

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWENTY-SIXTH MEETING OF THE THIRD SESSION

Lake Success, New York  
Friday, 16 July 1948, at 2:00 p.m.

President: Mr. LIU CHIEH (China)

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the twenty-sixth meeting of the third session of the Trusteeship Council.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted without discussion.

CONTINUATION OF EXAMINATION OF THE REPORT ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF NEW GUINEA FOR THE PERIOD FROM 1 JULY 1946 TO 30 JUNE 1947 (DOCUMENTS T/59, T/119, T/138 AND T/138/Add.1).

On the invitation of the President, Mr. Halligan, Special Representative of Australia, took his place at the Trusteeship Council table.

The PRESIDENT: At the conclusion of yesterday's meeting, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was on the point of making some observations on the question of administrative union. I now call on him.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): Article 75 of the Charter, concerning the trusteeship system, reads, in part, as follows:

"The United Nations shall establish under its authority an international trusteeship system for the administration and supervision of such territories as may be placed thereunder by subsequent individual agreements."

Under this union of New Guinea and Papua, there would be a union of legislative and administrative functions, a common labour policy for both territories, a common fiscal budgetary policy and a common policy for the utilization of land. This would be the same for Papua, which is a colony, as it would be for New Guinea, which is a trust territory. The peoples of both territories would play an equal role in the administration of this territory. In other words, if the native population is not allowed to participate in the government of one of the territories, the same would hold true for the other part of the territory, because the Statute does not contain any provision

which would allow the peoples of these territories to participate in the government, which is one of the provisions of Article 75 of the Charter. Such a law applied with respect to the colony of Papua and the trust territory of New Guinea would, as a result of the union of both of these territories -- territories which have differing political status -- deprive the United Nations of the possibility of carrying out its task of supervision and administration of the trust territory of New Guinea and would make it difficult for the United Nations to supervise the development of that territory. The creation of common organs of administration and executive bodies and the unification of services of both territories would deprive the United Nations -- and particularly the Trusteeship Council -- of looking into all the spheres of activity, the different aspects of life in the trust territory. The Legislative Council is a joint one for both Papua and New Guinea, and the administrative organ is also a common one for New Guinea and Papua. Therefore, if the United Nations wanted to go into the substantive aspect of the legislative branches of its administration in New Guinea, the administrative authority could reject this supervision, because it could say that the administrative or executive bodies were concerned not only with New Guinea but also with Papua as well. I should like to say that Papua is not within the competence of the Trusteeship Council. The territory of Papua has an entirely different status. If it were wished to undertake a detailed study of the activities of the administering authority in this joint legislative and administrative organ, it would autocratically imply an invasion of the United Nations into this sphere of activity of the administering power in its administration of Papua -- something which we could not allow. Therefore, taking the picture as it seems to be, this union not only violates the Charter but also, in practice, would lead to the fact that a study of the development of the peoples of

the trust territory would not be available to the United Nations. Furthermore, such a provision would deprive the Trusteeship Council and the United Nations as a whole of the means to judge the development of the indigenous population of New Guinea in the political, economic and social field, as well as in the field of education.



I must once again emphasize that the question is raised regarding the more detailed consideration of the activities of the administrative and executive bodies, which would be common both for Papua and New Guinea. The administering authority here very jealously preserves and delineates very carefully the distinction in the different status of both parties. An analysis of this bill for union of the trust territory of New Guinea and the Colony of Papua shows that there is nothing in this bill which would guarantee and promote the development of the indigenous population toward the road to self-government.

The Trusteeship Council cannot agree that the administering authority should not follow the Charter. Article 76 of the Charter <sup>is</sup> says that the basic objective of the trusteeship system is to promote the progressive development of the inhabitants of the trust territories towards self-government or independence. There is not the slightest hint or a single measure in this bill which would keep pace with this provision of Article 76 of the Charter. We must very clearly note the fact that the bill for the union of the trust territory of New Guinea and the Colony of Papua is not in accordance with the trusteeship system and does not provide -- rather, it even ignores -- those provisions which are set down in the Charter, specifically, under Article 76.

The Council will not find a single provision in this bill, which would even mention self-government on the part of the indigenous population. Therefore, this bill lacks one of the basic and main objectives of the trusteeship system, that is, the progressive development of the inhabitants of the trust territory towards self-government. One of the most basic objectives has been omitted from a provision which has been set up for a trust territory. We cannot approve of such a policy. The Trusteeship Council cannot approve a policy which does not coincide or agree with the trusteeship system.

Furthermore, this bill states that the native inhabitants do not actually have access to the administrative body. Therefore, under the

trusteeship system as provided for in the Charter, the administering authority is supposed to administer the trust territory for the welfare of the population of this trust territory, and it should administer the territory in such a way as to encourage the political, economic and social progress and development of the population of the territory, and particularly the development of the people in the field of education. The administering authority should make sure that all of this progressive development will be in a direction of self-government. However, the bill states that the natives are not to be involved in the administration of the joint territories. We cannot reconcile the provisions contained in Chapter XII of the Charter with the provisions of this bill. This bill is in a different form and in no way reflects the basic provisions and basic requirements of the trusteeship system. Since it does not reflect the basic objectives of the trusteeship system as set forth in Article 76 of the Charter -- since it does not do so -- the Trusteeship Council cannot consider this bill as a document which is in accordance with the trusteeship system.

What does this bill for the administrative union of Papua and New Guinea represent? It represents a certain framework, a certain skeleton within which the native population of Papua and the native population of the trust territory of New Guinea are to develop and grow. As regards the Colony of Papua, it would be difficult for the Trusteeship Council to make any critical comments on this territory, because it would be outside the competence of this body. However, as regards New Guinea, it is required that we discuss this territory, since it is necessary for us to see whether the framework which is to be applied to these territories would actually encourage and promote the population of this territory towards self-government, and whether it is in accordance with the trusteeship system. With regard to the unification of the two territories, a colony and a trust territory,

under one legislative and one administrative body with joint common services and so forth, no distinction is made, under this bill, between the populations of the trust territory or the native population of the Colony of Papua. However, very definite distinctions do exist. These distinctions are set down in Chapter XII of the Charter which deals with those rights which are given to the inhabitants of trust territories, and also the responsibilities of the administering authorities for territories given to them under the trusteeship system.

One may look at this bill in any way he wishes, through any magnifying glass, and he will find nothing in this document which says that the native population of the trust territories are being given any possibilities which would be more favourable to their development in the economic, social, cultural field or any advantages over those of the population of the Colony which is in this plan of union. Therefore, it is a bill which throws the population of a colony and the population of a trust territory into a common heap, and it does not give the native population of a trust territory any advantageous conditions for their development, conditions which they have the right to expect and which the administering authority should make available to them. If such things are not contained in this bill, then this bill is not in accordance with the trusteeship system and it is not in accordance with the provisions of the Charter and it can in no way be justified. This bill does not provide any measures which are directed to the fact that bodies should be established in the trust territories leading to the self-government of the people. This point is completely overlooked and omitted in this bill, and yet, I must repeat that this particular question is one of the basic problems, the basic objectives of the trusteeship system.

After listening to the many questions which have been asked of the Special Representative and the answers which we have received with regard to this bill for unification now, we can see that this bill is being

imposed upon the native population, the indigenous population, by the administering authority.

This bill is not as a result of a discussion by the native population; it is not a result of the freely expressed will of the native population. Nevertheless, Chapter XII, Article 76 (b) of the Charter deals with the basic objectives of the trusteeship system and states, directly, that measures should be taken towards the progressive development to self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory, and that it should be in accordance with the freely expressed wishes of the native population. However, this was not done in this case and it could not be done by the administering authority because such a desire on the part of the native population would hardly coincide with the intentions and the task and aims which the administering authority foresees in this bill. The idea here, from the political, administrative and all other respects, is to unite and unify the populations of a colony and the population of a trust territory. That is the aim of the bill. They will boil together in this common kettle and, in a short time, a single alloy will come out of this process of fusion and, in a short time, we shall see the same thing as that which will happen in Tanganyika, whereby, in the same process, Tanganyika is going to be combined with Kenya and Uganda.

The basic proposition in trusteeship is the development of self-government and independence of this trust territory; that is the main objective. Then, in a short time after New Guinea and Papua, in the course of their common development on the basis of this bill, under the guise of a single territory, will be very strongly fused in the economic, administrative and social fields, and they will be fused together in all other aspects of their life. Then, how can we ask that the trust territory of New Guinea be given independence? It is quite obvious that this question will be very easily pushed aside by the administering authority, by their simply saying that it is impossible to bisect a living organism into parts. It will be catastrophic for both parts of the organism. It

will mean that one part will not be able to live without the other, and that prospect, that future, seems to be a very definite one.

As I have already mentioned, when we discussed independence for Tanganyika, the question of independence for New Guinea will be completely buried; it will be lost and, in substance, New Guinea will be absorbed and annexed to the adjacent territory, and that would be the fate of New Guinea under this bill which would unify it with Papua.

I now wish to make a few comments in connection with this bill.

