Est. 1841 | YORK ST JOHN UNIVERSITY

Barnes, Robert (2026) Introduction. In: The South Africa Disputes before Apartheid: The United Nations and Commonwealth Relations, 1946-1952. Bloomsbury Academic

Downloaded from: https://ray.yorksj.ac.uk/id/eprint/13304/

The version presented here may differ from the published version or version of record. If you intend to cite from the work you are advised to consult the publisher's version: https://www.bloomsbury.com/uk/south-africa-disputes-before-apartheid-9781350439535/

Research at York St John (RaY) is an institutional repository. It supports the principles of open access by making the research outputs of the University available in digital form. Copyright of the items stored in RaY reside with the authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full text items free of charge, and may download a copy for private study or non-commercial research. For further reuse terms, see licence terms governing individual outputs. Institutional Repositories Policy Statement

RaY

Research at the University of York St John

For more information please contact RaY at ray@yorksj.ac.uk

This is an accepted manuscript of Barnes, Robert (2026) Introduction. In: *The South Africa Disputes before Apartheid: The United Nations and Commonwealth Relations, 1946-1952.* Bloomsbury Academic https://www.bloomsbury.com/uk/south-africa-disputes-before-apartheid-9781350439535/

The South Africa Disputes before Apartheid: The United Nations and Commonwealth Relations, 1946–1952

Robert Barnes

Introduction

Extreme segregationist racial policies had been implemented by White-controlled governments before and after the established of the Union of South Africa in 1910.[1] However, the programme of apartheid (aparthood or separateness) pursued by the ruling National Party between 1948 and the early 1990s was a more complex and legalistic system that ultimately sought the complete separation of the different racial groups in South Africa to ensure the political, economic, social and cultural domination of the White minority population. Yet, in the wake of the defeat of fascism in the Second World War and the subsequent acceleration of decolonization, South Africa's racial – as well as its interlinked expansionist – policies came under intense international criticism. This was especially the case at the United Nations (UN) where apartheid became one of the most debated issues in the world organization's history. South Africa was thus transformed from being one of the victorious Allied Powers into one of the UN's first pariah states. This international anti-apartheid campaign gathered pace in the late 1950s and early 1960s as the ranks of the General Assembly swelled with newly independent members determined to utilize the UN to pursue an anti-colonial and anti-racist crusade. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, therefore, ever-more severe demands were being made at the UN to impose economic and military sanctions against South Africa to force Pretoria to end apartheid as well as its occupation of neighbouring South West Africa/Namibia.[2]

Unsurprisingly, then, historians have for long lavished attention on the controversies generated by apartheid at the UN.[3] This scholarship overwhelmingly focuses on the period of 'high apartheid' from the late 1950s onwards and historians too often overlook the fact that Pretoria's racial and expansionist policies had been under scrutiny since the very first session of the General Assembly in 1946. That year two separate items were tabled that cast a spotlight

on South Africa: the future status of South West Africa and the treatment of Indians in the Union of South Africa. Both these disputes had long and complicated histories that predated the UN but took on far greater proportions after the Second World War and became deeply entwined with the fate of the new world organization. The South African government had initially expected these disputes to be swiftly dealt with, confident that the UN would back its plans to incorporate South West Africa and refuse to discuss its Indian population. But Pretoria misjudged the emerging post-war international environment and over the next six years South Africa became increasingly isolated, particularly after the formal institution of apartheid.

Consequently, this book will argue that by the time apartheid was first officially debated, South Africa had, in all practicality, achieved pariah status at the UN. What is meant by pariah status in this context is not that South Africa had become a complete outcast from the international community by 1952, but that after six years of bitter debate over its racial and expansionist policies no UN members were willing to openly support Pretoria's rigid stance. What constitutes a pariah state remains contested, but this book borrows from the definition in *The Penguin Dictionary of International Relations* that they are: 'international state actors which by virtue of their political systems, ideological postures, leadership or general behaviour, suffer from diplomatic isolation and widespread global moral opprobrium. Their legitimacy is in question since they are perceived to defy established rules and conventions of international law and diplomacy and/or behavioural norms generally associated with membership of international society.' Indeed, *The Penguin Dictionary of International Relations* singles out South Africa as 'the classic example of this type of actor'.[4]

While the attacks upon South Africa undoubtedly intensified after 1952, the criticisms levelled at Pretoria over the South West Africa and treatment of Indian disputes paved the way for this. The debates on these two disputes had clearly exposed South Africa's insincerity, its unwillingness to make even the minimum concessions, and its distain for the authority of the

UN. Moreover, despite its failure to bring about any change in South Africa's policies, this book highlights that from the outset the UN was playing a crucial role in setting the global agenda on matters concerning race and colonialism. Indeed, the South Africa disputes were essentially a trial balloon that broke new ground for the vast array of similar items that came before the UN in later years. Clearly, the shift away from a predominantly Western and Cold War dominated UN did not wait until the late 1950s and early 1960s, as is often assumed, when the General Assembly was numerically dominated by former colonies.[5] Resultingly, this book builds upon the expanding body of work, especially since the publication of Mark Mazower's seminal 2009 book *No Enchanted Palace*, that has rightly placed the UN at the forefront of the complex process of decolonization.[6]

Crucially, though, the South Africa disputes were also intimately connected to another international organization: the Commonwealth of Nations.[7] This book will for the first time examine the two disputes through a distinctly Commonwealth lens since all its members viewed them, to a significant extent, in terms of how they impacted upon intra-Commonwealth relations. While it is easy to dismiss the Commonwealth's role today, in the late 1940s and early 1950s, the organization remained important for its members, especially the 'Old' White-dominated Commonwealth countries – Australia, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa and the United Kingdom (UK).[8] More importantly, despite the UK's postwar decline and the fact most of its members gradually came to look to the United States for leadership in the Cold War, the Commonwealth represented a cornerstone of each government's foreign, security and economic policies. They also perceived Commonwealth membership as a source of prestige and influence in a world dominated by the superpowers. The Commonwealth members were still respected for the role they had played in the Second World War and the fact they represented Washington's key regional allies. The Commonwealth was also recognized as an important non-regional group at the UN: the UK was a permanent member of the Security

Council; another Security Council seat was earmarked for a Commonwealth country; and Commonwealth figures regularly held important positions in the General Assembly. In addition, Commonwealth delegations in New York kept in close contact to coordinate policy even if this did not always result in them acting as a voting bloc.[9] The Commonwealth was also seen to wield considerable moral authority at the UN after the UK appeared to take the lead in decolonization by granting independence to India and Pakistan in August 1947. These countries thus became the so-called 'New' Commonwealth.[10] As a result, the Commonwealth was no longer a 'white-man's club' and had become a multiracial institution based on supposed shared liberal democratic values. And after 1949 even common allegiance to the Crown was dropped as the defining criteria for Commonwealth membership.[11]

