emancipation was unthinkable. The Union should feel bound to contribute in a new spirit to a solution of the problem; instead, however, it had seen fit to withdraw once again even before debate had been joined on the substance of the question. The Moroccan delegation was genuinely sorry that the Union Government had once more evaded a confrontation of views which could only prove fruitful.

21. Although the Moroccan delegation fully appreciated the efforts made by the members of the Good Offices Committee, it did not feel that the conclusions they had offered would help to settle the question. The Committee had rather unexpectedly suggested the idea of partition, even though that went beyond its terms of reference. The United Nations could not subscribe

to any settlement that did not take into account the wishes of the people of South West Africa, who did not seem very favourably inclined towards a partition arrangement that would deprive the indigenous population of part of its territory. Moreover, to accept the idea of partition would be to ratify the policy of discrimination being enforced in the Territory and to sanction large-scale population shifts. At all events, partition in any form appeared in the circumstances to constitute an arbitrary act, for that was not the normal way to terminate a mandate or trusteeship. There was also good reason for asking why the Union of South Africa was prepared to accept trusteeship for part of the Territory while refusing to consider it for the Territory as a whole. There were grounds for fearing that the action contemplated would result in the outright annexation of the entire Territory, which could not be justified on either a *de facto* or a *de jure* basis.

22. The Moroccan delegation felt that consideration should be given to other solutions which respected above all the wishes of the people and were in keeping with the principles of the Charter. It was the Union of South Africa's duty to co-operate with the United Nations, not with the three Powers which it regarded as its only allies. Moreover, it was the responsibility of those Powers to contribute substantially to the resumption of talks and thus facilitate the solution of a problem whose very existence greatly impaired the prestige of the United Nations.

23. Mr. CAMPO POSADA (Colombia) pointed out that the United Nations had always shown a firm desire to reach an understanding with the Union of South Africa. It should not abandon that effort by yielding to impatience, even in the face of the extreme position which the Union Government had taken with regard to the hearing of petitioners. The Committee's report should be analysed objectively, for the fundamental rights of a people were at stake.

24. He noted first of all, from paragraph 33 of the Good Offices Committee's report, that the Union Government, although it had felt unable to subscribe wholly to the interpretation given by the Committee to the words "an international status", had nevertheless been prepared to see incorporated in any agreement which might be concluded a provision specifying that the Territory possessed "an international character". That was an area of agreement which should be maintained, for the implication was that the Union could not alter that international character in a unilateral manner.

25. He then noted with interest that the Union Government had been prepared to consider the inclusion, in any agreement which might be concluded, of provisions corresponding generally to those of articles 2 to 5 of the Mandate, subject to modification of article 4. That indicated recognition of the concept of a sacred trust, which was implicit in the articles referred to, as well as a less intransigent attitude on the part of the Union, which had hitherto maintained that the Mandate had ceased to exist.

26. He went on to point out that the Union Government would be prepared, in the event that an agreement was concluded, to make information available concerning the Territory. Although that did not mean that an annual report would be submitted, the concession nevertheless indicated that the Union would recognize

the right of the second party to secure information on the Territory.

27. Finally, he noted that, with respect to a possible partition, the Union Government had been willing, in the particular context, to contemplate the United Nations as the second party to an agreement. It would indicate a lack of respect for the dignity of the Union of South Africa to assume that it was abandoning a position which it had long held in order to promote an agreement which met its aims. What was involved was, rather, a noble demonstration of the new spirit in which the United Nations and the Union had resolved to approach the problem.

28. In the Pretoria talks, the Committee had taken the initiative in presenting the various proposals because its members had so decided during the preliminary meetings. There was little use in quibbling over that point, even though it might have been more logical for each side to submit its own proposals. The fact that the Committee had taken the initiative had placed it in a delicate position, since, at one point in the talks, the Union Government had asked what other solutions it had considered. The Committee had then been compelled to mention partition, thereby relieving the Union of the awkward necessity of suggesting the idea and affording it an opportunity to accept it graciously as a possibility which merited more thoroughgoing examination on its part and on that of the United Nations. Owing to that combination of circumstances, the talks had thereafter been confined to the possibility of partition, since the Union Government, as was to be expected, had indicated that it found the Committee's other proposals unacceptable.

29. A point to bear in mind was that at Pretoria it had been agreed that the Union should begin by submitting detailed proposals. In order for there to be detailed proposals, it was necessary for whoever was submitting them to have made a painstaking study. The Union of South Africa had every right to study the possibility of partition and to make proposals, just as the United Nations had the right to submit its own proposals after mature consideration. The United Nations was not committing itself to anything by examining such proposals as the Union might make after its study. The Colombian delegation did, however, feel that whatever proposals the Union planned to make should be submitted to the Good Offices Committee. There would seem to be no need for the Good Offices Committee to tell the Assembly that the Union Government should be encouraged to undertake a study of the possibility of partition; such a study was, by definition, within the domestic jurisdiction of the Union.

30. The Union of South Africa had several times declared its willingness to accept the remaining Principal Allied and Associated Powers as the second party to any agreement that might be concluded. In the present instance, it might be well if those Powers, which enjoyed great moral authority in the United Nations, should inform the Union of their desire that it should regard the United Nations as the possible second party.

31. The Good Offices Committee should continue its work, but as that work required the constant application of the three members, it might be advisable and fairer from their point of view to add three additional members, chosen from States not administering dependent territories. An arrangement of that kind would

provide the type of co-operation and co-ordination which were essential to the negotiations.