I should like once again to emphasize the fact that the administering authority insistently seems to forget the fact that when they combine a trust territory with an adjacent colony, the main task and purposes of the trusteeship system, with regard to the native population of a trust territory and, particularly, in this instance, the territory of New Guinea, the main task is progress. I repeat, there must be progress in the social, political and economic fields. If this bill is allowed to pass and come into force these aims and objectives of the trusteeship system, with respect to New Guinea, will remain unfulfilled and the development of the population toward the road to self-government and independence will simply remain a pious wish and will simply remain words in the Charter and will never be implemented in the future. Again, I wish to emphasize the fact that in this bill the administering authority makes no distinction between the indigenous population of the trust territory and the indigenous population of a colony. In general, we must say that a common colonial regime will be set up over the trust territory and the adjacent colony of Papua. I must say that the Charter contains no condition, no reservation and no loophole whereby the administering authority is to postpone the implementation of measures which would be intended for the encouragement of the native population toward self-government or independence. There are no reservations or conditions. The Charter is very clear and it very specifically states that the basic objectives of the trusteeship system -- and I am thinking here of Article 76 of the Charter -- is the progressive development towards self-government or independence, and to promote political



economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants. Not a single administering authority has the right to delay, to put off, or to postpone the implementation of this basic objective of the trusteeship system. They cannot, of their own free will, and as they see fit, put it off to a later date. This is not within the competence or responsibility of the administering authority. They cannot decide this question. The administering authority is responsible, under the trusteeship system, to take up the work and roll up their sleeves. The administering authority must roll up their sleeves and start to work immediately in order to carry out the objectives of the trusteeship system. The administering authority should do everything possible to set up conditions and provisions which would carry out the requirements of the trusteeship system under the Charter. The Trusteeship Council must remind the administering authority about these objectives, the administering authority which forgets its responsibilities in this regard. The Trusteeship Council should remind them of this basic objective which is contained in the Charter, the basic objectives of the Trusteeship Council.

Of course we have the colony of Papua here in the trust territory of New Guinea. Once again, I say that if the Trusteeship Council does not have the possibility to express its view as to whether this bill is appropriate for the indigenous population of Papua, for the administration of the Territory of Papua, if it cannot do that, however, it can, as regards the trust territory of New Guinea. The Trusteeship Council can point out; it can give its ideas and its views, and it can say whether this bill which unifies the territory of New Guinea and the Territory of Papua is an appropriate one for a trust territory. Therefore, in view of everything that has been said, and in view of the fact that this bill actually means a fusing of a colony and a trust territory; in view of the fact that this bill gives no advantages, no possibilities for the population of a trust territory to develop on the road which is set forth under the international trusteeship system of the United Nations, and because this bill does not provide for any organs of self-government for the native population; in view of the fact that this bill does not involve the native population in the administration of their own Territory; in view of all this, it seems to be quite definite. And we can quite definitely say that this bill, this Act, does not reflect the basic aims and purposes of the trusteeship system, does not agree with the basic aims of the trusteeship system. For that reason, it cannot be considered, it cannot be accepted, as appropriate and acceptable for New Guinea because the concept of the unification of the trust territory of New Guinea and the territory of Papua should be considered as a violation of the Charter and of the trusteeship system.

I would now like to make a few comments here on some of the remarks made by Mr. Garreau, the representative of France. I feel that I cannot let these remarks go unanswered. Speaking in defense of the bill for the

administrative union between the Territory of Papua and the territory of New Guinea, Mr. Garreau referred to previous discussions of the Trusteeship Council concerning the unification of a previous colony. I feel that this was not a very appropriate example; it was the unification of Eweland. I think that this was not a very appropriate view, an appropriate remark, because there we had the question of separating the Ewe people, the Ewe tribe, and putting that tribe as a whole under trusteeship. That was a different situation entirely. We are not speaking here of putting Papua under the trusteeship system and then combining it with another trust territory. I feel that that was not a very appropriate analogy. We have an entirely different system. It would be the same as if you had Ruanda-Urundi and the Belgian Congo; it would be the same with Tanganyika and Kenya and Uganda. That is what we have here, the unification of a trust territory with a colony, which will lead to similar results in all of the three instances. You will have annexation instead of self-government in the long run, and no one can really deny and refute the argument which I had advanced earlier; that is, that the administrative and other unification of a trust territory with a colony will unavoidably lead to annexation of the trust territory, unless the colony is given trust status. The setting up of such firm bounds between a colony and a trust territory would mean that the trust territory, in the long run, will lose its status as a trust territory and will finally become a colony. It will mean annexation. And the entire question of self-government for the trust territory will be lost and buried, and that, in the long run and in the final analysis, is the result of unification. That is why it is necessary for me to take this negative attitude towards the question of unification.

That is all I have to say on this specific question. I understand that we shall consider this Report on New Guinea from a different point of



view, and at that time I shall have something to say.

Mr. FORSYTH (Australia): Without anticipating the general discussion which, I understand, we shall have later on, I would like to make a few brief remarks on the comments that have just been made. The first one I should like to comment on is the statement that the bill clearly intends to deprive the United Nations of the power of supervision. Now, I think that that is clearly a misunderstanding or a misconstruction. The Australian Government has not only by declaration undertaken co-operation with the Trusteeship Council but has in fact carried out co-operation with the Trusteeship Council. The statement that we shall continue to facilitate, in every way, the Council's supervision of the trust territory has been made here very recently and on behalf of the Government. Not only that, but co-operation with the Council is written into our agreement, and the agreement is in effect, written into this bill. We are quite aware that the supervision of the Trusteeship Council will necessarily cover the common legislative and administrative measures suggested in this bill. But we accept that when I say the common measures I mean the measures that exist for the two territories together. We are quite aware of that; we accept that, that its supervision must apply to those common measures where they affect the trust territory. That is quite clear. We are content to have legislative and administrative matters examined by the Trusteeship Council, even though the territory of Papua shares in those measures. Our only statement about that is that we would have them examined as they apply to the trust territory of New Guinea.

A second remark on which I should like to comment concerns article 76, the basic objectives. I think the effect of Mr. Tsarapkin's observation was that the bill contained no provision to preserve these objectives or to promote them, and that there is no mention of them in the bill.

As I have just stated, the bill itself is a bill in part for approving the trusteeship agreement, and the trusteeship agreement is annexed as a schedule to the bill, so that the objectives of Article 76 are undertaken not only in the trusteeship agreement which entered into effect at the moment of its approval by the General Assembly, but also, again, the undertakings repeated here in the bill itself and in the schedule to the bill.

The objective with which Mr. Tsarapkin - and I think most of the members of the Council who have been concerned and have had doubts about this proposal for administrative union - is the second objective in Article 76. I think that that is the one that they have placed the most emphasis upon. That provision, paragraph 3 of Article 76 of the Charter, reads:

"To promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its people and the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned as it may be provided by the terms of each trusteeship agreement."

I would refer at this point to section 6 of the bill, the section which gives legislative enactment to the placing of the territory under the international trusteeship system upon the terms of trusteeship embodied in the agreement. I would refer to the fourth schedule of the bill which contains the text of the agreement between Australia and the United Nations, placing the territory and the trusteeship. And in the terms of that trusteeship agreement, as all members well know, Australia undertakes to administer the territory in such a way as to achieve basic objectives. I refer also to section 52 (d) of the bill, in which it is the duty of the Administrator, if any ordinance is passed or is discussed in the Legislative Council which may not be fully

in accordance with Australia's treaty obligations or with Australia's obligations under the trusteeship agreement, then it is the duty of the Administrator to reserve that bill, not to allow it to go into effect, but to reserve it for consideration by the Governor-General which, in effect, means <sup>for</sup> consideration by the Government of Australia. Now, if those provisions are not provisions to preserve the undertakings made in the agreement to achieve objectives, then I can't read plain English. The bill is for the very purpose of creating machinery to carry on those objectives.

There is another comment which has been made, that the bill says - and I think that this may perhaps be a mistranslation - the natives are not to participate in administration. That was the effect of what I heard through the receiving machine. It may be that that is a mistranslation but I would draw attention - in case it is not a mistranslation - to sections 25 to 29 of the bill in which there is provision for the setting up of Advisory Councils and for native Village Councils.

In other words, let me first read paragraph 27, sub-paragraph 1:

"An advisory council shall consist of such number of native members and such number of other members as is provided by ordinance."

This is Article 29.

"A native village council shall have such functions as are provided by Ordinance..."

Now, if those are not provisions for participation of the inhabitants in the administration and government of the Territory, then, again, I am incapable of understanding plain words. It is further stated that the natives are not given any possibilities in this bill for economic and social development.

The whole purpose of the bill, as I have said before, is to create machinery to carry out the objectives which are undertaken in the agreement and, indeed, are written into the bill itself by the annexing of the trusteeship agreement.

As regards participation of the indigenous inhabitants in administration, the Special Representative would be able to answer specific questions on the matter. It is also said in the criticism of this bill that it gives the inhabitants of the trust territory no advantages over the inhabitants of the neighbouring territory of Papua. Well, my answer is that we seek to achieve in the trust territory the highest standards and to achieve them in co-operation with the Trusteeship Council, and the standards we achieve there will be trusteeship standards. And if, at the same time, the same standards will be applied in Papua, as clearly they must, because you cannot have two sets of standards where you have a common machinery for administration and benefits will flow to the administration of Papua; in other words, the real position is the other way around: the trust territory is not being held back or dragged back, but the non-trust

territory stands to benefit from the achievement of the higher standards, if they be higher standards, in the trust territory; at any rate, the standards set by the Trusteeship Council.

I have one further observation. I do not think that it is clearly enough realized in this Trusteeship Council that it is not many years -- it is well within the memory of people present around this table -- since cannibalism, infanticide and endemic warfare prevailed throughout the whole of this territory. Much of it was unexplored when the Australian Government became responsible for it after the war of 1914-1918. Many districts are still only under partial control by the administration, in spite of thirty years of unremitting effort. We are dealing with people, who for the most part, are only now emerging from savagery, and it is Australia which has been bringing them up from that unhappy state. The inhabitants have in fact made considerable progress under the Australian administration, but we could never claim that we have been able to bring them in that short time from a state of savagery to a point where they could apply the most up-to-date democratic methods, as democratic methods are understood in our countries. Their idea of elections, when Australia went into the country was to kill off the opponents. We have at least brought about sufficient progress for Mr. Halligan to be able to tell you the other day that the people now select,

if they do not understand the formal process of election, at least, they produce their leaders and representation by a reasonable and peaceful method. The idea that we are dealing here with people who are even capable of reading and understanding fully the terms of the trusteeship agreement is not a correct idea. There are some of them who can, but they are a tiny minority.