More specifically, South Africa had been a Commonwealth member since the organization's inception despite many Afrikaners, with living memories of defeat in the Second Boer War (1899-1902), resenting this link to the British Empire. In 1945, then, South Africa remained an integral part of the Commonwealth's political, economic, security and cultural network. In fact, South Africa and the UK had especially close ties despite their historic tensions. Economically, the UK – and the sterling area as a whole – relied on South African gold; the two countries traded extensively; and the City of London was a vital source of investment for South Africa. In terms of defence, South Africa was geostrategically located on the sea route to the Indian Ocean; South Africa appeared to be the UK's most likely Commonwealth partner in the defence of the vitally important Middle East; and South Africa was the UK's principal source of uranium for its atomic programme. And imperially, South African goodwill was necessary to maintain British colonies in southern Africa, including Southern Rhodesia and the High Commission Territories where Pretoria had long-standing claims. What is more, Jan Christiaan (J. C.) Smuts, the South African prime minister and

minister of external affairs during and after the Second World War, was a staunch advocate of the Commonwealth connection.[12]

With regards to the other Old Commonwealth members, the postwar British Labour government of Prime Minister Clement Attlee, elected on 5 July 1945 with a landslide victory over Winston Churchill's Conservatives, realized that nominal leadership of the organization helped prop up the UK's waning great power status, especially with regards to its so-called 'special' relationship with the United States and at the UN. The Commonwealth was also seen as crucial to alleviating the UK's burdensome global defence commitments and trade within the sterling area was seen as essential to its economic recovery.[13] In addition, the Australian and New Zealand Labour governments of Ben Chifley – who had only become prime minister in July 1945 after the death of John Curtin – and Peter Fraser – prime minister since 1940 – respectively, remained strongly attached to the Commonwealth. A sense of Britishness remained strong in these countries; the UK remained their most important trading partner; and, despite increased ties to Washington since the fall of Singapore in 1942, they still looked principally to the Commonwealth for their defence needs. Still, Canberra was eager to flex its independent muscles after 1945, especially at the UN where it saw itself as a 'middle power'.[14] Canada, and its Liberal Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King who held office for over twenty-one years and had narrowly won re-election in June 1945, however, had a more ambiguous relationship with the Commonwealth. Most English-speaking Canadians still held strong affinity to the UK and Commonwealth, but these feelings were not shared by its Francophone population and those who had immigrated from beyond the UK. Moreover, Ottawa's relationship with its southern neighbour had drawn Canada away from the UK's orbit. As a result, while Canada wished to maintain its Commonwealth connection, it greatly resisted any measures to centralize the organization and wanted to assert its own voice in international affairs, especially at the UN where it hoped to play a mediatory role.[15]

Predictably, though, the New Commonwealth held very different views. Jawaharlal Nehru, the first prime minister and minister of external affairs of India, chose to join the organization at independence despite his long-held calls to sever all ties with the British Empire. Despite his personal and cultural links to the UK, Nehru did not base this decision on any sense of nostalgia but on the realization that India's shaky economy and security benefited from being inside the Commonwealth. Nehru also believed that Commonwealth membership helped amplify India's voice in world affairs, especially at the UN where he hoped to both mediate between the Cold War superpowers and lead the international campaign against imperialism he had long advocated.[16] In contrast, Liaquat Ali Khan and Muhammad Ali Jinnah, the first prime minister and governor-general of Pakistan respectively, had long advocated joining the Commonwealth.[17] But they had less lofty ambitions than Nehru and were more interested in Commonwealth membership to secure themselves against, and to keep an eye on, India.[18]

Commonwealth membership, therefore, was critically important to how each member's government approached the South Africa disputes at the UN. At least initially Pretoria took for granted that it would be supported by its Old Commonwealth partners in the disputes. The emergence of the New Commonwealth, however, played a crucial role in preventing this from happening. India was South Africa's leading critic in both disputes, shrewdly combining them into a dual campaign against apartheid even before this was formally under scrutiny at the UN. In doing so, New Delhi attracted support from beyond the Commonwealth amongst other members of the emerging Global South composed mainly of newly independent Asian and African states but occasionally in this period also including Latin American countries. India thus gradually broadened its campaign to cover anti-colonialism and anti-racism. In this climate, the Old Commonwealth governments, at different speeds and in differing ways, felt increasingly uncomfortable appearing to endorse South Africa's racial and expansionist

policies under the glare of international attention at the UN. They also became deeply frustrated with Pretoria's intransigence in the face of international opinion, especially after Smuts lost power and apartheid was formally instituted by Prime Minister Daniël François (D. F.) Malan. Yet, due to their own national interests none of the Old Commonwealth members completely abandoned South Africa before 1952. Instead, they fell back on adopting a legalistic policy of neutrality in both disputes in the hope of offending neither South Africa nor India. This loss of support – as opposed to direct opposition – from its closest allies compounded South Africa's pariah status at the UN. Accordingly, this book will argue that the South African disputes, that so publicly exposed Commonwealth fissures to the world, posed the most sustained challenge to Commonwealth harmony in the early post-war years and ultimately set in motion events leading to South Africa's withdrawal from the Commonwealth in 1961. Still, it must be noted that even after this apartheid remained the most divisive issue within the Commonwealth for another three decades. This period has received considerably more attention from Commonwealth scholars than what is covered in this book.[19]

To emphasize these central arguments, then, the following pages are structured into three chronological sections each composed of two chapters with one focused on South West Africa and the other on the treatment of Indians dispute. The first section covers the opening round of the two disputes that set the tone for UN debates for years to come. Chapter 1 starts by outlining South West Africa's long and complicated history before examining the discussions at the First Session of the General Assembly over Smuts's request to incorporate South Africa's League of Nations' mandate. This plea immediately divided the Commonwealth since the UK openly supported incorporation while India insisted that South West Africa be placed under the UN's new trusteeship system. The other Commonwealth countries, however, were torn since they did not think South Africa was under any legal obligation to submit a trusteeship agreement but believed that this was the correct course to take. Crucially, India's

arguments prevailed in 1946 and the incorporation of South West Africa was firmly rejected. Similarly, Chapter 2 traces the origins of the treatment of Indians dispute as well as Smuts's important role at the 1945 San Francisco Conference in inserting human rights clauses into the UN Charter. This achievement, though, soon came back to haunt him when India submitted a complaint about the treatment of South African Indians to the General Assembly. This time all the Old Commonwealth members supported Smuts's argument that this issue fell under South Africa's domestic jurisdiction and was exempt from discussion at the UN. Yet, even in 1946 the Old Commonwealth members felt uncomfortable appearing to support South Africa's racial policies, especially if this put them at loggerheads with India on the eve of independence. Their legalistic arguments also struggled to compete with the emotive political arguments presented by the Indian delegation. As a result, another defeat was inflicted upon South Africa.

