

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



THIRD COMMITTEE, 444th

MEETING

Thursday, 13 November 1952, at 3 p.m.

Headquarters, New York

CONTENTS

Page

Human rights: Recommendations concerning international respect for the self-determination of peoples (E/2256, annex V, A/2165, A/2172, chapter V, section V, A/C.3/L.293) (<i>continued</i>)	153
--	-----

Chairman: Mr. S. Amjad ALI (Pakistan).

Human rights: Recommendations concerning international respect for the self-determination of peoples (E/2256, annex V, A/2165, A/2172, chapter V, section V, A/C.3/L.293) (*continued*)

[Item 30]*

GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

1. Mr. KISELYOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation attached special importance to the principle on which the recommendations of the Commission of Human Rights were based, and which was confirmed in the United Nations Charter itself.

2. Never before had national movements towards independence in dependent territories achieved their present strength. Millions of human beings, determined to shake off the yoke which they have borne for so long, were demanding independence for their countries and the right to decide their own fate and to dispose of their national wealth. In many parts of Asia and Africa, the movements had taken the form of veritable conflict, conducted by men who were thirsting for freedom and peace. The Byelorussian SSR fully sympathized with such peoples and considered that the United Nations could not refuse to hear their legitimate claims.

3. Under Article 1, paragraph 2, and Article 55 of the Charter, Member States which administered Trust or Non-Self-Governing Territories had undertaken to promote the well-being and political, economic and social advancement of the inhabitants, with a view to the independence or self-government of the territories, and to respect the right of self-determination of peoples.

4. The provisions of the Charter were being flagrantly violated by the colonial Powers, and especially the

United States of America, which was trying to stifle movements for national independence by all possible methods, including the use of armed force. The world was witnessing a striking example of that policy in Korea, where the American aggressors were trying to prevent a peaceful people from enjoying the fundamental right of all peoples and nations. Behind a screen of false statements on peace, the United States of America was preparing monstrous plans and did not even balk at the use of bacterial weapons, at the very time when negotiations were taking place, in an attempt to intimidate the Korean people and to kill their resistance. Nevertheless, it was not fear, but hatred, that the Americans left behind them, and the heroic example of Korea had served to strengthen the resistance of the peoples of Vietnam and Malaya, who had been struggling for years against their oppressors. It was well known that the French Government had sent 3,000 men armed by the United States of America against the democratic Government of Vietnam, which, after seven years of war, still controlled over 90 per cent of the territory and had 20 million people under its jurisdiction. It was not surprising, therefore, that the colonial Powers refused to recognize the right of peoples to self-determination.

5. In order to retain their control over the resources of the countries which they administered, the colonial Powers kept the inhabitants in a state of total poverty and ignorance. The best example was Puerto Rico, which has been completely dependent on the United States of America since 1898. The deplorable conditions in that country, where the economy had been adapted solely to the needs of the United States of America and the national culture had been annihilated, was described in an article in the Uruguayan newspaper *Justicia* of 20 October 1951, which pointed out that, after fifty-three years of American domination, 100,000 persons had been deprived of their land for the benefit of the sugar monopolies and 200,000 of the 2,250,000 inhabitants were unemployed. The

* Indicates the item number on the agenda of the General Assembly.

infant mortality rate and the incidence of tuberculosis in Puerto Rico were terrifying; lack of schools and teachers prevented 350,000 children from receiving any education; the sections of the population which were in favour of independence were subjected to discriminatory measures and were watched by the police, while thousands of young men were sent to their death on the Korean front. On 29 March 1952 the United States magazine *Collier's* had admitted that the average annual wage in Puerto Rico was \$US294, or approximately five times less than in the United States of America. The Constitution "granted" by the United States Congress to Puerto Rico confirmed the colonial status of the territory, as could be seen from the statement by the head of the Puerto Rican Independence Party, published in the newspaper *El Mundo* on 16 June 1952, that the sole purpose of the Constitution imposed on the people was to conceal the truth from the world public, and especially from the public of Latin America. The newspaper *National Guardian* had recently stated that the alleged government set-up in Puerto Rico enjoyed no autonomy.

6. In the Marianna Islands, the Caroline Islands, and the Marshall Islands the United States of America had also set up an arbitrary system, under which the indigenous population was not represented in any of the legislative organs. The peoples were even forced to migrate, without any consideration for their interests, if such migrations furthered the designs of the United States of America, and especially their notorious experiments with atomic bombs.