These people, as I have said before, are only emerging from savagery. They need tutelage, and we understood that that was the idea of the trust, that we should do our best to raise the level of these people, to educate

them, to help them, to give them some progress and steady progress, to bring about a consciousness in them of the methods of democracy, but that is not a task that can be achieved overnight or in a generation.

Earlier I referred, without quoting to some remarks that I made at the second session of this Council. I did not quote them at the time because I thought that possibly some members might look them up. I have seen no evidence that this has been done and with the President's permission I shall quote some of the remarks that I made at the preliminary examination of this report.

I said, on 15 December 1947 that it must not be imagined that these territories are at such an advanced stage that they can be treated for all practical purposes as units. They do have to be treated rather as collections of smaller units. The emphasis of the administration has to be on districts, partly for geographical reasons and partly because the people have to be approached on a local basis. It has to be remembered that full self-government is a very long way off in such primitive territories as these, and what steps can be taken to educate these people by participation in the administration and by means of local bodies in which they have a voice or conduct their own affairs are being taken and will continue to be taken.

But the notion that there is in New Guinea or in Papua a kind of consciousness of the territory as a whole, of New Guinea as a whole and of Papua as a whole, is not correct. There is not such a concept in the minds of the inhabitants at this stage.

Further, I went on to say that such a consciousness must be the product of a long period of assistance and of tutelage on the part of the administering authority. One has to get rid of the idea that one is dealing here with people who are just one step below nationhood. There is no such thing in that territory, nor is there any such thing in Papua.

As I said at the beginning, I do not want to anticipate the general discussion, and I shall therefore conclude my remarks at this point for the moment.

The PRESIDENT: We have been discussing the political portion of the Report, and the question of union with Papua has taken most of the time of our debate. I believe that the question of union with Papua is of transcending importance, and therefore it perhaps was only proper that the attention of the Trusteeship Council should have been concentrated on that part of the Report.



Are there any further observations on this portion of the Report?

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): If the President will allow me, I should simply briefly like to reply to Mr. Forsyth.

I did say, Mr. Forsyth, that the natives under this new Bill are not allowed to participate in the administration of the territory. The representative of Australia, in order to refute my statement referred to paragraph 25 of the Bill, which provides for the establishment of advisory councils upon native matters or native village councils. Mr. Forsyth pointed out that either this paragraph mentions that natives participate in administration or he does not understand English. I am quite sure that Mr. Forsyth understands English quite well, but I am afraid he is making believe he does not understand what "administration" means. This is an advisory body. Do you admit, Mr. Forsyth that this is an advisory body? Would you answer that question, Mr. Forsyth?

I see that you do admit, Mr. Forsyth, that this is an advisory body. If it is an advisory body, it does not mean participation in administration; it simply means that they can express their views -- and that is all. That is the limit of the role which they play. Therefore, my statement has not been refuted.

Mr. FORSYTH (Australia): I should like, with the permission of the President, to ask Mr. Halligan to have an opportunity to comment on this particular matter.

Mr. HALLIGAN: In my remarks yesterday referring to that section of the Bill, I stated that that was something entirely new in the territory and that it was the result of experiments and trial over some years in the functioning of village councils. Since 1936, or thereabout, village councils have been functioning to a very limited extent -- mainly around Rabaul --



and those village councils have been watched very closely. The administration officers would go along and guide these councils in their deliberations, with the idea of training them to take part in such organs. As a result of that experience, it is now considered that the time has arrived when a verdict might be taken and it might be possible to vest such village councils with some statutory authority. That will be done by ordinance, and the section of the Act to which Mr. Forsyth referred -- that is, section 29 -- says that "a village council shall have such functions as are provided for by ordinance in relation to the peace, order and welfare of the natives in the area in respect of which it is established."

Now, the Ordinance will give the details and, based on the experience of what those natives are capable of doing, they will be given a measure of authority in their village councils. As a further extension to that -- and this I again state is in the project stage -- there will be advisory councils for native matters. The project there is that, out of the village councils and scattered around -- we hope they will grow, and our anticipations are that it will -- out of that, there will then be a number of centralized advisory councils over an area, say, comprising a large number of villages. Selected natives from those villages will come together and form an advisory council -- another further step forward. The ultimate <sup>would</sup> / be that, such natives having gained the experience through village councils and then advisory councils, these natives would have been guided and trained and would have gained the experience to enable them to take <sup>a</sup> part in the legislative machinery and also in the administrative machinery. Yet we must emphasize again -- Mr. Forsyth has brought this out -- that these are a primitive people. We have guided them since Australia has had the territory, having these objectives in mind. That it is a very slow process, and results cannot be expected in a brief period.

However, as members will see, steps are now being taken with the object in view -- the ultimate object -- of giving the natives a full share in the government of the country. That of course is an ultimate objective.

Mr. CARPIO (Philippines): Before we leave this very important problem, I should like to be permitted to ask just one more question of Mr. Halligan.

It has been emphasized here that the people of New Guinea are a very backward people and that that is why, up to now, the progress that had been expected of the administration has not been forthcoming. I am going to ask my question because, when the Filipino people came under the aegis of the American colonial venture, at the turn of the century, there were two tribes in the Philippines called the Egrobs and the Negretos whom visitors had dubbed as "headhunters". They lived in the mountains in the Philippines and had hardly any taste of civilization. Yet, as a result of the benevolent program of education that was established there by the American regime, a careful selection was made among these aborigines in the mountains and many were sent to the United States, educated here and, after several years, were brought back to the Philippines and assumed positions of leadership in all fields of governmental activity. Therefore, fifteen or twenty years after that, some of these educated mountain peoples were sitting side by side with their lowland brothers in the highest councils of state -- both in the administrative and in the legislative and judicial branches of the government.

Yet, to all intents and purposes, these people had been dubbed -- and rightly so, I take it -- as the most backward peoples. I bring this matter up, because emphasize has so repeatedly <sup>been</sup> made here on the backwardness of these peoples. That seems to be the all-embracing reason for the present lack of any development, economically, socially or otherwise.

I note, however, that this territory has been under the aegis of the mandate since 1920. From then, up to the present time, twenty-eight years have passed, and yet the result, as we now learn from the Report, is that they are still the most backward people on earth.

I should now like to propose this question: In view of the lack of progress that has so far been made -- for the past twenty-eight years -- how many centuries more does the administering authority think necessary to put these people in a state where they can be given at least the rudiments of democratic processes?

Mr. HALLIGAN: I must say that I cannot agree that there has been a lack of progress in the development of any phase of the territory during the twenty years that Australia has been responsible for its administration. As our discussion proceeds, I have no doubt I shall be able to convince the Council that what I am saying is well-illustrated.

However just to make one point to support that in a very small way, I would say the following:

In 1921, the Commonwealth Government under mandate, commenced the administration of the territory. That was on 9 May 1921, and on that day 150,000 indigenous inhabitants were under administrative control; that is, they had reached the stage where the administration was in touch with them, and they were under control -- not in all cases thoroughly, but in partial control at least. Now, in 1941, which is just twenty years afterwards, the number of people who <sup>were</sup> / under control sufficiently to be placed on a census was 668,000, so during those years in the progress of the Government's policy of peaceful penetration -- and I emphasize that that has been the policy which the Government has pursued: peacefully to get in touch with these people -- the number of people that could be placed on the census; in other words, under control of the administration; had increased from 150,000 to 668,000.

Now, there are still a number of natives -- we estimate probably another 300,000 -- <sup>in</sup> parts of the territory, whom it has not yet been possible to bring to the stage where we consider that they can be regarded as under administrative control. Those people are largely in areas of the territory, in the mainland which I showed on the map there (indicating) -- where it is most rugged and mountainous country.

That, I think, without any other point which I might bring out, shows that progress has been made during that time.

Mr. CARPIO (Philippines): I should like to ask another question to follow up my first question.

BC:cc

T/P.V.99  
40

What can we expect, then, when the authority will be divided and will cover two such extensive territories?

Now I have some remarks with respect to the primitive stage of savagery of the inhabitants of New Guinea, which, according to the opinion of the administering authority, would keep them from occupying any political posts.

I find, in a list dealing with the indigenous inhabitants employed in the territory, that there are carpenters, mechanics, and men in charge of the garages; there are assistants to doctors; there are cooks; there are chauffeurs; there are even interpreters; there are telephone operators; there are telephone technicians, and so forth. I see a list of qualified workers, and I also see that among that mass of savage inhabitants in New Guineau, there are 1,300 of them charged with keeping and maintaining order, and there are 1,465 persons approximately working on general labour. I do not know exactly how many are working in mines, for instance, but it would be a few thousand. This means that they are men who are capable of receiving instructions and following discipline, and that they do co-ordinate at work in difficult tasks such as I have enumerated, and tasks which require a certain amount of culture in order to be accomplished. Now I do not speak of those others that have to attend to modern mechanisms, such as in a garage in New York, or along the highways of the United States. Further, I do not believe that these men are so primitive and that the inhabitants are so savage, because if they were, there would have been no difficulty, in the draft bill which has been presented to us, in giving them more political opportunity; the bill does not give them any, because they cannot struggle for more freedoms here.

That is why, in this bill, they have no ability to initiate any action. They can only discuss a little.

In conclusion, I shall sum up my statement. Firstly, when there was a single administrative authority directly interested in the territory, only

a third part was under definite control. Now this means, I suppose, logically, that with this same personnel that is stated here in the bill, it will not be possible to improve the conditions for the fulfillment of the Trusteeship Agreement. Secondly, I do not believe, unless there is some grave error on my part, that the inhabitants of the territory are incapable of participating, let us not say, in elementary action, such as tribal action, but even with a broader conscience of the knowledge that they belong to a great population and that they have interests which should be safeguarded.

These are the general observations which I wish to make with regard to the commentaries which have been made up to this point in the course of the meeting.