At the time no one was aware that the two disputes would remain deadlocked on these points. Indeed, the second section of this book covering the next three General Assembly sessions reveals that some hope of resolving the disputes remained. The third chapter first considers Smuts's decision to postpone incorporation and continue administering South West Africa as a mandate. This compromise was welcomed by the Old Commonwealth members but did not go far enough for India that continued campaigning for the territory to be placed under the trusteeship system. Commonwealth tensions then intensified in 1948 with the election of the National Party government determined to annex South West Africa. Malan also refused to submit reports on the administration of the territory to the UN and vehemently opposed India's campaign to have Reverend Michael Scott, the representative of several South West African headmen, heard at the General Assembly. While the Old Commonwealth members backed South Africa on this last point, they opposed Malan's position on sending reports. Nevertheless, at the end of 1949 expectations were raised that a solution could be found when Pretoria accepted a resolution requesting an International Court of Justice (ICJ) advisory

opinion on the legal obligations regarding South West Africa. Likewise, the fourth chapter demonstrates that between 1947 and 1949 the treatment of Indians dispute was seemingly not beyond remedy. Early optimism was sparked when Smuts and Nehru corresponded with each other about trying to resolve the issue. But the differences between the two leaders were too great. Friction then rapidly escalated following Malan's election on the platform of apartheid. After this, the treatment of Indians item became a surrogate for Indian and, to a lesser extent, Pakistani attacks on apartheid while the Old Commonwealth countries sought to distance themselves from this embarrassing dispute. Even so, a feint glimmer of hope appeared in late 1949 when Malan accepted holding a round-table conference with India and Pakistan.

Yet, the prospects of resolving both disputes were snuffed out in 1950 and the third section of this book reveals how South Africa achieved pariah status at the UN even before apartheid was officially debated in 1952. Chapter 5 centres on South Africa's rejection of the ICJ's advisory opinion that South West Africa remained under the international supervision of the UN and South Africa was obliged to submit reports to the world organization. Resultingly, despite Pretoria's belief that its military commitment to the Korean War would stymie further criticisms at the General Assembly, even the Old Commonwealth endorsed the ICJ's ruling and pressed Pretoria to agree to a new mechanism to implement this ruling. India and Pakistan also stepped up their campaign to have South Africa submit the territory to the trusteeship system. In response, the Old Commonwealth members became openly hostile towards South Africa when its delegation temporarily boycotted the UN in protest against a decision to invite Scott and his South West African sponsors to speak at the General Assembly. By 1952 it had become clear that Pretoria would not cooperate with the UN over South West Africa and it had essentially lost Old Commonwealth support in this dispute. Furthermore, Chapter 6 will show that during this same period the treatment of Indians dispute also became intractable. South African, Indian, and Pakistani representatives did hold preliminary talks in Cape Town in early

1950 that went surprisingly well. Before a round-table conference could be held, however, the Malan government accelerated its apartheid programme and India announced that it would not participate in a conference unless this new legislation was paused. But Pretoria refused while insisting that it remained ready to negotiate. With India's and Pakistan's wrath mounting, the Old Commonwealth countries retreated behind a position of neutrality allowing the first UN resolution to be adopted that explicitly criticized apartheid. In retaliation, South Africa refused to cooperate with all UN efforts to mediate between the three interested Commonwealth governments and in 1951 refused to participate in the debate on the treatment of Indians item. Thus, by the start of 1952 the treatment of Indians item was languishing, and the Old Commonwealth countries simply wished it would disappear.

The disputes, though, did not end there since India decided to expand its assaults on South Africa at the UN. The Epilogue of this book briefly traces events from the Seventh Session of the General Assembly onwards when the race conflict (apartheid) item was debated for the first time. The South West Africa and treatment of Indian disputes continued to be bitterly contested, but this new item became the focal point of the Indian-led campaign against South Africa at the UN. As they had done in 1946, the Old Commonwealth initially rallied behind South Africa's domestic jurisdiction argument. But they were more cautious from the outset and by the late 1950s Canada and New Zealand joined with India, Pakistan, and the other recently independent New Commonwealth members now present at the UN in voting against South Africa. The year 1961 thus marks a logical end point for this study since after Pretoria's decision to become a republic a year earlier, South Africa's position within the Commonwealth became untenable and it withdrew from the organization. The South Africa disputes at the UN thereafter were no longer a specifically Commonwealth concern. What is more, the treatment of Indians item was no longer debated after this time.

Evidently from what is written above, this book falls within the broad sphere of international history since it examines intra-alliance diplomacy within the context of two international organizations. It is also concerned principally with the top echelons of government foreign policy making and pays particular attention to the themes of national interests, security, and prestige since these factors underlay the positions adopted by each Commonwealth country. Given the specific nature of the South Africa disputes, issues relating to race, imperialism and decolonization also provide a constant backdrop. Additionally, this book will devote significant attention to the key individuals within each Commonwealth government who shaped policy since these figures were just as, if not more, important than structural and systemic factors. This book also recognizes that foreign policy is not formulated in a vacuum and will emphasize how other domestic factors within Commonwealth countries helped shape the positions adopted by their governments.

Consequently, my research methodology has focused on official government records of all the Commonwealth countries, except for Pakistan, directly involved in the South Africa disputes at the UN between 1946 and 1952.[20] In particular, my research centred on documents produced by the Ministry or Department of External Affairs in each Commonwealth country since this is where foreign policy making predominantly took place. The one exception was at the UK National Archives where policy making regarding the South Africa disputes was divided across various ministries but was focused on the Dominions Office/Commonwealth Relations Office.[21] In fact, the Dominions Office/Commonwealth Relations Office was the central hub for Commonwealth communications in this period and its records proved invaluable in joining the dots between the national records of each country. The Commonwealth Relations Office records also particularly helped fill in the gaps regarding Pakistan's thinking. Given the UN focus of this book, I have also extensively utilized the official records of the General Assembly and the Trusteeship Council as well as the those of

the ICJ and the League of Nations. Luckily, these collections are digitized and readily available online.

Moreover, this book looks beyond these formal records at a variety of private papers to discover the motivations behind the views and actions of many of the key policymakers involved. For instance, it makes extensive use of the voluminous published works of Nehru and Smuts. The private papers of various relevant British officials found at the Churchill Archives Centre in Cambridge have also been utilized. Additionally, while viewed critically, the memoirs of key individuals involved in shaping the South Africa debates have supplemented the official records. For example, the memoirs of Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, Nehru's sister and frequent champion of India's cause at the UN, and those of George Heaton Nicholls, Smuts's ally at the UN in 1946, have offered important insights.[22]

The Commonwealth-wide research base for this book thus goes far beyond that of the existing scholarship focused on the South Africa disputes. Indeed, despite the critical importance of these disputes to the evolution of both the UN and the Commonwealth, historians of these two organizations generally only briefly cover the formative years of the international anti-apartheid campaign when the South West Africa and treatment of Indians items were the official focus. One exception is T. B. Miller's book that has an entire chapter on the Commonwealth's response to the South Africa disputes at the UN but this is based on limited primary research.[23] Still, other issues that affected the two international organizations in this eventful period dominate these broader histories. Much the same can be said about the vast array of literature examining South Africa's domestic and foreign affairs; India's emerging role in global relations; Anglo-South African relations; and the biographies of the key officials involved in the South Africa disputes. Even so, all these works have provided the invaluable contextual information needed to fully understand the dynamics of the South Africa disputes between 1946 and 1952. This book has drawn particularly heavily on the works of Manu

Bhagavan, Saul Dubow, Daniel Gorman, Ronald Hyam and Peter Henshaw, Ryan Irwin, Lindie Koorts, and Jeremy Shearar.[24] Additionally, despite its focus on government foreign policy making, this study has been influenced by the growing body of innovative literature on Global South solidarity networks in the early years of decolonization and the Cold War.[25]

