



UNITED NATIONS  
TRUSTEESHIP  
COUNCIL



Distr.  
LIMITED

T/COM.2/L.40  
11 September 1957

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

COMMUNICATION FROM THE INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE RIGHTS  
OF MAN CONCERNING TANGANYIKA

(Circulated in accordance with rule 24 of the rules  
of procedure of the Trusteeship Council)

Int'l League for the Rights of Man  
25 East 64th Street  
New York 21, N.Y.

June 29, 1957

Chairman of the Trusteeship Council,  
United Nations

Sir,

I enclose a document which we hope may be circulated under the Council's  
rules, believing that it merits attention as a general problem of policy.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Roger Baldwin  
Chairman

THE INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE RIGHTS OF MAN

Incorporated N.Y. State, Consultant Agency  
with the United Nations

25 East 64 Street, New York 21, N.Y. EU8 - 5945  
Cable Address: RIGHTSMAN, N.Y.

June 29, 1957

Comment by the International League for the Rights of Man on the  
Observations of the United Kingdom Government on T/PET.2/211  
(T/CES.2/39)

The observations of the United Kingdom government raise general questions which we desire to call to the attention of the Council.

The United Kingdom maintains in the case of Tanganyika that freedom of speech and association may be curtailed whenever the authorities conclude that public speech might create a breach of peace. Admittedly, no such breach occurred at meetings addressed by Mr. Nyerere, president of the Tanganyika African Union. The authorities based their ban on his further public meetings solely on their speculation as to possible disorder.

We submit that the assumption of such authority by administrative officials, unreviewed by a court of law, is contrary to the guarantees in the trust agreement. If the authorities may arbitrarily decide what speakers and what speeches may tend to create a breach of the peace in the absence of any evidence of acts, freedom of speech and association is meaningless. Only when a ban is based on actual disturbances arising from a public meeting would it appear justified under the concepts of free speech contemplated in the trust agreement as well as in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

We suggest that the general principle involved in the case of Tanganyika merits the consideration of the Council as guidance to administering authorities.

The comment of the United Kingdom government on the law of sedition in the trust territory also appears to raise a general question meriting the attention of the Council. Sedition, in whatever form it is phrased, is confined to language

in opposition to government not associated with any acts. Any acts are presumably everywhere penalized. Sedition laws are historically instruments of repression of speech, press and association. In a trust territory particularly they appear to have no place, in view of the fact that the government is not sovereign; it is an agent of the United Nations. If sedition against the United Nations is untenable, as we assume, so it should be against its agent.

We are confident we reflect the desires of our affiliated organizations in four of the African trust territories in calling the Council's attention not only to a single instance in Tanganyika but to the principles which it raises in applying the liberties embodied in trust agreements.

International League for the Rights of Man, Inc.

(signed) Roger Baldwin  
Chairman

-----