The PRESIDENT: I believe that the Council has discussed at some length this portion of the Report which deals with political advancement of the inhabitants. The Council will now enter upon an examination of that portion of the Report which deals with the economic advancement. The delegations which are especially concerned with that part of the Report are the delegations of Belgium, Costa Rica and the United Kingdom.

Does the representative of Iraq wish to raise a point of order?

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): Almost.

The PRESIDENT: As I said, other representatives will have an equal opportunity of asking questions on this part of the Report and making observations thereon.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): Before the Council turns to the economic section of the Report, I wish to say a few words. It was my understanding that we



were proceeding with this great subject of "administrative union", and that when we were finished with it, we would proceed to the political section, because I have certain questions with regard to the political side, almost divorced from the question of the "union."

The PRESIDENT: In that case, that part of the Report which deals with political advancement will still be subjected to questioning and discussion. I thought that there were no further observations forthcoming, but in this case, I shall defer the discussion of the economic phase of the Report.

I shall ask the representative of Iraq to ask questions on the political portion of the Report.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): My questions relate merely to the very core of the Report. I wish to ask the representative of the administering authority the following question. Page 10, Part III, 3rd paragraph of the New Guinea Report begins with the following words: "the task of restoring civil administration to an area..." Later, the paragraph continues with the following wording: "commencement has been made with the task and despite the many difficulties much progress has been made." Could the special representative tell us what progress has been made?

Mr. HALLIGAN: Progress has been made in one direction, in the provision of houses and in the provision of ships to replace all the small ships that were lost. There were preliminary inquiries and technical investigations with regard to the rebuilding of the townships of Lae, Robaul, Mading, and there was rebuilding and temporary repairing, in many cases, of the walls. All of those facilities and all of those structures were lost and everything was destroyed, and everything has to be rebuilt. Considerable progress has been made. In some cases, it has been on a temporary basis only, on account of the difficulties in getting materials.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): Could the Special Representative give us some figures?

Mr. HALLIGAN: What is the nature of the figures that you would desire?

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): The Special Representative stated that many houses were built. Comparatively, how many were destroyed and how many were rebuilt? Truly, the answer does not tally with the subject matter of the paragraph. The paragraph speaks of restoring civil administration. The Special Representative spoke of houses and ships. Do houses and ships come under civil administration?

Mr. HALLIGAN: I shall deal with the last question first. I understood, when I replied, that the question had relation to the over-all task of restoring the civil administration to the area. I do not deal with the physical part of it. The other part, in relation to the provision of staff, was a considerable task, because two to three hundred of our most experienced administration officers were lost during the Japanese war and the task there was, so far as is possible in the time, to obtain and train officers to carry on the functions of civil administration, and, at the present time the staff -- I refer to both territories -- is about a thousand, and two-thirds of those, five to

six hundred, would be in the territory of New Guinea.

With regard to the figures relating to houses, a recent summary indicates that houses in the Morobi district show temporary houses, single mens' barracks, hospitals, for a total of thirty at that time. In the Soopique district, there were dwellings for administrative offices and hospital buildings, which reached a total, at that stage, of ninety-two buildings constructed.

The PRESIDENT: Before the representative of Iraq continues with his questions, I should like to point out to the members of the Council that the copy of the report which Mr. Khalidy is using is the original mimeographed report, and I notice that some representatives have the printed report. Therefore, the pages and the paragraphs may be a little different. I just wanted to point that out so that the representatives will find the right portion of the report.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): I am afraid that the question is still unanswered. To what extent, and how, was the civil administration restored? Mr. Halligan was good enough to tell us that about a thousand men were in training or being trained, after the occupation was over. Yes. But how was the civil administration itself, as we understand it, restored and to what extent? What is still to be accomplished and what has already been accomplished? This is the question.

Mr. HALLIGAN: I wish to point out that the last part of the territory was transferred from military control to civil control at the end of June 1946, just a few days before the commencement of the period which this report covers. During that year, the restoration of civil administration meant that the officers appointed to the administration took over from the military officers who had carried on the administration under the military regime, at the various posts, at the headquarters of the districts, and the various sub-posts, and took

over the hospitals, the stores, the provisions of the stores, and took over the proper patrol offices, the men who went out among the natives and carried on the administration and affected that contact of administration that I previously referred to.

That process of the restoration of civil administration started in the whole of the territory about three days before the commencement of this Report and, progressively continued during the whole year. I am afraid that it is not possible for me to give comparative figures, or to say what the number of people are, or what the stations are, and what is yet to be done, because the plans for the development of administration of the territory are such that we are expanding our administration services just as fast as it is possible to get qualified and experienced officers to carry on that administration in all parts of the territory.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): Page 12 of the Report on New Guinea has a paragraph which deals with the rehabilitation of ex-service men. The paragraph reads as follows:

"The benefits of the commonwealth government's scheme for the repatriation and rehabilitation including training of ex-service men are being applied to residents of the territory with special provisions for natives who served as members of the armed forces."

Could Mr. Halligan tell us how? In other words, I shall make the question easier for the special representative. How is it being applied and how is it beneficial to the residents of the territory?

Mr. HALLIGAN: In Australia itself, the commonwealth government has set up an organization for the re-establishment of Australian personnel; that is, the training in all occupations and all crafts. That scheme has been extended to the territory of New Guinea, not only for the European former members of the services, but for the native members who served in

the native infantry and other regiments of the Australian forces.

The training is divided into four categories, industrial, scholastic, domestic and medical. The figures I have here show that the total number of men in training, as of 31 March, were 1,100 natives at that time.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): On page 22 of the New Guinea Report, there is a list -- a formidable list indeed -- extending through eleven pages, under the heading of "bilateral treaties with other countries which have been applied to the territory at 30 June 1947 -- excluding extradition treaties." May I ask why, in the wisdom of the Government of Australia, this formidable list has been given in the form of eleven pages?

Mr. HALLIGAN: That was given in reply to an item in the questionnaire.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): Half of it is almost unnecessary, for our purposes. It is true that in the questionnaire we have listed certain things, but if you would read it, one by one, at least fifty per cent or seventy per cent is unnecessary in so far as our purposes are concerned.

The PRESIDENT: Before Mr. Khalidy again replies, I believe that what he has said is not a point of objection; it is a comment. The representative  
not  
of Iraq is/really asking for any special reason.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): No, I want to know why they included so many.

Mr. HALLIGAN: As I mentioned, that was supplied in answer to an item  
might  
in the questionnaire. We / have given more than was absolutely required by the Trusteeship Council, but that was our understanding of the reply that would be required.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I am very happy that the representative of Iraq has raised this question, because a few weeks ago I asked the representatives to call our attention to those questions which they felt unnecessary or the documentation which they felt would not have in any way expedited the work of the Trusteeship Council. Here is an excellent and very valuable example. If we all followed this example, we would convince the questioner somewhat and greatly lighten the burden of the whole administration as well as the burden of those who are called upon to read the Report.

The PRESIDENT: In my opinion, I think the Council should, at one time or other, be seized, or be informed of the international treaties that are applicable to a trust territory. That in itself, <sup>I think,</sup> would not be an objectionable feature.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): In reading the political section of the Report -- still one can call in a political section -- I unfortunately feel that I have no clear idea at all as to how the political fabric of the territory is instituted. I have had occasion to note that the Report is, in detail, entirely inadequate and it is insufficient in almost every aspect.



There is one excuse for that, the war. But I still feel in my ignorance that I have no idea of how the territory is being governed politically. Could Mr. Halligan give us an idea of the political structure especially as it affects the daily life of the indigenous population.

Mr. HALLIGAN (Special Representative, Australia): You mean as to how the government of the territory functions?

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): That is what I am asking you. You can start with the government of a territory, if you like.

Mr. HALLIGAN: You mean, how the government of a territory functions?

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): Yes, that is what I am asking you. What sort of government is there, and what is its structure. That is to say, do you have a king, or do you have a governor? Do you have a prime minister, or do you have a commissioner; then who is under him, and how are they governing. Give me a general picture.

Mr. HALLIGAN: That is quite clear to me. There is a diagram on this report on page 15. That is the printed report. On that page there is an organizational chart. The organization of the government is that there is an Administrator of the Territory. Under the Administrator there is a number of departments. These are all set out in the chart on page 15. You will see under the sub-department of Education, Library Services; under Treasury, there is the Government Printing Office, the Government Stores Branch, and the Post and Telegraph Branch. Those departments have their headquarters in their outside branches, and the departments there have district services, concerning native affairs. That is a department that runs right through the territory, and under the heads thereof is in each district of the territory, of which there are eight, there is a District Officer, and that District Officer is the representative of the Government in all its activities in that area. He has technical men, such as agricultural men and medical officers, but he is the Government representative there, and he is



required to co-ordinate the activities, all administration activities. Directly under him, apart from his clerical staff, he has a Assistant District Officer and Patrol Officers. The Assistant District Officer has as his title indicates, to assist in the general administration and to move around the districts, and generally, as I said, to act as the representative of the Government and see that administration is carried on. Under him, in that particular department, there are Patrol Officers whose particular function it is to proceed through the territory into the native villages where the area is under control to inspect the villages, guard the natives, take the census, and generally to see that village life is going on as it should, and they also give any guidance that is necessary. In the case of areas that are not under control, he is the man with the Assistant District Officer, to carry out that policy of peaceful penetration that brings more natives under the control of the administration. That is a brief outline of the functions of the administration.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): Have all those departments been restored, or are they all in existence now?

Mr. HALLIGAN: All the departments are in existence, but they staff required for them is not available to the extent that we want them to be, and that is particularly, <sup>so</sup> in the case of the Medical Department where we are experiencing very considerable difficulty securing qualified medical officers. We have requirements for about forty, and at the present time there are less than twenty, despite consistent efforts to secure them. We regard those officers as being important officers for the administration, and the same applies, particularly in regard to technical men. All the positions have not been filled, more particularly in the Department of District Services and Native Affairs, where the officers can only be fully effective when they have had the experience and are able to carry on the very important task of native administration. We cannot get those officers

other than securing officers and training them, and that links up with what I said yesterday about the training of those officers through schooling. The training relates particularly to those Patrol Officers, but instruction is given to all other officers, particularly those who come in direct contact with the indigenous population.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): Could Mr. Halligan tell us to what extent the indigenous population is taking part in the political fabric of the territory, apart from the police force?