Still, my research owes a more direct debt to the excellent if limited range of works focused specifically on the South Africa disputes in the UN's early years. To start with, Peter Henshaw wrote two journal articles that examine the South Africa disputes, including the later apartheid item, between 1945 and 1961. These works effectively highlighted the policy-making processes in London and Ottawa while emphasising that neither of these two Old Commonwealth members were prepared to adopt strong policies against South Africa at least until the late 1950s due to their Cold War priorities, their close bilateral ties to South Africa, and their fear that South Africa would leave the Commonwealth. Yet, Henshaw's articles only covered each dispute briefly and did not fully stress how isolated South Africa had become at the UN in the late 1940s and early 1950s. Also, because he did not look at the Commonwealth holistically, Henshaw largely ignored the key roles played by other Commonwealth countries, especially India.[26] Allana O'Malley filled this latter gap in an article focussed specifically on the Indian campaign against apartheid in this same period. O'Malley offers a strong analysis of how New Delhi shifted its attention from South Africa's racial and expansionist policies to rallying the emerging Global South against all forms of colonialism and racism at the UN. Still, O'Malley only briefly covers the very early stages of the South Africa disputes and largely ignored India's relationship with the Commonwealth. This book, instead, emphasizes that the Commonwealth remained just as important to New Delhi as its ties to the Global South in the late 1940s and the early 1950s.[27]

A more substantial body of work focuses singularly on each dispute. Of the two, the treatment of Indians dispute has garnered more scholarly attention. This is unsurprising given

the more obviously emotive nature of this dispute directly pitting South Africa – the embodiment of European imperialism in Africa – against India – the emerging champion of anti-colonialism. Lorna Lloyd shed important light on the origins and first year of this item at the UN, focusing particularly on British policy-making and Anglo-Indian and Anglo-South African relations.[28] Vineet Thakur has subsequently taken a broader focus, looking at the origins of the treatment of Indians dispute all the way to when it was merged with the apartheid item at the UN in 1962. Thakur's work is especially insightful regarding Smuts's long and contentious involvement in this dispute and the formulation of Indian policy in the postwar period, emphasising that it was not just Nehru but also figures in the Indian Ministry of External Affairs as well as Indian representatives in South Africa who shaped New Delhi's position.[29] Lloyd and Thakur, though, do not consider at length how the disputes affected intra-Commonwealth relations. In addition, Angela Loschke's recent chapter questions how isolated South Africa was in the treatment of Indians dispute. She focuses on the efforts of the UN Secretariat to insulate South Africa from criticism and the support South Africa received at times from Latin American countries. However, Loschke goes too far in refuting South Africa's growing isolation at the UN and only briefly considers the Commonwealth dimension.[30]

A limitation of all these works, though, is that they do not consider how the treatment of Indians and South West Africa disputes were intimately connected. This book will argue that the two disputes were equally important in facilitating South Africa's descent to pariah status at the UN as well as sowing intra-Commonwealth disharmony. Yet, the controversies surrounding the future status of South West Africa in the early postwar period have received less attention. The reasons for this seem apparent: South West Africa was a sparsely-populated territory with no notable nationalist movement and no other member state had a direct interest in it. The issue at the UN also on paper concerned South West Africa's legal status rather than race relations. However, several important chronologically broad works were written at the

time of the South West Africa/Namibia debates at the UN and often by figures directly involved. These works were often based on limited primary source material and are now rather dated, but they still offered useful insights for this book.[31]

More significantly, a recent tranche of innovative studies has been written scrutinising different aspects of the South West Africa dispute. Molly McCullers has led the way, producing several articles examining South West Africa's journey from being a German colony to attaining independence as Namibia. McCullers' work was especially strong on the local dynamics involved in this process, focusing on South West African/Namibian actors.[32] Moreover, while Lydia Walker's work focused on the campaign for an independent Nagaland in post-colonial India, she also examined South West Africa/Namibia as an example of a territory with nationalist claims that had not received international recognition during the wider process of decolonization. Walker's groundbreaking work has been very useful to this book in understanding the evolution of nationalist claims-making in South West Africa and its international advocates at the UN.[33] Furthermore, E. Ike Udogu's book provided an in-depth study of the of the South West Africa/Namibia dispute at both the League and the UN between 1920 and 1990. Its early chapters, in particular, helped frame the UN-focus of this book.[34] Yet, McCullers, Walker and Udogu are all predominantly focused on events either before or from 1960 onwards and they do not focus on the impact of the South West Africa dispute on intra-Commonwealth relations. More closely aligned to this book is Jason Morgan's recent chapter that examines the dispute between 1946 and 1949. Still, Morgan focuses principally on the activities of Black South West Africans in getting their voices heard at the world organisation and only briefly touches on intra-Commonwealth relations.[35]

Finally, a range of other works have looked at the South Africa disputes through the prism of specific individuals or non-governmental organizations. Regarding the treatment of Indians dispute, Arianna Lissoni, Parvathi Raman and Hilary Sapire have focused on the South

African Indians themselves, especially key leaders like Dr Yusuf Dadoo and Dr Monty Naicker who campaigned tirelessly for equal rights and worked closely with the government in New Delhi.[36] Furthermore, on South West Africa Carol Anderson and Roger Clark have respectively examined the work of the US-based National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and the International League for Human Rights in supporting the high profile crusade at the UN of Michael Scott on behalf of Black South West Africans. Tom Buchanan's history of the British-based Amnesty International has shed further light on the work of Scott. In addition, Michael Crowder has highlighted the efforts of Tshekedi Khama, the regent of the Bamangwato in neighbouring Bechuanaland, to bring South West Africa to the world's attention.[37] This book is essentially focused on high politics rather than the actions of these private actors, but it still considers the important roles they played in shaping the debates at the UN and influencing the Commonwealth governments' policies.

Resultingly, this is the first book-length study of the early years of the South Africa disputes. Given the importance of these disputes to the evolution of both the UN and the Commonwealth an in-depth study on this topic is long overdue. What is more, none of the works mentioned above fully appreciated the extent to which South Africa had already become a pariah state at the UN even before apartheid was officially debated. By 1952 there was no going back for South Africa since it had made it so abundantly clear it was unwilling to make any concessions over South West Africa and its Indian population that even its closest Commonwealth allies had abandoned Pretoria. This was a very long way from the apparent position of strength Smuts and South Africa were in at the close of the Second World War where this book begins.

NOTES

[1] The Union of South Africa was the official title of the country between 1910 and 1961 after which it became the Republic of South Africa. The short form of South Africa will be used throughout this book.

[2] The UN General Assembly adopted the name Namibia instead of South West Africa in 1966 although this was not supported by all Black nationalists in the territory at the time. Allegedly the name was coined by Mburumba Kerina, a leading Namibian nationalist leader, in a conversation with Indonesian President Sukharno between 1960 and 1961 while studying for his PhD in Bandung. Given this chronology I will use South West Africa for the period up to 1966. See Lydia Walker, *States-in-Waiting: A Counternarrative of Decolonization* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2024), 144, 152.