7. Such practices, which constituted flagrant violations of the principles governing the United Nations, were not the prerogative of the United States of America. In all the dependent territories, the populations were decimated by famine and disease, while the oppressors derived large profits from dues and taxes, the collection of which was facilitated by the tribal system, maintained by the oppressors in their own interests. In other words, the colonial Powers were opposed to the development of the territories which they administered. That was amply proved by the Belgian Government's report on the administration of Ruanda-Urundi in 1951, which showed that the people did not take part in the activities of the legislative organs and that no electoral system had yet been introduced in the territory. As regards the living conditions of the inhabitants, the report of the Visiting Mission which had gone to the territory in 1951 stated that the daily wage of an agricultural worker was 5 francs, or 10 United States cents, and that expenditure on education in 1951 amounted to 16 cents per head. Those figures made it easy to understand why it was impossible to ensure the education and vocational training of the inhabitants and, in particular, why there was not a single indigenous doctor in the territory. With regard to the abolition of corporal punishment, the report of the Visiting Mission to East Africa in 1951 showed that the Belgium Government had taken no steps to apply the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Trusteeship Council.

8. As to the territories administered by the United Kingdom, the *Financial Times* of 4 November 1950 had estimated the profits of companies exploiting the

territories at £193,635,000, a figure which exceeded that of the preceding year by approximately £15,000,000. The United Kingdom Secretary of State for the Colonies had himself stated in the House of Commons on 29 May 1951 that the standard of living in the territories administered by the United Kingdom was extremely low and that disease was taking a high toll. Furthermore, the official report of the United Kingdom Parliament had admitted that Kenya enjoyed no real autonomy, since the population did not choose its own representatives on the Legislative Council. The situation in Northern Rhodesia was even worse.

9. Kenya had been shamefully exploited by the United Kingdom for over fifty years. It was common knowledge that the population had risen against the oppressor and that the purpose of the Mau Mau movement was independence. On 30 October 1952, the Associated Press had reported that the British authorities had taken stringent measures to suppress the movement and were making mass arrests; some 1,700 persons had been arrested by 30 October 1952. On 1 November 1952, the *New York Times* had reported that the Kenya Government had received instructions to proclaim the territory a forbidden zone. It was difficult to imagine what brutalities the British armed forces were perpetrating in Kenya, brutalities which the United Kingdom Government wished to conceal from the whole world.

10. According to the Secretary-General's preliminary report on the world social situation in 1951 (E/CN.5/267), the proportions of illiterates in the territories administered by the United Kingdom were 95 per cent in the Cameroons, 84 per cent in Swaziland and 80 per cent in the Gold Coast.

11. It was impossible to pass over the tragic position of the Moroccan and Tunisian peoples, which, goaded beyond all patience, were rebelling against the French Government. That Government, not content with suppressing the national independence movement by armed force and causing blood to flow in the streets of the large Moroccan and Tunisian towns, was even refusing to have the question discussed in the United Nations, being well aware that it was unable to explain the tense situation.

12. The United Nations could not remain indifferent to the many violations of the fundamental right of peoples to self-determination. Recognition of that right was an essential condition for the harmonious development of the international community and for the establishment of friendly relations among nations. The question was not one of platonic recognition of a principle, but of its application on the basis of the sovereignty and equality of nations and of mutual respect and understanding.

13. The principle had been applied in the Soviet Union. The example of the USSR, which comprised populations with different characteristics—languages, traditions, customs and ways of life—was worthy of consideration in a discussion of the right of peoples to self-determination. The USSR certainly had no intention of imposing its own methods on other States, but the United Nations could not ignore the results that had been achieved in that part of the world, where the principle of the equality of all peoples, large or small, advanced or backward, had been recognized and given

effect. If the Organization wished to take an objective view, it could probably benefit by that experience.

14. Marshal Stalin, expressing the point of view of the USSR as a whole, had stated that every people was the master of its fate and that no one could interfere in its internal affairs, destroy its culture and traditions, or take away its rights. One of the fundamental principles of the USSR Constitution was that of the equality of peoples, without distinction as to race, language, power, way of life, cultural level, degree of development or any other consideration. On 16 November 1917, the right of the people of the USSR to self-determination had been confirmed in one of the first decrees passed after the Revolution.