Mr. HALLIGAN: When you refer to political matters, I take it it does not mean the administrative part.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): Not quite. I mean the administrative part as well as the political consciousness of the indigenous population. In fact, I have another question for you on the political consciousness after this question. After that I want to ask you to what extent you are making an effort. When I say you I mean the Administering Authority, to imbue into the indigenous population political consciousness.

Mr. HALLIGAN: As I understand the question, this is the answer: Just a little earlier, in reply to a question, I described the part that natives have been taking in Village Councils up to now, and I further explained that we have now reached the stage where we are giving those Village Councils some statutory functions. There is a further proposal, which is only in the projection stage, to advance them to the Advisory Councils, but at the present time, the part that the natives are playing in what you describe as the political life of the territory would be to the extent that they take part in these Village Councils. I must again emphasize that that is in a very limited way, participation in those Village Councils.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I want to ask a concrete question. As we heard a moment ago, the Government of Australia during the war used the natives.

(At this point there were mechanical difficulties.)

What were they defending? Were they conscious of what they were defending or not? I should like to know something concrete about that.

Mr. HALLIGAN: I should say that they were very conscious of what they were doing, and that is assisting to protect their country. I think, although, they are described as primitive, they are very conscious of the action they were taking.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): I would still like to know what Australia is doing to educate the people along political lines. We all know what is meant by political consciousness, or perhaps I can put the question in another fashion: To what extent is there political consciousness in the territory? After that, I should like to ask Mr. Halligan if there have ever been any political demonstrations?

Mr. HARRIGAN: I can answer the first question. There have been no political demonstrations.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): Never?

Mr. HALLIGAN: No.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): Why not?

Mr. HALLIGAN: In the absence of political consciousness.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): That is the question.

Mr. REID (New Zealand): I am grateful to my Iraqi colleague because up to the point when he spoke we did not have any questions on the political aspects, apart from the question of union. I, myself, have one or two questions.

I  
In the first place, gathered from the representative of Australia that this Report has been prepared under difficulties, and that it cannot be regarded as satisfactory even to the administration, in the sense that it is not full or complete, and that it deals with a rather chaotic stage of the administration.

A great deal of our attention has been concentrated on this draft bill which, I think, is called the Papua-New Guinea Administration Bill. However, I understand it is not in effect. I should like to ask Mr. Halligan under what law the trust territory is being governed at the present time. Following on that question, I should like to ask in what way the present law will be changed when this new bill comes into operation.

Mr. HALLIGAN: At the present time, the territory is being administered under the Papua-New Guinea Provisional Administration Act of 1945-1946. And when this bill comes into force, you will see from the schedule to the bill, page 38, at the top of the page that certain acts are repealed. That is the Papua Act of 1905-1914; that is, the Papua Act of 1905 will be repealed, and also the Papua-New Guinea Provisional Administration Act. The Papua-New Guinea Administration Bill is an extension of each of those Papua Acts, and the New Guinea Act, as it relates to the respective territories. Thus, Papua-New Guinea Administration Act, plus the Papua Acts, in relation to Papua, plus the New Guinea Act, in relation to New Guinea, is the law that is in force.

Mr. REID (New Zealand): May I ask the difference between the two, the existing law and the proposed law? Is there any material difference as regards political, economic, educational, and social aspects?

Mr. HALLIGAN: You mean is there any difference between the Provisional Act and the Bill?

Mr. REID (New Zealand): Yes.

Mr. HALLIGAN: Yes, in the ordinary provisions, as to administration and legislation, and matters of that sort, they are much the same, but the main provision, the main difference, of course, is the matter in here that deals specifically with the trusteeship agreement, the distinction that is made as between the trust territory and the territory of Papua as emphasized there. As to those provisions relating to the Advisory Council for

Native Matters are new, at the present time, under the provisional arrangement, there is no legislative council there. In the Supreme Court there are certain changes made in the Constitution, but they are not very serious ones. Welfare and development is a new provision. That, generally, is a very hasty survey, but it points out the differences.

Mr. REID (New Zealand): I gather from that that the difference really relates to some increasing measure of political development between the two, <sup>the</sup> existing law and the proposed law, but mainly it relates to the legislature and to the Native Advisory Council. The rest are administrative.

I notice in the schedule to which we were referred, on page 38, that there was a Papua Act as late as 1940, and a New Guinea Act as late as 1935. Would Mr. Halligan say whether that brought the two territories into line, whether there was any distinct difference in the type of administration or in the political advancement of the two territories immediately prior to this 1945-1946 act coming into operation?

Mr. HALLIGAN:: No, you will notice that the original act of Papua is the Papua Act of 1905. In 1920, some minor amendment was made, but there were no major amendments of any of the Papua Acts there, but the first New Guinea Act was in 1920, and that was based largely upon the provisions in the Papua Act, except at that time there was no provision for a Legislative Council for New Guinea. That was brought in by the amendment of the New Guinea Act of 1932, as in the Papua Act, and the New Guinea Acts were, in the main, very similar. The only difference, I think, could be in the matter of provisions relating to the Mandate which would appear in the New Guinea Act and, of course, not in the Papua Act. Otherwise, they were almost identical in provisions.

Mr. REID (New Zealand): On page 18 of the supplementary report, there is a reference to native village councils to which Mr. Khalidy has already asked some questions. I should like to know first whether these are already



in operation. Secondly, do they have any direct powers, or are they simply advisory, as are the Advisory Councils referred to in/ sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph 25?

Mr. HALLIGAN: They are, as I pointed out, in existence to a very limited extent, mainly around Rabaul. They are not yet covered by ordinance, as is visualized in this provision. A trial of them was first made in 1936 to see how far the tribes could be encouraged to take part in such councils. The council assemblies were chosen by the members of the community from the people themselves, and each council is visited once a fortnight by an experienced officer of the district staff who was detailed to watch the growth of these councils, the extent to which greater functions might be put on them. The result of that experience there has caused the Government to consider that the time has arrived in which those councils could by ordinance be vested with certain statutory functions, instead, as they are now without statutory functions. They are just councils/without any statutory authority behind them. The ordinances that are visualized in this section 29 are in course of preparation for promulgation at the present time.

Mr. REID (New Zealand): I should also like to know in regard to these native village councils whether they are superseding the previously existing/ indigenous tribal organizations that were governing the tribes without any intervention from Australian officials, or whether their functions are mainly new functions that are imposed in your effort to civilize, whether they are matters of hygiene, of keeping law and order, and of education, or similar functions, whether they are superseding the old or they are taking over only new functions?

Mr. HALLIGAN: They will not be superseding the old. The customs and usages of the natives are preserved as much as possible so far as are beneficial to them, and these councils will carry on native customs as much as possibly can be done, and they are granted additional statutory functions as much as possible, but they will be largely based upon the native

customs, supplemented by any further additional functions to take and carry out under statutory authority.

Mr. REID (New Zealand): What I am driving at is that we have had in the discussion of other reports a good deal of discussion on whether the existing native political organization should be destroyed and abolished and replaced by a modern European or American<sup>democratic</sup>/type of government. What I am trying to get at here is to know whether these native village councils are the beginning of the destruction of the old system, or whether the chiefs and their tribal organizations are continuing parallel or, the third alternative, whether the chiefs and their elders are absorbed into these councils.

Mr. HALLIGAN: I shall refer to article 8 of the trusteeship agreement, wherein the Administering Authority undertook that it will, in accordance with the establish policy, take into consideration the customs and usages of the inhabitants of New Guinea and respect the rights and safeguard the rights of present and future indigenous inhabitants of the territory. Pursuant to that requirement, of course, not disregarding the customs and usages of the natives, but building on them.



Mr. REID (New Zealand): I understand, then, that what is called indirect rule in other territories, the use of the existing tribal organization by the administering authority, delegated authority to the chiefs, and their elders, is continued in New Guinea.

Mr. HALLIGAN: To make that clear, I think I should state that there are no huge tribes in the territory, as they might be known in other countries, with tribal chiefs and their elders. The native structure of New Guinea is based largely on the family, the family and the clan unit, than there is not in the territory anything that might be regarded as what exists in other areas where the chief, the hereditary chief, carries on over a large area and over a very large number of people. There is nothing like that in the territory, and the leaders in the village are people who are in that position of leadership not by hereditary but by selection by the people themselves because of some particular skill they have, a skill in fishing or in hunting or some other particular skill, or selected for their personality. Those are the things for which they are elected -- or I should not use the word elected, but selected -- as leaders by the people in the village or in the clan. There are, of course, certain other ties as between the clan and the family, but I wanted to make the above points clear, so that, in talking of indirect rule coming through to the chiefs, there will not be any impression on the part of any member of the Council that it carries through to a chief who holds sway and authority over a large area comprising a large number of people.

Mr. REID (New Zealand): I am grateful for that reply, and I sorry that we could not get it in the Report earlier. I have no doubt that in a future report, we shall be able to obtain a background statement which I think we need on all these territories, giving us an idea of the people and their political and social organization.

I take it, then, that the Australian Government regards the political basis of the people in their own clans as reasonably satisfactory from a democratic point of view -- one that can be built on and one that does not require any destruction or abolition, at least at the present stage.

Mr. HALLIGAN: It possibly requires alterations as we go along; but certainly no destruction would be necessary. The aim would be to build on what they have and extend, educate them as we go along, preserving what is good in their customs but teaching them further things that we are able to teach them according to our thoughts.

The PRESIDENT: I am quite interested in the answers which have been elaborated from the questions put by the representative of New Zealand to Mr. Halligan.