32. Mr. MITCHEV (Bulgaria) saw in the report of the Good Offices Committee the result of the efforts of those who, without daring openly to support the Union's policy of annexation, were attempting, under the guise of harmless compromises, to lead the United Nations step by step to capitulation. The report made two basic proposals: partition accompanied by an annexation, and a mandate outside the framework of the United Nations.

33. The Committee's chief proposal was for a partition that would be accompanied by the annexation of the richest and more extensive part of the Territory, the South, and the transfer of the African population of that area into the northern section, a very limited, desert area, which would be placed under trusteeship and administered as an integral part of the Union. The Mandates System of the League of Nations had been based on recognition in international relations—although by certain countries in an incomplete and not always sincere way—of the right of peoples to self-determination, and on abandonment of the practice of allowing victorious States to annex the colonial territories of their defeated enemies. The principle had been established that the sovereign owners of those territories were the peoples who lived in them and that the mandatory or an administering country should act as a trustee, being required to administer the territory in the interests of the people and to prepare them for independence. The role of the international community was to protect the rights of the peoples in question.

34. The Good Offices Committee should now be asked whether the proposal it was putting forward was in accord with those principles. The proposal could not be acceptable to the people of South West Africa, in whom sovereignty over the Territory resided, for it was out of the question that a people able to express itself freely would consent to cede a part of its territory. The people of South West Africa had, moreover, already made their opposition to annexation unmistakably clear. That opposition was recorded in the reports of the Committee on South West Africa for 1957 (A/3626, annex I, para. 18) and for 1958 (A/3906, para. 51), and it had been confirmed by the petitioners. It was therefore difficult to understand how the United States, which was represented in the Good Offices Committee and had always claimed to be an enemy of colonialism, could, in view of those facts of which it was well aware, propose a shameful settlement with the Union of South Africa that would have the effect of perpetuating colonial slavery.

35. The Good Offices Committee should also be asked whether the contemplated partition would promote the advancement of the people and bring them closer to independence, the principal goal of the Trusteeship System. It would be absurd to argue that the advancement of a people could be promoted by depriving them of the richest part of their territory and abandoning them in the desert-like reserves of the remaining part.

36. He drew attention to the inhuman consequences of the policy of apartheid, which partition would only reinforce. Not only was the African population deprived of its political rights, but its indescribable poverty contrasted with the prosperity of the European popu-

lation. It was gradually being deprived of its best land and would, by the annexation, lose all of its land in the South. It served as a reservoir of cheap labour which worked in conditions close to slavery. The restrictions on freedom of movement were such that the reserves were veritable prisons. It was obvious that annexation would make the situation even more unendurable.

37. In view of those facts, it would be natural for all Member States categorically to condemn the manoeuvres of the Union Government. Yet the Good Offices Committee proposed simply that that Government should be compensated and the victim of those manoeuvres despoiled. Perhaps the interests of certain countries were involved in the matter. In paragraph 85 of its 1958 report, the Committee on South West Africa mentioned that in 1957 there had been 802 local European companies in the Territory with a capital of about 18 million and 108 foreign companies—American, British and others—with a capital of about 32 million. All those companies shared in the exploitation of the country's wealth and of the African labour force, whose wages, according to the petitioners, were in certain places—as for example in the mines of the American company at Tsumeb—ten times lower than those of the whites. Partition would result in taking away from its rightful owners, the people, the land and its wealth and would stabilize the position of the people as a reservoir of cheap labour. It was clear that the Good Offices Committee, of which the United States and the United Kingdom were members, was submitting a proposal which served the interests of the United States and United Kingdom companies established in the Territory as well as the Union's plans for annexation. The task of the United Nations was not to promote such proposals but to defend the interests of the people of South West Africa.

38. Consequently, his delegation considered that the partition proposal was unacceptable, and especially as it might create a dangerous precedent which could be invoked by other colonial Powers. The General Assem-

bly, by its resolution 65 (I), had decided against the incorporation of the Territory into the Union in 1946, and it should not now become an accomplice to the integration which the Union was asking it to sanction.

39. The second proposal of the Good Offices Committee would involve a revival of the Mandates System of the League of Nations. In 1953 the General Assembly had adopted resolution 749 A (VIII) rejecting that idea, for, according to Article 77 of the Charter, all the former mandated territories which had not attained independence should be brought under the Trusteeship System. As the Union of South Africa, a Member of the United Nations, had assumed the obligations flowing from Article 77, the aim of the proposal would seem to be to take the question of South West Africa definitely out of the hands of the United Nations and to hand the Territory over to one or more colonialist Powers or, in other words, to substitute collective for individual colonialism.

40. His delegation therefore believed that the Committee's two proposals were contrary to the interests and aspirations of the people as well as to the Charter and to international law. It did not accept the argument of those who wished to act in what they claimed was a practical and realistic manner. In its view, the choice was either to maintain the principle of the self-determination of peoples proclaimed in the Charter or else to deal an irreparable blow to that principle and to the hopes which the peoples subjected to the colonial yoke had placed in the United Nations. At the twelfth session the Bulgarian delegation had voted against resolution 1143 (XII) setting up the Good Offices Committee and now its reasons for thinking that there was no justification for the existence of that Committee were even more valid. More than ever, it was the General Assembly's duty to insist that South West Africa should be placed under United Nations trusteeship so that it might thereby attain independence.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.