[3] For more on the long-running debates on *apartheid* at the UN see Adekeye Adebajo, *Global Apartheid to Global Village: Africa and the United Nations* (Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2009); Abdul Karim Bangura, 'The United Nations and Apartheid: 1948–1994', *Journal of Third World Studies* 14, no. 2 (1997): 291-302; Ibrahim Gassama, 'Reaffirming faith in the dignity of each human being: The United Nations, NGOs, and Apartheid', *Fordham International Law Journal* 19, no. 4 (1996): 1464-1541; Anna Konieczna, '"We the people of the United Nations": The UN and the Global campaigns against Apartheid', in *A Global History of Anti-Apartheid: 'Forward to Freedom' in South Africa*, eds Anna Konieczna and Rob Skinner (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), 67-104; Seane Mabitsela, 'Impact of the United Nations' Anti-Apartheid Regimes on South African Race Relations, 1952–1974', *Journal of Nation-building and Policy Studies* 8, no. 1 (2024): 89-107; Özdemir Özgür, *Apartheid: The United Nations and Peaceful Change in South Africa* (Dobbs Ferry: Transnational Publishers, 1982); Enuga Reddy, 'The United Nations and the

struggle for liberation in South Africa', in *The Road to Democracy in South Africa – Volume 3: International Solidarity, Part 1*, eds Abede Zegeye and Elizabeth le Roux (Pretoria: University of South Africa Press, 2024), 41-140; Newell Stultz, 'Evolution of the United Nations Anti-Apartheid Regime', *Human Rights Quarterly* 13, no. 1 (1991): 1-23; and Newell Stultz, 'The Apartheid Issue at the General Assembly: Stalemate or Gathering Storm?', *African Affairs* 86, no. 342 (1987): 25-45.

[4] Graham Evans and Jeffrey Newham, *The Penguin Dictionary of International Relations* (London: Penguin Books, 1998), 417.

[5] Fore more traditional Western-centric accounts of the UN in this early period see Maurice Betrand, *The United Nations: Past, Present and Future* (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1997); Evan Luard, *A History of the United Nations – Volume 1: The Years of Western Domination* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1982); and Geoff Simons, *The United Nations: A Chronology of Conflict* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1994).

[6] For some important works in this recent historiographical trend see Nicola Eggers, Jessica Pearson, and Aurora Almada e Santos, eds, *The United Nations and Decolonization* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2020); Frank Gerits, *The Ideological Scramble for Africa: How the Pursuit of Anticolonial Modernity Shaped a Postcolonial Order, 1945-1966* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2023); Julius Heise, *Securitising Decolonisation: The Silencing of Ewe and Togoland Unification under United Nations Trusteeship, 1945–1960* (Bielefeld: Verlag, 2024); Mary Ann Heiss, *Fulfilling the Sacred Trust: The UN Campaign for International Accountability for Dependent Territories in the Era of Decolonization* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2020); Robert Hill and Edmond Keller, *Trustee for the Human Community: Ralph J. Bunche, the United Nations, and the Decolonization of Africa* (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 2010); John Kent, *America, the UN and Decolonisation: Cold War conflict in the Congo* (London: Routledge, 2010); Jan Lüdert, Maria Ketzmerick, and

Julius Heise, *The United Nations Trusteeship System: Legacies, Continuities, and Change* (London: Routledge, 2022); Mark Mazower, *No Enchanted Palace: The End of Empire and the Ideological Origins of the United Nations* (Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2009); Henning Melber, *Dag Hammarskjöld, the United Nations and the decolonisation of Africa* (London: Hurst, 2019); Eva-Maria Muschik, *Building States: The United Nations, Development, and Decolonization, 1945–1965* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2022); Alanna O'Malley, *The Diplomacy of Decolonisation: America, Britain and the United Nations during the Congo Crisis, 1960–64* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018); and Vrushali Patil, *Negotiating Decolonization in the United Nations: Politics of Space, Identity and International Community* (London: Routledge, 2008).

[7] The official title was the British Commonwealth of Nations until the late 1940s when the word British was gradually dropped from usage. The short form of Commonwealth will be used throughout this study.

[8] Éire was officially a Commonwealth member until 1948 when it became the Republic of Ireland. However, Éire had boycotted the Commonwealth since the late 1930s and did not become a UN member until 1955. It will thus not feature in this book.

[9] Lorna Lloyd, *Diplomacy with a Difference: The Commonwealth Office of High Commissioner, 1880–2006* (Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2002), 64, 186-7, 232.

[10] In early 1948 Burma (now Myanmar) and Ceylon (now Sri Lanka) were also granted independence from the British Empire. While the former chose not to join the Commonwealth, Ceylon enthusiastically did so. The Soviet Union, though, vetoed Ceylon's membership of the UN until 1955 on the grounds that the 1947 United Kingdom-Ceylon Defence Agreement denied true independence to the island. Consequently, Ceylon will not feature in this book.

[11] For more on the Commonwealth in the early post-war period see H. Duncan Hall, *Commonwealth: A History of the British Commonwealth of Nations* (London: Van Nostrand

Reinhold Company, 1971); 604-5, 639-40, 649-58, 763-879; Nicholas Mansergh, *The Commonwealth Experience – Volume Two: From British to Multiracial Commonwealth* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982), 135-62; W. David McIntyre, *The Britannic Vision: Historians and the Making of the British Commonwealth of Nations, 1907–48* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 194-216, 235-57, 281-300; W. David McIntyre, *Colonies into Commonwealth* Revised Edition (London: Blandford, 1977), 202-26; W. David McIntyre, *The Commonwealth of Nations: Origins and Impact, 1869–1971* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977), 331-88; W. David McIntyre, 'The Strange Death of Dominion Status', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 27, no. 2 (1999): 193-212; Francine McKenzie, 'In the National Interest: Dominions' Support for Britain and the Commonwealth after the Second World War', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 34, no. 4 (2006): 553-576; Francine McKenzie, *Redefining the Bonds of Commonwealth, 1939–1948: The Politics of Preference* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 128-259; R. J. Moore, *Making the New Commonwealth* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987); Philip Murphy, *The Empire's New Clothes: The Myth of the Commonwealth* (London: C. Hurst, 2021), 19-26, 96-7; Philip Murphy, *Monarchy and the End of Empire: The House of Windsor, the British Government and the Postwar Commonwealth* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 34-48; Krishnan Srinivasan, *The Rise, Decline and Future of the British Commonwealth* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 5-32; and Patrick Gordon Walker, *The Commonwealth* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1962), 49-53, 128-329, 354-6.