15. The attitude of the USSR towards Finland in 1918 had been a noteworthy example of the application of that principle. Finland, which had formerly been a colony of Czarist Russia, had been given complete independence. The USSR Government had renounced all the privileges and advantages enjoyed by the Czarist government by virtue of a system of capitulation. The USSR had dealt recently with Iran, whose territory had been evacuated by USSR troops after the end of the war, in the same spirit. There were other examples to prove that the USSR Government had always applied the principle in question. In April 1948 Marshal Stalin had proclaimed the possibility and necessity of equality between large and small countries. He had pointed out that each had its own characteristics, which could benefit the whole of mankind, and had added that all countries were equal in value.

16. No one could deny that all the peoples of the Soviet Union were ensured political, economic and social equality. All discrimination had been abolished and all nationalities enjoyed the same rights and collaborated fraternally with mutual respect for one another's dignity and individuality. The Constitution proclaimed and the law guaranteed that equality. Under the Czars, the non-Russian peoples had had no rights and had lived under a colonial or semi-colonial system. Today they were independent, each with its own legislature, each freely nurturing its own culture, each having achieved considerable economic progress through industrialization. That was particularly true of the Republics in Asia—Turkmenistan, Azerbaijan, Kazakstan, Kirghiztan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan. In Azerbaijan the electric power industry was seven times more advanced than in Turkey. In Uzbekistan there were 14 tractors to a thousand hectares, whereas there were only 7 in France and 4 in Turkey. Economic progress was accompanied by remarkable achievements in education, science and culture. There had been 96 universities in Czarist Russia; there were 837 in the USSR, with a million and a half students. All grades of education were guaranteed. Ninety-eight per cent of the people in Uzbekistan had been illiterate before the Revolution; all could now read and write. Formerly there had been only 160 schools in Uzbekistan, which had met the needs of only 2 per cent of the people and there had been a lack of school premises, text-books and teachers. Now there were 5,103 schools attended by 1,250,000 pupils, and 36 universities with 35,000 students; 25,000 higher education certificates were granted yearly. In Uzbekistan there were 29 scientific research institutes, 1,500 libraries, 2,000 cultural centres, 26

theatres, 1,100 cinemas. The cultural renaissance was general throughout the Union. Books, text-books and newspapers were published in 48 of the languages of the USSR. In 1951 the active school population had totalled 57 million. School attendance for seven years was compulsory. There were evening extension classes for workers. Writers, scientists and artists vied with one another in producing works reflecting the Soviet people's moral qualities. The standard of living was rising continuously. There was free medical care, a thing unknown in most other countries.

17. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic had been a backward region under the Czars, mainly agricultural and with little or no industry. Four thousand and big land-owners had held 66.1 per cent of the land, while 664,000 peasants had shared 33.5 per cent of the land, which had then been poor. Eighty per cent of the people had been illiterate. With the aid of the other peoples of the USSR, the Byelorussian people had made considerable progress in all fields since the Revolution. Its development had been brutally interrupted in 1941 by Hitler's aggression. The destruction had been so vast that the country's economy had reverted to the 1913 level. Half the national wealth had been lost. Material loss had been estimated at 75,000 million roubles; more than 10,000 enterprises, such as *kolkhozes*, *sovkhozes* and tractor stations, had been destroyed; 209 towns and 2,200 villages and hamlets had been burned, and 420,000 *kolkhoz* dwellings had been burned. Since the end of the war, Byelorussia had made a great reconstruction effort. In 1952 the pre-war level had already been exceeded by 50 per cent. A motor-car industry had been created; the rational exploitation of sources of energy had been begun, especially of the oil fields, the development of which would enable even greater strides to be taken towards reconstruction. In Minsk, the capital, which had been 80 per cent destroyed, an area of 348,000 square metres had been rebuilt. Four hundred and thirty-six thousand new houses had been built for peasants and 2 million persons were housed in them. In 1940, 29 per cent of the budget had been allocated to education, in 1949, 34 per cent and in 1952, 38 per cent. School attendance for seven years was compulsory. At the end of the current five-year plan, secondary education in the towns would be guaranteed, and that would mean that it would become general during the ensuing five years. There were 3,099 cultural centres and establishments in the rural areas, libraries and many museums. Those were only a few of the achievements to which Byelorussia could lay claim. They showed the great progress that could be achieved by a free people enjoying equality.