On behalf of the Chinese delegation, I should like to have clarification of one or two points arising from the answers which the special representative has just given. It seems to me that if the leaders of a village or a clan are not hereditary leaders but are selected by the people because of their ability and personality, then it is a very democratic feature. It seems to me that is the kind of basis upon which modern democratic practices can be encouraged. Therefore, it seems to me that it is not quite consistent with the picture we have formed earlier of people who are entirely incapable of distinguishing between right and wrong and incapable of being trained in democratic processes.

That leads me to one question which has puzzled me for some time. When we were discussing advisory councils and village councils. Is it the opinion of the Special Representative that the people of New Guinea are not sufficiently advanced in their intelligence to be given a part in the administration -- that is to say in the administration of the services

the administration of the governmental departments, and so on; but that they are sufficiently intelligent to take part in the deliberative bodies and to formulate policies and to give advice to the administration. Is that the opinion of the administering authority?

Mr. HALLIGAN: The President means to give advice through such organs as the village councils and advisory councils?

The PRESIDENT: Yes.

Mr. HALLIGAN: I would note again, as I have pointed out many times, that those native village councils have been operating on a very limited extent and mainly around Rabaul, where the natives would, of course, be more advanced than further out. The trial and investigation we carried out led us to make this provision, to make it possible, but we do not expect to be able to set up native village councils throughout the country. We shall have to go very slowly.

There is no great body of natives who will be capable of carrying out the functions the President has described through deliberative bodies and advising the Government, but this beginning has been made, and eventually the goal we are aiming at should be brought about.

I would also mention the fact that the natives are capable of being trained, but it is a very slow process, as we have found out, and quick and immediate results cannot be anticipated on a lot of these measures that are put into effect.

The PRESIDENT: The point I had in mind was that the Trusteeship Council has been given the impression that these people are pseudo-savages, and therefore incapable of taking any responsible part in the civil service or in the administration of the territory. However, then, later we are also given the impression that they are capable of being put into advisory councils, so that they can deliberate and formulate policies for the advice of the administration.

Now, it seems to me that it takes a higher stage of political development for people to be capable of deliberation and formulation of policy than to be trained in the routine administration of their affairs. Also coupled with this is the information we have had that native leaders are selected by the villages because of their ability and personality. It seems to me, therefore, that the two pictures are not quite consistent. That is why I asked whether it is the opinion of the administering authority that the people are not sufficiently intelligent to be trained for responsible parts in the administration of the territories, but are sufficiently intelligent to be listened to and to be given the responsibility of setting up advisory councils. Is that his opinion?

Mr. HALLIGAN: An apparent inconsistency, I think, could be explained by the fact that the standard of intelligence of the natives varies throughout the territory, and the people who may now be capable of taking a part in the village councils are those who have been in contact and under close supervision of the administration for a number of years. They are possibly people who have been trained and have been employed in the administration in some various positions such as mechanic, etc. They probably have gone through a training in the mission school. But, again I stress, that would be only in a very limited area. I do not wish to give the wrong impression that natives generally are at a stage where an advisory council could be established in any part of the territory. That is not so. What we have done is only a beginning. We think these councils will be able to function in certain places and we shall be able to get enough natives to constitute these councils.

The PRESIDENT: The Chinese delegation is very gratified to have and interested in having the information that there are over a thousand ex-service men from among the indigenous people who are being trained for post-war work. Therefore, there must have been a very great number of the native population who were in the armed services, if there are over a thousand ex-service men who are now being trained. It seems to me there were such a number of the indigenous people who joined the armed services -- and the Special Representative, in reply to a question by the representative of Mexico, said that they went to the war with all consciousness of their duties of defending their country-- that there is some inconsistency with the reply given by the Special Representative to the question of the representative of Iraq, that these people are completely devoid of national consciousness.

Mr. HALLIGAN: It was political consciousness he was asking me about.

The PRESIDENT: I thought it was national consciousness.

Mr. HALLIGAN: It was political consciousness.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): Would Mr. Halligan be good enough to tell me what is the difference between political/and national consciousness?

Mr. HALLIGAN: I would seek enlightenment myself. It is not a phrase I used. I would answer the question if it were clear to me.

Mr. CARPIO (Philippines): I should just like to follow up a point made by the President a while ago, which is also in line with the point brought out by the representative of Mexico. I should like to ask the Special Representative of the Administering Authority this question:

Suppose you choose two average newly-born babies from the natives and also choose two average white newly-born babies from among the non-native population in New Guinea. Rear these four children together under the same atmosphere, under the same conditions and under the same instruction. Could the Special Representative, in his experience, tell us just how these four children -- two natives and two whites -- would develop into manhood eventually? Is there any substantial difference?

My point is this: How does the native intelligence of the indigenous inhabitant compare with the native intelligence of the white resident? Is it about the same, or would he say that the native intelligence of the white is so much higher than that of the indigenous inhabitant?

Mr. HALLIGAN: I should say that to determine that would require some scientific knowledge and investigation which I do not possess, but in general I should say that the experiment would prove -- of course I might be wrong -- that the native intelligence of the white person would be greater than that of the indigenous inhabitant. Of course the experiment might prove that it was equal.



Mr. REID (New Zealand): I wish simply to raise a point of order as to whether the last question is one which we could expect the Special Representative to answer. Of course, I should like to have the answer. I think it has been troubling the world for many generations, but I doubt whether it is going to help us here..

The PRESIDENT: I do not think that the question is out of order, because the administering authority has had experience in training the natives. We have known of natives of a very primitive part of the world being given the full opportunity of education etc. and having risen to the same level of attainment and skill as the white. I do not think the point is entirely out of question.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): I am glad the President ruled that the question is in order. Otherwise, the whites in New Guinea would be out of order and the indigenous population would be rather in order.

Arising from the same point, I want to ask Mr. Halligan this: Given the same opportunity -- and this is most important -- the very same opportunity (and I believe Mr. Carpio insisted on this point by implication) and the same training, would the level of intelligence be widely different, taking always into consideration the element of time and the opportunity and the training?

Mr. HALLIGAN: I am afraid, as I mentioned, that the experiment <sup>to</sup> would have/be tried right to its conclusion in every factor, in every phase of the upbringing of those two children. The upbringing would have to be the same. Until that is tried and a conclusion reached, I am afraid I could not give an answer in specific terms.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): I venture to answer the very interesting question raised here by Mr. Carpio. If you take four newly-born children -- two white and two native -- it is perfectly possible that, after twenty years, you may have two imbecilic



white children and two genius native personalities. In taking up the question of newly-born children, it is impossible to determine their potentialities. You may have an imbecile among the white and a genius among the black.

Therefore, I do not believe the experiment would be very conclusive. However, nonetheless, the question raised by Mr. Carpio is of great interest because if children -- whatever may be their origin and background -- if they are equally intelligent at birth, and if they are placed under identical conditions as regards education -- I do not believe there is any profound difference between the two races and this is justified in the light of my own experience.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): I should like to know if the authorities in New Guinea have ever tried that experiment -- that is, to give the same opportunity to both whites and indigenous population and to see how they behave as to intelligence, how they react? Has that experiment every been tried, for no matter how limited a time?

Mr. HALLIGAN: Does the representative mean was the experiment carried out in all its details, with exactly similar circumstances, selecting, say, two babies from each of the peoples mentioned and carrying them through in all details to an age where the test could produce some results?

If that is the question, I would say that the answer is, no, that has not been tried out to its conclusion.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): Was the experiment carried out in any other form?

Mr. HALLIGAN: No.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I should like to know, according to the opinion and the knowledge and experience of the Special Representative of the Government of Australia what the conditions are which he considers just, necessary and fundamental to give a

political capacity to the indigenous inhabitants, a capacity for the administration of their towns, a capacity for administering their lands. What are those conditions, those minimum conditions which he feels to be necessary to fulfill a political function? What are the conditions which exist in New Guinea for the representative elements of a small community to fulfill political functions?

Mr. HALLIGAN: As I understand the question, my answer would be that education of the natives to a greater extent will produce the result which I understand the question envisages.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I wonder if we are not going some what far afield and embarking upon a somewhat academic discussion. The issues that have been raised here -- namely, knowing whether the native population has the intellectual potential, so to speak, of an Australian, and whether experiments have been made to see whether a Papuan child can achieve the same intellectually as a white child -- all these questions are very interesting from the anthropological point of view, but they are hardly germane to the issue. I am speaking here in the light of experience which we have had years ago at the time when we were trying to tame the populations of the Congo. It sometimes happens that the very fact that a child or a native had been in contact with a white person for a certain time made that person unacceptable to his compatriots. When he returned to his village, he was astrocized; he was told that he came from foreign lands, that he had contact with foreign people and he was thereupon eaten in a very cannabilistic manner/<sup>by</sup> his compatriots. When the Government attempts to tame people without the use of force, we must consider whether we are going to ask Australia to impose upon certain villages a social organization by use of force.

Probably, in this way, it would be possible to obtain very rapid success. But if the Australian Government has preferred not to violate the rights of these populations, and not to impose this happiness upon them, then the Australian Government must be consistent with this progressive policy. They must act, stage by stage, and obtain rather limited results, whereas, by the use of force, they might be able to obtain more complete and more rapid results. In any event, let us not discuss this very theoretical question of whether a Papuan child might attain the same scholastic achievement as a white child. That is not the question. The question is, how are we going to aid the society to evolve? We are not dealing with individuals but with a society which has certain social and family organizations, both of which are very reluctant to permit the permeation of European influence. They do not want our own intellectual means. They do not want our culture. They do not want our language. If we are to bring this to them, we must do it progressively and step by step.