[12] For more on South Africa's relationship with the Commonwealth and specifically the UK in the early post-war period see Lucky Asuelime, 'Uranium politics of gatekeeping: Revisiting the British government's policy vis-à-vis South Africa, 1945–1951', *Historia* 58, no. 1 (2013): 33-50; Dennis Austin, *Britain and South Africa* (London: Oxford University Press, 1966); Geoffrey Berridge, 'Britain, South Africa and African Defence, 1949–55', in *British Foreign*

Policy, 1945–56, eds Michael Dockrill and John Young (New York: St Martin's, 1989), 101-25; David Deveraux, 'Britain, the Commonwealth and the Defence of the Middle East, 1948–56', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 24, no. 2 (1989): 331-35; David Devereux, *The Formulation of British Defence Policy towards the Middle East, 1948–56* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1990), 76-7, 81-83, 99, 189-90; Saul Dubow, 'The Commonwealth and South Africa: From Smuts to Mandela', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 45, no. 2 (2017): 290-5; Peter Henshaw, 'Britain, South Africa and the sterling area: gold production, capital investment and agricultural markets, 1931–1961', *Historical Journal* 39, no. 1 (1996): 207-15; Peter Henshaw, 'South African Territorial Expansion and the International Reaction to South African Racial Policies, 1939 to 1948', *South African Historical Journal*, 50, no. 1 (2004): 70-76; Ronald Hyam and Peter Henshaw, *The Lion and the Springbok: Britain and South Africa since the Boer War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 4-7, 31-4, 115-7, 146-7, 286-7; McKenzie, 'In the National Interest', 553-76; McKenzie, *Redefining the Bonds*, 11, 44, 79-90, 118-21, 125, 164, 228, 257-8; Moore, *Making the New Commonwealth*, 11-2, 121-4, 177-80; Stuart Mole, *The Commonwealth, South Africa and Apartheid: Race Conflict and Reconciliation* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2023); 18-47; Ritchie Ovendale, *The English-Speaking Alliance: Britain, the United States, the Dominions and the Cold War, 1945–1951* (London: G. Allen and Unwin, 1985), 21, 81-2 114, 119, 121, 245-57, 265; Ritchie Ovendale, 'The South African Policy of the British Labour Government, 1945–1951', *International Affairs* 44, no. 591 (1983): 41–58; Tim Rooth, 'Britain, South African Gold, and the Sterling Area, 1945–50', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 32, no. 1 (2004): 93-115; and Nicholas Waddy, 'The Fork in the Road? British Reactions to the Election of an Apartheid Government in South Africa, May 1948', *Historia* 55, no. 1 (2010): 78-89.

[13] For more on British perspectives of the Commonwealth see Clement Attlee, *As it Happened* (London: William Heinemann, 1954), 170-3, 177-92; Clement Attlee *Empire into*

Commonwealth (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961); Francis Beckett, *Clem Attlee* (London: Blake Publishing, 2000), 181-2, 219-21; Alan Bullock, *The Life and Times of Ernest Bevin – Volume III: Foreign Secretary* (London: Hassell Street Press, 1967), 64-5, 110-15, 192-3, 219, 234, 450-1, 633, 782; Roger Eatwell, *The 1945-51 Labour Governments* (London: HarperCollins, 1975), 78, 140, 158; D. K. Fieldhouse, 'The Labour Governments and the Empire-Commonwealth, 1945–51', in *The Foreign Policy of the British Labour Governments, 1945–1951,* ed. Ritchie Ovendale (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1984), 83-120; Daniel Haines, 'A "Commonwealth Moment" in South Asian Decolonization', in *Decolonization and the Cold War: Negotiating Independence*, eds Leslie James and Elisabeth Leake (London: Bloomsbury, 2015), 186-90, 193-5; McKenzie, 'In the National Interest', 553-76; McKenzie, *Redefining the Bonds*, 1-13, 39-48, 68, 91-3, 101, 104-12, 117, 123, 139, 145-6, 150-1, 154, 159, 165-6, 182, 207-8, 212-14, 220, 229, 239, 245, 250, 258-9, 265-6; Kenneth Morgan, *Labour in Power, 1945–1951* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), 188-231, 237-8; Srinivasan, *Rise, Decline and Future*, 1-9, 16-26; and Patrick Gordon Walker, 'The British Labour Party and the Commonwealth: architect of the Commonwealth', *Round Table* 60, no. 240 (1970): 503-9.

[14] For more on Australian and New Zealand perspectives on the Commonwealth see Frank Bongiorno, 'H. V. Evatt, 'Australia and Ireland's Departure from the Commonwealth: A Reassessment', *Irish Historical Studies* 32, no. 128 (2001), 537-55; Frank Bongiorno, '"British to the bootstraps": H. V. Evatt, J. B. Chifley and Australian Policy on Indian Membership of the Commonwealth, 1947–1949', *Australian Historical Studies* 36, no. 125 (2005): 18-29; Frank Bongiorno, 'Commonwealthmen and Republicans: Dr H. V. Evatt, the Monarchy and India', *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 46, no. 1 (2000): 43-8; Harshan Kumarasingham, 'The "New Commonwealth" 1947–49: A New Zealand perspective on India joining the Commonwealth', *Round Table* 95, no. 385 (2006): 441-54; Harshan

Kumarasingham, 'Peter Fraser', *Political Science* 60, no. 2 (2008): 51-60; Jatinder Mann, *The Search for a New National Identity: The Rise of Multiculturalism in Canada and Australia, 1890s–1970s* (New York: Peter Lang, 2016), 120-123, 124-5, 128, 199-200, 205-7; McKenzie, 'In the National Interest', 553-76; McKenzie, *Redefining the Bonds*, 10-11, 57-79, 92, 100-1, 95, 114-7, 123, 152, 162, 173, 266; W. David McIntyre, 'Peter Fraser's Commonwealth: New Zealand and the Origins of the New Commonwealth in the 1940s', in *New Zealand in World Affairs – Volume 1*, ed. Alister McIntosh (Wellington: New Zealand Institute of International Affairs, 1977), 1945–57; P. G. A. Orders, *Britain, Australia, New Zealand and the Challenge of the United States, 1939–46: A Study in International History* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 151-192, 198-201; and Ken Ross, 'Peter Fraser's Post-War Diplomacy', *New Zealand International Review* 41, no. 5 (2016): 18-21.

[15] For more on Canadian perspectives on the Commonwealth see Mann, *Search for a New National Identity*, 6, 25-6, 29-31, 34, 38-47, 197-200, 205-7; Mansergh, *Commonwealth Experience*, 213-26, 228; McKenzie, 'In the National Interest', 553-76; McKenzie, *Redefining the Bonds*, 11, 48-57, 92, 94-5, 100, 111,113, 123-6, 152, 168, 209, 251-2, 266; and F. J. McEvoy, 'Canada, Ireland and the Commonwealth: The Declaration of the Irish Republic, 1948–9', *Irish Historical Studies* 24, no. 96 (1985), 506-27.

[16] For more on Nehru's international campaign against imperialism see Michele Louro, *Comrades against Imperialism: Nehru, India, and Interwar Internationalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018); 79-94; Michele Louro, 'The Anti-Imperialist "Echo" in India: Nehru, the Indian National Congress, and the LAI', in *The League Against Imperialism: Lives and Afterlives* eds, Michele Louro, Carolien Stolte, Heather Streets-Salter and Sana Tannoury-Karam (Leiden: Leiden University, 2020), 257-82; and Carolien Stolte, 'Towards Afro-Asia? Continuities and Change in Indian Anti-imperialist Regionalism, 1927-1957', in

The League Against Imperialism: Lives and Afterlives eds, Michele Louro, Carolien Stolte, Heather Streets-Salter and Sana Tannoury-Karam (Leiden: Leiden University, 2020), 347-69.

[17] Liaquat Ali Khan was generally referred to by his first name and so will be subsequently in this book.