18. If other peoples were to have a similar development, their independence had to be ensured. The United Nations was in duty bound to assist the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories who wished to be free. The peace-loving countries were demanding the abolition of colonialism and the establishment of relations between peoples on an equal footing, for that was the only firm foundation for international peace and security. The Byelorussian delegation had always supported the adoption not only of texts proclaiming the right of peoples to self-determination, but also of measures of implementing that right. It regretted that the draft resolutions transmitted to the Third Com-

mittee for consideration dealt only with the legal aspects of the matter. They were therefore inadequate, but they were still a good step forward.

19. In conclusion, he analysed the two draft resolutions adopted by the Commission on Human Rights (E/2256, annex V). He emphasized that the two paragraphs of the operative part of draft resolution A were consistent with the principles set forth in the Charter. The colonial Powers were hypocrites; he reminded the Committee of the facts which he had cited earlier in his statement. They proved that the imperialist countries, while professing respect for the right of peoples to self-determination, were continuously engaged in violating it and were brutally suppressing the subjugated peoples' desire for independence. Thus, the representatives of the colonial Powers in the United Nations had tried by hook or by crook to prevent the adoption of effective measures. For example, they had asserted that they were not compelled under the Charter of the United Nations to supply the information mentioned in draft resolution B. That attitude was contrary to the very spirit of the Charter, and, furthermore, the calculations of people who sought to evade their responsibilities would be frustrated. The two draft resolutions were no doubt inadequate, since they were purely legal in scope, but they might help to bring about the fulfilment of many peoples' aspirations. The Byelorussian delegation accordingly supported them and would vote for them.

20. Mrs. EMMET (United Kingdom) said that in the course of history her country had often been the originator of liberal political views and its Parliament had earned the title of "Mother of Parliaments". Accordingly, the United Kingdom was naturally disposed to understand the current pressure in favour of self-determination and self-government.

21. The urge for independence had been given particular prominence by President Wilson, who had called it the principle of self-determination. He had, however, emphasized that the satisfaction of national aspirations should not introduce new or perpetuate old elements of discord. It had been in that spirit that the principle had been applied, after the First World War, to Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. It was not a new one and it could be dealt with without emotion, practically and dispassionately. Certain delegations might well change their attitude and not approach the problem in the way they seemed to wish.

22. The United Kingdom delegation had supported the decision to make a reference to that principle in the Charter of the United Nations. It was specifically mentioned in Articles 2 and 55, and the Trusteeship System and the declaration on Non-Self-Governing Territories in Chapter XI were in harmony with it. Moreover, the United Kingdom's actions for many years had been consistent with the position taken by its spokesmen. The evolution of the Sudan towards self-government might be cited in that connexion.

23. Principles, however, were meant to be guides, not fetters. That was why an attempt to define them in too great detail was usually avoided. To try to define them too strictly in order to translate them into rights without corresponding duties was dangerous. She wondered whether it would not have been wiser to draw up a covenant on human duties instead of a covenant

on human rights. From that point of view it was doubtful whether the draft resolution was likely to be helpful in promoting the interests which all Members of the United Nations had at heart.

24. The first question was the definition of the term "peoples", which had been used in different senses on previous occasions. "Peoples" might be equated with nations, as in the Charter of the United Nations. Alternatively, it might mean a group of individuals with special ties which singled them out from the surrounding population, the whole population within the frontiers of a particular State, the inhabitants of a particular piece of territory, or even a group who did not inhabit an identifiable piece of territory but considered themselves a people. Could any group, however small, claim to be a people? What evidence had to be produced to support such a claim? Each of the definitions raised problems, particularly that of the criterion to be regarded as valid in any given acceptance. Within several States there were peoples in the form of minorities, as in the United Kingdom, the USSR, Canada, India and certain Eastern and several South-American States. Were those minorities to be excluded? If so, how? The matter was far from clear and easy to settle.

25. She wondered what was meant by the right of peoples and nations to self-determination. The Charter gave only very general clues. Would it be the right to set up an independent State, and, if so, were minorities so to use the right? Did the right imply that a group might claim political independence, either through the exercise of a right to secession which many formerly independent people and indeed nations did not possess, or through fission of an existing State? Could it be adapted to fit the idea of a federation or commonwealth? What was its application to a union or similar arrangement, where there was a single State but no special provision for the voices of the component groups to be heard and their interests protected? Did it apply to the inhabitants of a piece of territory which was the subject of negotiations between States? Then again, there was the question of the machinery by which the wishes of the group were to be expressed, the question whether the machinery of a democratic government would be sufficient, whether the group might claim the establishment of special machinery, who would decide whether such a claim was justified and what would be the role of the government of the State concerned.