The PRESIDENT: I would not have considered any purely abstract discussion of anthropology, but I have allowed these questions because I feel that they are relevant in relation to the statement that the people are, on that level of cultural development as the people of the Stone Age, and, therefore, it is rather impossible to give them the kind of participation in administration or training for administration, as we have witnessed in territories under trust in other parts of the world. I mean, that it is relevant to find out whether these people are capable of being trained and, particularly, in the light of the statements that they have been able to be trained as a soldier, to manipulate the most intricate instruments of war, and also that they are able to select their leaders by ability and personality, and so on -- that is why I believe that those are not questions of abstract theories, but that they are relevant to our discussion. However, we should not enter into

that field too far.

Mr. CARPIO (Philippines): We have found out, as a result of the answers of the Special Representative of the administering territory, that the New Guinea inhabitant or the indigenous inhabitant is susceptible to the same mental and intellectual influences as the white inhabitant. So much so that, according to him, all that is required, in order to give him this political confession along the national development that we have been talking about for the past three days, is education. In other words, <sup>what</sup> we have found out about the native intelligence of the average African is that he is susceptible to mental development in the same manner as the European. All that we need here, therefore, is education, and to give him education, and then he will develop in the same manner as the average white man.

I found a very peculiar statement on page 10 of the report, which says:

"The cardinal points of the Government's policy are the fullest possible development of the Territory and the social, economic <sup>and</sup> political advancement of its inhabitants..."

I am wondering about this. Was it through an oversight or was it deliberate that the word "educational" was omitted, one of the four functional fields which is envisaged in the basic objectives of the Charter and in the development of the indigenous inhabitants of a trust territory. Now, knowing as we do, and as admitted by the Special Representative, that education is the measure of political confession to the native inhabitants, why, may I ask, is not educational advancement included as one of the cardinal points of the Government's policy in the administration of New Guinea?

Mr. HALLIGAN: That is an oversight and it is borne out by reference to the second paragraph on that page, which says that:

"the Government aims to provide full facilities for better health, better education, and for an increasing participation by the natives in the wealth of their country and eventually in its government."

I am sorry to state that the word "education" has been left out through an oversight, because education is one of the cardinal points <sup>present</sup> of the Government's policy.

Mr. CARPIO (Philippines): Therefore, I take it, Mr. Halligan, that if education would be embarked upon now -- and it takes about fifteen to twenty years to educate a child of school age -- that in twenty-five years, the New Guinea inhabitants ought to be able to arrive at a point where they could assume self-government?

Mr. HALLIGAN: I would not be able to confirm that statement.

The meeting was recessed at 4.35 p.m. and resumed at 5.08 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: The Council is called to order and I call on Mr. Sayre.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I am wondering whether we cannot speed along a little more, and whether we are not going over the same ground many times, without making the progress which we would hope to make. In other words, I am wondering whether, under the arrangements, as I understood them, we were to ask first questions on these reports and then have a second stage later on of making comments and discussing the report, and then referring the matter to the committee, and then having a final stage of discussion of the committee's report, and whether in view of that arrangement, we could continue to confine this first stage of asking questions to the asking of specific questions and avoiding making observations expressing our own thoughts, confine it pretty largely to the asking of these specific questions. With that idea in mind, I was wondering whether we could not finish this afternoon the asking of the social questions and the economic questions, and if there will be time left, the educational questions, so that we could begin Monday morning with other matters and try to expedite our work. I think it is in the interests of all of us that the work should be expedited. I wanted to be understood by those who wish to point out difficulties or questionable features of the report that I want to avoid being considered as trying to curb them. I am not doing that at all. I am wondering, however, whether we could not more expeditiously reach our common objectives by confining ourselves, first, as the President has suggested, to questions and make our observations at the second stage of our deliberations.



The PRESIDENT: I think that Mr. Sayre has a very good suggestion there, and I think that procedure will be agreed upon by the Council, the Council will ask such questions as it feels need to be clarified. I should like to make this observation. Questions should be asked not simply for the sake of asking. In other words, the questions must, I think, serve the purpose of the Council and have some meaning in order to bring up some points which the Council feels are important to enable it to form an opinion on those functional fields we are discussing. It is also important that each representative, when he answers the questions, for him to frame the question to be understood by the entire Council, so that the reply from the Special Representative will cover any point that may be present in the minds of other representatives, so that questions would not be duplicated. I believe that we have completed our examination of the political phase of the Report. I would therefore suggest that we proceed to the economic questions in the Report.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): As far as I am concerned I raised the questions which I did, which I felt should be brought up here, as we were requested to do, after the consideration we gave to the Report on New Guinea last year, and I have received the answers to my questions in writing. I believe that most of the questions which were raised here by members of the Council were raised some time ago.

The PRESIDENT: As I said, questions should not be asked simply for the sake of asking questions. It is only when there are certain points that need clarification. I do not suggest that now we are in that questioning period and that therefore a lot of questions must be asked.



Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): It seems to me that we have not completed asking questions on the political aspect because I have some questions on this phase. My first question is this: / Can the Special Representative of the Administrative Authority advise the Council of the number of natives who participated in the armed forces of the Australian Commonwealth during the recent war, the total figure, or even an approximate figure of the number of indigenous population who served in the Australian armed forces during the recent war.

The PRESIDENT: Of course, I have always been waiting for questions to be forthcoming, and if the members have not completed their questions we will continue with that before we go into the next phase.

Mr. HALLIGAN: On the question of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, I am afraid I will have to give the figure that relates both to Papua and New Guinea, an estimate of those. In New Guinea the total figure was something like 15,000, and of those probably about 5,000, I think, would be from the territory of New Guinea because the difference there is that the territory of New Guinea was under Japanese domination for a much longer period than Papua, and those who participated in the reconstruction training scheme were not confined to only those actually in the military units, but also those who acted in the capacity, such as labourers in association with the armed forces.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): Does the approximate figure from New Guinea that was given also include those that participated as labourers but not as soldiers in the armed forces.

Mr. HALLIGAN: There were a mixture of those. Some were in the  
and  
armed forces, /some were labourers, associated with the armed forces.  
Commonwealth  
Those categories of people eligible for training under the /Reconstruction  
Training Scheme, applicable to ex-service men, and this takes in not  
only those definitely in the forces but those who were associated with  
them in their capacity as labourers.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(Interpretation from Russian): In view of the fact that there were 5,000 natives of New Guinea in the Army, could the representative of the administering authority give us a brief explanation as to whether the service in the army have any effect on the development and political progress and consciousness of the natives, or can it be said that they left the army in the same condition as they were in when they entered it?

Mr. HALLIGAN: No, they certainly learned a lot of things in the army, during that association, the same as does the native who comes from his village to undertake employment on plantations or otherwise. His education in a practical way has been improved by that period of service as a labourer or in any other capacity.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(Interpretation from Russian): When the natives were in the army, since the army had specific tasks before it -- that is, it was struggling against an enemy -- was any training, indoctrination work carried out in reference to the native population which was attached to the army?

Mr. HALLIGAN: I would ask exactly what is meant by "indoctrination". I do not quite understand. Perhaps the representative could clarify that a little.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(Interpretation from Russian): I shall explain.

In each army, a certain political education of the soldiers is carried out, since they have a definite enemy facing them and the army has a specific task to perform. Therefore, in each army, including the army of the Australian Commonwealth, specific work was carried out during the war in the direction of preparing the soldiers from the point of view of political and cultural aspects relating to the war.

I should like to know whether such political and moral education was given to the soldiers and the labourers taken from the native population.

Mr. HALLIGAN: The natives were trained in discipline and in war-like measure. They were used largely as scouts and in other functions of that nature, and their training was along physical lines and other lines that usually go with a body of men trained for a task such as the one they were undertaking.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(Interpretation from Russian): The representative of the administering authority has told the Council that, of the ex-servicemen, about a thousand men were chosen for the purpose of bearing certain responsibilities in the administrative organization and in the native councils. It would be desirable to know what ideas were taken as a basis for the choice of these thousands natives for this purpose.

Mr. HALLIGAN: I am afraid there is a slight misunderstanding. A thousand natives were not chosen for participation in village councils. The thousand men I mentioned were natives who were undergoing training in the various categories of industrial measures under this scheme. The facilities are made available for them <sup>in</sup> /their capacity of ex-servicemen to receive training in industrial matters, scholastic matters, domestic matters and medical matters. They were not collected as a body, to participate in village councils. There is some confusion there, I am afraid.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(Interpretation from Russian): What is the aim of the administering authority in regard to the utilization of this particular category of natives -- these servicemen -- who had certain skills and disciplines which are necessary for certain levels of social progress? Did the administering authority have the idea of utilizing this category of natives for the purpose of introducing them into the

administrative organism as representatives of the native population or for the creation of organs of self-government for the native population -- since, as we can understand, the level of these natives during their period of service in the army was substantially raised and special hopes are placed in this group by the administering authority, inasmuch as the administering authority is utilizing them for participation in industrial development and other work and services in the future?

Mr. HALLIGAN: Those natives are in no different category from any other natives. The scheme is entirely one of training, and these special facilities are made available to the natives who served in the forces of a reward for that service. They are in no different category from the natives generally whose education facilities are being made available by the administration, along similar lines and in similar capacities.

It just happens that it was decided that the provision of training to ex-servicemen should be extended to natives, but those natives are in no way different nor have they been selected for any special task other than that they should receive education, and the other natives who were not in the forces, will receive education under the administration's ordinary scheme of education.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(Interpretation from Russian): I have still another question with regard to this political field.

Part of the territory of New Guinea is territory which is not under the control of the administration. In order to bring these territories under the control of the administration, the administration utilizes the policy of peaceful penetration into these areas, and in this way places the natives in the areas which are not under administration under the administration of the administering authority.

I should like to have more detailed information on this policy of the administering authority, on this policy of peaceful penetration -- how it is carried out practically and who does the administration etc. Whom does the administration rely upon for the carrying out of these policies and what implication does this policy have upon the natives who have hertofore not been under the control of the administration? What changes in the life of these natives is brought about by bringing them under the control of the administering authority? What changes are brought about by this peaceful, let us say, conquering of areas which are brought under the control of the administering authority?