[18] For more on Indian and Pakistani perspectives on the Commonwealth see M. Rafique Afzal, *Speeches and Statements of the Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah [1911–34 and 1947–48]* (Lahore: Research Society of Pakistan, 1966), 247, 424, 451, 460; M. Rafique Afzal, *Speeches and Statements of Quaid-i-Millat Liaquat Ali Khan [1941–1951]* (Lahore: Research Society of Pakistan, 1967), 181-2; Y. Rafeek Ahmed, 'India's Membership of the Commonwealth – Nehru's Role', *Indian Journal of Political Science* 52, no. 1 (1991): 43–53; Michael Brecher, 'India's Decision to Remain in the Commonwealth', *Journal of Commonwealth and Comparative Politics* 14, no. 7 (1974): 62-90; Judith Brown, *Nehru* (London: Routledge, 2000), 127-8, 184-5; Judith Brown, *Nehru: A Political Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 178-9, 248-9, 251-8; Judith Brown, 'Jawaharlal Nehru', in *Mental Maps in the Cold War Era*, eds Steven Casey and Jonathan Wright (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 201-2, 209-15; Sarvepalli Gopal, *Jawaharlal Nehru: A Biography* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1979), 43-55; Sarvepalli Gopal, 'Nehru and the Commonwealth', in *Retreat from Power: Studies in Britain's Foreign Policy of the Twentieth Century – Volume Two: After 1939*, ed. David Dilks (London: Macmillan, 1981), 138-51; Haines, '"Commonwealth Moment"', 190-3; Ayesha Jayal, *The Sole Spokesman: Jinnah, the Muslim League and the Demand for Pakistan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 257-8, 270; Muhammad Reza Kazimi, *Liaquat Ali Khan: His Life and Work* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 304-5; Harshan Kumarasingham, 'The "Tropical Dominions": The Appeal of Dominion Status in the Decolonisation of India, Pakistan and Ceylon', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 23 (2013): 232-42; Mansergh, *Commonwealth Experience*, 146-8, 151-7, 232-5; Moore,

Making the New Commonwealth, 6-8, 14, 120-57, 180-91; B. R. Nanda, 'Nehru and the British', *Modern Asian Studies* 30, no. 2 (1996): 476-8; Sunil Purushotham, 'Jawaharlal Nehru, Indian Republicanism, and the Commonwealth', in *Commonwealth History in the Twenty-First Century*, eds Saul Dubow and Richard Drayton (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020), 143-59; Pallavi Raghavan, *Animosity at Bay: An Alternative History of the India-Pakistan Relationship, 1947–1952* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2020), 142-3; G. Ramachandram, *Nehru and World Peace* (New Delhi: Sangam Books, 1990), 98-114; Hugh Tinker, *Separate and Unequal: India and the Indians in the British Commonwealth, 1920–1950* (London: C. Hurst, 1976), 264-354; Paul Tonks and L. M. Ratnapalan, 'Bound "Together by the Golden Thread of a Common Tradition"? Decolonization. Identity, and the Legacies of Empire in British-South Asian Relations', *International History Review* 45, no. 1 (2023): 118-20; Paul Tonks and L. M. Ratnapalan, 'Ideologies of the New Commonwealth', *International History Review* 43, no. 4 (2021): 890, 892, 898; and Walker, *Commonwealth*, 135-8.

[19] For more on the Commonwealth controversies surrounding *apartheid* after 1961 see Harriet Aldrich, 'Racial Legacies: South African Apartheid and the Old Commonwealth', in *Commonwealth History in the Twentieth Century*, eds Saul Dubow and Richard Drayton (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020), 229-49; Dubow, 'Commonwealth and South Africa', 295-305; Linus Hoskins, 'Apartheid South Africa: The Commonwealth Stand and US-British Collusion', *A Current Bibliography on African Affairs* 22, no. 1 (1990): 1-18; W. David McIntyre, *A Guide to the Contemporary Commonwealth* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001), 26, 31, 38-43, 82, 87, 89, 122; W. David McIntyre, *The Significance of the Commonwealth, 1965–90* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1991), 2-3, 8, 34-43, 87-8, 68-9, 99-106, 115-23, 168-9, 239-40; Mole, *Commonwealth*, 48-194; Murphy, *The Empires New Clothes*, 58, 89, 119, 140, 160; Thula Simpson, 'The Commonwealth and Apartheid', in *Commonwealth History in the Twentieth Century*, eds Saul Dubow and Richard Drayton

(Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020), 207-27; and Ian Taylor, 'Legitimisation and de-legitimisation within a multilateral organisation: South Africa and the Commonwealth', *Politikon* 27, no. 1 (2000): 51-72.

[20] Travel warnings prevented me visiting Islamabad and the National Archives of Pakistan does not offer a digitization service.

[21] The Dominions Office merged with the Indian Office to form the Commonwealth Relations Office when India and Pakistan gained independence in August 1947.

[22] G. Heaton Nicholls, *South Africa in My Time* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1961); and Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, *The Scope of Happiness: A Personal Memoir* (New York: Crown Publishers, 1979).

[23] T. B. Miller, *The Commonwealth at the United Nations* (Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1967), 136-91.

[24] Manu Bhagavan, *India and the Quest for One World: The Peacemakers* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013); Saul Dubow, 'Afrikaner Nationalism, Apartheid and the Conceptualisation of ''Race''', *Journal of African History* 33, no. 2 (1992): 209-238; Saul Dubow, *Apartheid, 1948–1994* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014); Dubow, 'Commonwealth and South Africa', 284-314; Saul Dubow, 'Smuts, the United Nations and the Rhetoric of Race and Rights', *Journal of Contemporary History* 43, no. 1 (2008): 45-74; Daniel Gorman, 'Britain, India, and the United Nations: colonialism and the development of international governance, 1945–1960', *Journal of Global History* 9, no. 3 (2014): 471-490; Hyam and Henshaw, *Lion and the Springbok*; Ryan Irwin, *Gordian Knot: Apartheid and the Unmaking of the Liberal World Order* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); Lindie Koorts, 'An ageing anachronism: D.F. Malan as prime minister, 1948–1954', *Kronos* 36, no. 1 (2010): 108-165; Lindie Koorts, *DF Malan and the Rise of Afrikaner Nationalism* (Cape Town:

Tafelburg, 2014); and Jeremy Shearar, *Against the World: South Africa and human rights at the United Nations, 1945–1961* (Pretoria: University of South Africa Press, 2011).

[25] For some key examples of the recent literature on solidarity movements see Su Lin Lewis, 'Decolonising the History of Internationalism: Transnational Activism Across the South', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 2 (2024): 345-69; Su Lin Lewis and Carolien Stolte, 'Other Bandungs: Afro-Asian Internationalisms in the Early Cold War', *Journal of World History* 30, no. 1-2 (2019): 1-20; Erez Manela and Heather Streets-Salter, eds, *The Anticolonial Transnational: Imaginaries, Mobilities, and Networks in the Struggle Against Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023); Carolien Stolte and Su Lin Lewis, eds, *The Lives of Cold War Afro-Asianism* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2022); and Carolien Stolte, 'South Asia and South Asians in the worldwide web of anti-colonial solidarity', in *The Routledge of the History of Colonialism in South Asia*, eds, Harald Fischer-Tiné and Maria Framke (London: Routledge, 2021), 463-73.