26. It would also have to be decided at what stage in the life of a people the principle of self-determination should be put into practice. Would that decision be final or could it be revoked? Could any group of people, however small or scattered, regardless of the territory it occupied and of its geographical locality, of the political unit to which it belonged and of the interests of other peoples and other States, claim to exercise that right in full? It was obvious that the recognition of such an unbridled right would be a potent cause of friction and would be one of the very first things to upset friendly relations among nations and to threaten the domestic peace of the States themselves. The question deserved particularly close study in its relation to the circumstances of federal States and of States which were unions, like the United Kingdom.

27. For those reasons, the need for certain limitations and safeguards in implementing the principle of self-

determination, in cases where its applicability might be admitted, would surely be generally recognized, as it had been by the majority of the members of the Commission on Human Rights. Such qualifications obviously had their roots in realities. Article 76 of the Charter provided for promotion of the advancement of the peoples "as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples"; and the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Factors set up by the General Assembly had recently defined "political advancement" as meaning such political advancement of the population as would enable it to decide upon the future destiny of the territory with due knowledge. Education and the existence of democratic institutions were therefore a prerequisite to application of the principle of self-determination.

28. It must again be stressed that there was a danger in separating rights from duties. The exercise of the right of one people or one individual to liberty could not be allowed to infringe the liberty of another; if it did so, it became an abuse of the right. A people seeking to exercise its right of self-determination must take into account its obligations and duties towards its neighbours, or anarchy would result. Moreover, the extent to which institutions were democratic varied in different States; and certain peoples claiming the right of self-determination might demand external intervention—for example, a plebiscite under United Nations auspices—on the ground that the institutions of the State of which they were a part did not allow them adequately to express their views.

29. She therefore invited members of the Committee to consider, in the interests of the countries which they represented, the practical implications of recognizing an unfettered right to self-determination if the nature of the right itself and the circumstances in which it could be exercised were not defined. A principle cut both ways, and those who advocated the application of a principle in one country must be prepared to have it applied also in their own. The history of the past half-century had shown the international difficulties which could be caused by treaties, declarations and agreements the implications of which were undefined or differently understood by the parties concerned; and that history made clear the potentially explosive character of an unrestricted right extended by the United Nations to any group, minority, population of foreign origin, indigenous race or irredentist faction which felt that it had a grievance.

30. She hoped that the members of the Committee would express their views on the many questions which she had left unanswered, and that they would all agree that the principle of self-determination had the following main characteristics: it did not lend itself to easy definition as a right; it was a principle of universal application; it was a political principle, which had exercised and would continue to exercise a profound influence upon the creation and existence of States and upon the relations between them; and, finally, it affected groups and not the individual. She regretted that draft resolution A could not be reconciled with those four characteristics. The draft resolution spoke not of a principle, but of a right; that right was not recognized as of universal application; it was not treated as a political principle; and it had been inserted in a covenant which dealt with individual human rights.

31. Since those four characteristics had to be taken into account in adopting any practical measures, it would be premature to discuss any specific proposals until the fundamental elements of the problem had been clarified.

32. The Committee's task was to help the world to progress from self-sufficiency and power politics to a policy of understanding and co-operation. The ultimate goal was to enable the peoples to manage their affairs for themselves; but only a sense of the duty of each to all and the desire to serve could bring men happiness and knit the peoples of the world together in a commonwealth of nations.

33. Mr. DE MORAES (Brazil) was convinced that the right of self-determination was of paramount importance not only to the peoples which were still striving for political independence, but also to all the nations which, owing to circumstances beyond their control, had not yet attained the decisive stage of economic independence.

34. There was no escaping the fact that the right of a nation or a people to constitute an independent State and determine its own government had a solid and indisputable foundation in the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. That instrument, which had been freely accepted by all the sixty Member States represented in the Committee, unreservedly rejected the theory that some races or nations should be allowed indefinitely to rule over other races or peoples without their consent. By proclaiming their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, the peoples of the United Nations had committed themselves to a course of action which they had to pursue lest the conscience of mankind charge them with betrayal of the Charter.

35. Nor was there any doubt that the provisions of Articles 73 and 74 of the Charter constituted a clear obligation upon Member States to recognize and apply the right of self-determination of the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories under their administration. The principle upon which Chapter XI was based was that the territories were not owned by the administering Powers, but were held by them in "sacred trust" for their inhabitants until the inhabitants were able to govern themselves.