[26] Peter Henshaw, 'Britain and South Africa at the United Nations: "South West Africa", "Treatment of Indians" and "Race Conflict", 1946–1961', *South African Historical Journal* 31 (1994): 80-102; and Peter Henshaw, 'Canada and the "South African Disputes" at the United Nations, 1946–1961', *Canadian Journal of African Studies* 33, no. 1 (1999): 1-52. The first of these articles also appears as a chapter in Hyam and Henshaw, *Lion and the Springbok*, 146-67.

[27] Alanna O'Malley, 'India, Apartheid and the New World Order at the UN, 1946–1962', *Journal of World History* 31, no. 1 (2020): 195-223.

[28] Lorna Lloyd, 'An Acutely Embarrassing Affair: Whitehall and the Indian-South African Dispute at the United Nations (1946)', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 46, no. 5 (2018): 909-934; Lorna Lloyd, '"A Family Quarrel?": The Development of the Dispute over Indians in South Africa', *Historical Journal* 34, no. 3 (1991): 703-726; and Lorna Lloyd, '"A

Most Auspicious Beginning": The 1946 United Nations General Assembly and the Question of the Treatment of Indians in South Africa', *Review of International Studies* 16, no. 2 (1990): 131-153.

[29] Alexander Davis and Vineet Thakur, 'Walking the Thin Line: India's Anti-Racist Diplomatic Practice in South Africa, Canada, and Australia, 1946–55', *International History Review* 38, no. 5 (2016): 880-899; Vineet Thakur, *Jan Smuts and the Indian Question* (Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2017), 49-99; Vineet Thakur, 'Liberal, Liminal and Lost: India's First Diplomats and the Narrative of Foreign Policy', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 45, no. 2 (2017): 232-258; and Vineet Thakur, 'The "hardy annual": A history of India's first UN resolution', *India Review* 16, no. 4 (2017): 401-429.

[30] Angela Loschke, 'The United Nations between "old boys' club" and a changing world order: The South African-Indian dispute at the United Nations, 1945-1955', in *The United Nations and Decolonization*, eds Nicola Eggers, Jessica Pearson, and Aurora Almada e Santos, (Abingdon: Routledge, 2020), 83-104.

[31] For traditional works on the South West Africa/Namibia dispute at the UN see Faye Caroll, *South West Africa and the United Nations* (Louisville, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1967); Charles Arden-Clarke, 'South-West Africa, the Union and the United Nations', *African Affairs* 59, no. 234 (1960): 26-35; John Dugard, *The South West Africa/Namibia Dispute: Documents and Scholarly Writings on the Controversy Between South Africa and the United Nations* (London: University of California Press, 1973); Ruth First, *South West Africa* (Penguin: Harmondsworth, 1963); L. Adele Jinadu, 'South West Africa: A Study in the "Sacred Trust" Thesis', *African Studies Review* 14, no. 3 (1971): 369-388; Mburumba Kerina, 'The United Nations and South West Africa', *Negro History Bulletin* 22, no. 5 (1959): 99-105; S. C. Saxena, 'Namibia and the United Nations', *Indian Journal of Political Science* 36, no. 3 (1975), 274-96; Michael Scott, 'The International Status of South West Africa', *International Affairs*

34, no. 3 (1958): 318-329; Solomon Slonim, *South West Africa and the United Nations: An International Mandate in Dispute* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973); and J. T. Van Wyk, 'The United Nations, South West Africa, and the Law', *Comparative and International Law Journal of Southern Africa* 2, no. 1 (1969): 48-72.

[32] Molly McCullers, 'Betwixt and Between Colony and Nation-State: Liminality, Decolonization, and the South West Africa Mandate', *American Historical Review* 123, no. 5 (2019): 1704-8; Molly McCullers, 'Like Biscuits in Wrappers: Apartheid Development and Decolonization in South West Africa, 1962–1968', *International Journal of African Historical Studies* 50, no. 1 (2017): 59-78; Molly McCullers, 'South by Southwest: South Africa, South West Africa, and the Commonwealth', in *Resplendent Adventures with Britannia: Personalities, Politics and Culture in Britain*, ed. Wm. Roger Louis (London: I. B. Tauris, 2015) 275-87; Molly McCullers, '"The Time of the United Nations in South West Africa is Near": Local Drama and Global Politics in Apartheid-Era Hereroland', *Journal of Southern African Studies* 39, no. 2 (2013): 371-389; Molly McCullers, 'The "Truppenspieler Show": Herero Masculinity and the German Colonial Military Aesthetic', in *German Colonialism Revisited: African, Asian, and Oceanic Experiences*, ed. Nina Berman, Klaus Mülhahn, and Patrice Nganang (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2013), 226-42; and Molly McCullers, '"We do it so that we shall be men": Masculinity Politics in Colonial Namibia, 1915–49', *Journal of African History* 52, no. 1 (2011): 43-62;

[33] Lydia Walker, 'Decolonization in the 1960s: On Legitimate and Illegitimate Nationalist Claims-Making', *Past & Present* 242, no. 1 (2019): 227-264; and Walker, *States-in-Waiting*, 7, 14, 21, 58, 60, 66-8, 76, 80, 94, 134-71, 223-5, 236-7.

[34] E. Ike Udogu, *Liberating Namibia: The Long Diplomatic Struggle Between the United Nations and South Africa* (London: McFarland & Company, 2011), 37-50, 60-2.

[35] Jason Morgan, 'A challenge to the system: The South West Africa question and the United Nations Trusteeship Council', in *The United Nations and Decolonization*, eds Nicola Eggers, Jessica Pearson, and Aurora Almada e Santos, (Abingdon: Routledge, 2020), 40-60.

[36] Arianna Lissoni, 'Yusuf Dadoo, India and South Africa's Liberation Struggle', in *A Global History of Anti-Apartheid: 'Forward to Freedom' in South Africa*, eds Anna Konieczna and Rob Skinner (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), 203-238; Parvathi Raman, 'Yusuf Dadoo: A Son of South Africa', in *South Africa's 1940s: Worlds of Possibilities*, eds Saul Dubow and Alan Jeeves (Cape Town: Double Storey Books, 2005), 227-45; and Hilary Sapire, 'South African Indians, Monarchy and the New Commonwealth: Transnational Conversations and Perspectives, 1946–1948, in *Commonwealth History in the Twenty-First Century*, eds Richard Drayton and Saul Dubow (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020), 161-80.

[37] Carol Anderson, *Bourgeois Radicals: The NAACP and the Struggle for National Liberation, 1941–1960* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 69-132; Carol Anderson, 'International Conscience, the Cold War, and Apartheid: The NAACP's Alliance with the Reverend Michael Scott for South West Africa's Liberation, 1946–1951', *Journal of World History* 19, no. 3 (2008): 297-326; Tom Buchanan, *Amnesty International and Human Rights Activism in Postwar Britain, 1945–1977* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020), 4-8, 22, 42-80, 229-32; Roger Clark, 'The International League for Human Rights and South West Africa 1947–1957: The Human Rights NGO as Catalyst in the International Legal Process', *Human Rights Quarterly* 3, no. 4 (1981): 101-36; Michael Crowder, 'Tshekedi Khama, Smuts, and South West Africa', *Journal of Modern African Studies* 25, no. 1 (1987): 25-42.