36. In that connexion, the Brazilian delegation did not share the views of several delegations which had warned the Committee against unrestricted and unqualified implementation of the provisions of the Charter relating to the right of self-determination of peoples and nations. Such excessive timidity was tantamount to a lack of faith in the ideals which had inspired the creation of the United Nations. Moreover, it might give the world the regrettable impression that, paradoxically, the United Nations was afraid of the ideas and principles to which the Member States had solemnly pledged themselves under the Charter, and that it viewed the Charter as a dangerous and subversive document.

37. It was his delegation's conviction that in order to achieve economic and political stability throughout the world the United Nations should ensure that no

people or nation should be deprived of its fundamental right of self-determination. He was familiar with the arguments of those who advocated indefinitely delaying the granting of the right of national independence on the pretext that the peoples concerned were not yet ready for self-government. The truth was that in most cases the removal of the negative force which alien rule represented gave more impetus to local energies.

38. It had also been said that an inescapable element of modern international life was the interdependence of peoples, and that for that reason too much stress should not be laid on the ideal of national independence. But it was hardly necessary to point out that that point of view was usually defended by the fully developed nations, which had arrived at a stage where co-operation had of necessity to be given more emphasis than national independence. It would therefore be cruel and unfair to conclude that because of the fact of the interdependence of peoples, some less highly developed nations and peoples should forever renounce the enjoyment of their national independence. Such an attitude would also weaken the possibility of one day achieving a peaceful and prosperous international community founded on justice. Sincere co-operation was possible only if all the partners were free to express themselves and to have their rights and interests respected; that was why national independence was an essential prerequisite to any system of international co-operation. Respect for and application of the right of self-determination of peoples could not be reconciled with the totalitarian system, under which it was considered right and proper that individualism should be sacrificed to the purposes of an unscrupulous State. That right sprang from the democratic idea, which affirmed the freedom and dignity of the human person, whereas the totalitarian system destroyed them.

39. For those reasons the Brazilian delegation welcomed the two draft resolutions transmitted by the Commission on Human Rights; it was substantially in agreement with them and would vote for them.

40. Mr. ZAMOR (Haiti) congratulated the representative of Egypt on his analysis of the situation at the 443rd meeting. The difficulties inherent in the problem of the right of self-determination were not new, for they were rooted in the principle of nationality. That principle should be applied to all peoples, without distinction as to race or geographical position. Some progress had already been made, by eliminating the colonial clause from United Nations usage; and adoption of the draft resolutions transmitted by the Commission on Human Rights would make further progress possible.

41. His country had not changed its position on the right of self-determination of peoples, a position which was the same as that of all the American States. Haiti was convinced that freedom was not a gift to be granted but something to be fought for. The history of the American continent was proof of that contention. The New World looked upon the right of self-determination as the right of free people to associate freely as independent and sovereign nations within fixed boundaries. That idea obviously was in contradiction with the concept held by the countries of Europe, which had inherited the ancient Greco-Roman tradition of the right of the stronger to dominate the weaker. While recognizing that attitudes which had existed for thousands of years were difficult to eradicate, the Haitian delegation appealed to the major Powers to show a conciliatory spirit and associate themselves with all peoples of goodwill in order to hasten the triumph of a noble idea. All too often the major Powers offered concerted opposition to the implementation of certain principles which they considered dangerous to their interests. The small subjugated countries, however, had the consolation of knowing that such a policy defeated itself, since it was a constant source of dissension among the major Powers.

42. The presence in the United Nations of representatives of nations unknown thirty years before had been achieved only at the cost of two world wars. Those wars had brought into existence India, Pakistan, Egypt, Czechoslovakia and Poland, while, it was true, such other nations as the Baltic States had disappeared.

43. One of the fundamental purposes of the Charter of the United Nations was to solve international problems through co-operation, but that purpose would never be achieved without the goodwill of the States with an imperialistic tradition. Those States, however, were aware that blood was being shed, that legitimate claims could no longer be ignored, and that the subjugated peoples were on the march to freedom. The time had come for the United Nations to prove to the peoples that it was concerned with their plight by adopting the draft resolutions transmitted by the Commission on Human Rights, and at the same time to find ways of enabling the colonial Powers to reach honourable compromises. To delay the movement of emancipation could only lead to a new upheaval in the course of which, although the nations of Europe might disappear, many other peoples would at last be liberated.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.