Mr. HALLIGAN: It might be helpful in replying to that question if the map which we distributed were in front of members. It is a photostatic copy and does not show clearly the shadings, but I think it would be sufficiently clear to assist me in giving the explanation asked for.

Members will note <sup>on</sup> the legend on the side of the map that a certain area is shown as under complete Government control. Members will see that the island of Manus comes under complete Government control. The island of Manus has an area of about a thousand square miles. It is completely under Government control.

The island of New Ireland and all the adjacent, smaller islands around it, comprise an area of 3,000 square miles, and that is also under Government control.

Coming to the right of the map, we have the island of Buka and the island of Bougainville. Members will see from the shadings of the map there that that is an area which has been penetrated by patrols, but is not under Government control. The area of that is 2,300 square miles.



Coming around further members will see on the map the island of New Britain. On this island is located Rabaul, to which I have referred. It might be explained that Rabaul was selected as the capital in 1910. The Gazelle Peninsula, at the top portion of that island, is an area which is all under Government control and has been for a long time.

Coming to the centre of New Britain, various shadings will be seen which indicate that some of that area is under Government influence; some have been penetrated, some is under partial influence and penetrated, etc. This is true until you come to the mainland and all the area inside.

Members will notice the wording "Northeast New Guinea" in the centre of the map. That practically is the line on inside country that is not completely under Government control. The lines of the map which appear to be tracks are indications on the original map to show that these areas have been penetrated by Government patrols. The intervening spaces, which are blank, have of course not been touched.

The method of carrying out the policy of peaceful penetration is that an administration party -- usually the patrol officer to whom I referred earlier -- accompanied by members of the native constabulary, proceed from a village which is under Government control through an area further into the uncontrolled territory. Messages are conveyed through the natives -- any number of them might be necessary -- that is, to natives speaking the language of the village under the controlled area. This native passes the message on to a native a little further out, who in turn is able to pass it on and convey it in the language of a man in the uncontrolled area. The patrol party then proceeds into that area and sees what sort of reception they get. If it is a hostile reception, of course the party may have to retreat. If they are well received, they would then, by the exchange of presents and talks through the interpreters, settle in the village and explain to the people some of what their object there is and convey through these interpreters what the administration has done in the areas that are under control.



Then they leave, and after some time a further patrol comes through. That is the process of peaceful penetration, and as members can realize it takes time.

Along that line on the map that is described as Northeast New Guinea, practically the whole of that has been defined by ordinance as uncontrolled area. The purpose of defining an uncontrolled area is that no person may enter that areas other than an administration officer in the quest of his duties, unless he has a special permit from the administration. The purpose there is to see that it is only the experienced men of the administration who make contacts with these natives, and then other people who are required to go there will not endeavour to go through an area and possibly upset the native inhabitants. People going with the object of getting metals or anything else can only go into certain areas on the outskirts, after the areas has been under patrol for a short period, so that it will be known that the natives will not attack them, which might happen if a white man or a party went in as strangers.

Then, after a certain period, the unpatrolled area would be proclaimed as an area under control, and the uncontrolled areas would be gradually diminished until such time as the whole of the territory would be under control.

With regard to the nature of that country, I would say that the country inside is very rugged. There are mountains up to ten, thirteen and fourteen thousand feet. The country above 9,000 feet is not inhabited; it is rugged territory. Eight thousand, I think, is the limit of habitation there. The estimate of the number of people in that area was obtained by aerial reconnaissance over the territory to see the number of villages; but it is only an estimate and we cannot regard those people as being in touch with the administration until an administration officer actually goes on foot and makes contact with them in the manner I have described.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): With regard to this peaceful penetration from native village to native village, what is the attitude of the native population towards the establishment of control over them by the administering authority? What is their attitude towards this process?

Mr. HALLIGAN: In many places, it may be entirely hostile. Then, the course of action by the officer is not to take any steps that would in any way bring about bloodshed. He would have to retire and take his time to do it. It may be that they have received word from natives somewhere else that there are advantages to be obtained by association with the administration, in which case their reception might be quite welcome.

I was asked yesterday about the case where some natives had been killed. Now that occurred in this uncontrolled area, on a patrol, as I have described, which had gone into that area. They were in a certain part of the area, as between those villages. The natives there, for some reason, were hostile. They attacked them there. The administration officers of the police, during the incident, fired on those natives. Some of the natives -- the attacking natives -- were killed. The law runs in that uncontrolled area, as far as the administration officer goes, just as it is anywhere else. It was not any question of a man being in there and the expedition having to go in there. He was an administration officer and, in the course of this area, had been attacked. I am mentioning this again, in reply to the question as to what sort of a reception they would get. In that case, that was the reception they received there and, unfortunately, those natives were killed. Following that, there was an inquiry as to what brought it about and whether the action was justified, and whether there was any negligence or wrongful action.

The inquiry was held and, in this case, it was found that the natives had fired and the administration party had fired in self-defense. A full inquiry was made, as it would be anywhere else.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I believe that this sense of hostility which the indigenous inhabitants sometimes reveal when a mission on penetration reaches their region, could be interpreted as a feeling of nationality. This is a thing which we have been attempting to seek<sup>out</sup> /, to see whether or not it exists. We see that it is beginning to be defined. On the other hand, this first contact between the inhabitants of New Guinea and the Australian party is of the greatest importance. This is a fact, because many future elements depend upon this first contact. I should like to know whether the administering authority takes very great care in the training of the officers who participate in these missions. What qualifications exist which these officials must have in order to participate in these missions which penetrate into territory not under control?

I shall recall, as far as the history of Mexico goes, one or two stages in our history of violent conquest of native nuclei, and then, what we call, peaceful conquest. Both of these stages had dire results for the natives, both the violent and the peaceful conquest. But there was no bloodshed in the peaceful conquest which occurred in Mexico.

This peaceful conquest occurred by means of missionaries and Spanish priests who had received an ethic training over a long period of years, within Christian practices, and they, in reality, had a noble apostolic feeling. They were neither bureaucrats nor merchants, nor explorers for economic purposes, but rather, they were attempting to save the fold by means of baptism.

I should like to know what training or qualifications are demanded of these officers, before they participate in this very delicate task in New Guinea?

Mr. HALLIGAN: These officers who are described as patrol officers are some of the most important officers in the service, and in 1925 -- that is, twenty years ago -- a scheme was inaugurated for the training of officers, especially for this task.

The qualifications which were required of the selectees for such a position, were a good general education, a good physique and a good personality. Such persons were then selected and went to the territory for a period of twenty-one months, during which time they were attached to the various departments of the headquarters, which was then in Raboul, to learn something about the administration. After they had spent some period -- say, ten or twelve months in all -- going through those various developments and learning the methods of government and the routine, they were attached to one of the districts, to a district officer, and accompanied the patrol officer in the area under control, to give them experience in the class of task they would have to perform. After a period of twenty-one months in the territory, they were brought to Australia and received a short term at a university, studying anthropology and allied subjects. If they were successful in the various stages of that training, they were confirmed as patrol officers, and as such, were then assigned to the districts to assist the district officer in his task of controlling the district. A usual thing, of course, was to attach the new patrol officer to the area districts under full control, and to select for the task of peaceful penetration of the area, experienced officers who had been trained in the manner I have described.

This was looked upon as a task of the utmost importance, and only to be carried out by officers who had the training to fit them to carry out the task in the way that the Government policy requires to be done.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I shall ask the representative of the USSR to pardon me, but this is the last question I am going to pose. I should like to know, in relation to wages, what the wage of these officers is, of the penetration patrols? What is their salary; what is the salary of a veteran, grade No. 1, and what is the

salary of an educator, and what is the salary of an aid for police inspector? This will give us an idea of the scale which these penetration patrols have in this territory.

Mr. HALLIGAN: I think, in some part of the report, that we have furnished some particulars on the salaries. No, we have furnished a number of the positions, but I have the information. The salary range of a patrol officer is, from a commencing salary of four hundred pounds -- five hundred pounds in the case of a married man -- to six hundred and thirty-six pounds per annum.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): Returning to this incident, this clash between the patrol under Commander Taylor, with the natives, I should like to ask the Special Representative to explain what was the result of that clash.

Mr. HALLIGAN: I might first explain, in regard to that, that there is no mention in the report of the incident because it occurred later than the closing date of the report. I thought I might just mention that in order to show the reason for any absence of the mention of it. I have not brought full details of the incident with me, and I speak from memory. But a full inquiry was held and the finding, my recollection is, was that the police attached to this party had fired in self-defense.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): In connection with the natives of these regions which are still not under control of the administration, do these natives have firearms at their disposal, or are they equipped with bows and arrows?

Mr. HALLIGAN: Bows and arrows.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): Therefore, we can assume that the only way in which the natives could have attacked this patrol was by means of bows and arrows?

Mr. HALLIGAN: Yes.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): In reply to this, the patrol fired on the natives from their rifles?

Mr. HALLIGAN: Yes.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I wish to ask one more question. What is the system of administration of the natives; what is the administrative system of the natives in areas which have not yet been brought under control?

Mr. HALLIGAN: Is the question, what is the administrative system of the regions not brought under control? Do I understand that correctly?

The PRESIDENT: Is that correct?

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): Yes.

Mr. HALLIGAN: They are not under the control of the administration and there is no administrative control system. They are not in touch with the administration.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): <sup>If</sup> there is no contact with these people, then we can understand that these large native areas are controlled by themselves, without any interference on the part of the Australian administration.

1



Is that how we are to understand your answer, that they control themselves, they rule themselves?

Mr. HALLIGAN: That is so. They have not been contacted by the administration and whatever control is exercised there is between themselves. It is entirely their own.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): Those/are the questions which I have to ask at the moment on the political aspect.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): Arising from the question which was just put by Mr. Tsarapkin, do I understand that there is a sort of frontier in the territory. I hope that the special representative understands by the word "frontier" the same sense that was used in America during the Indian affairs. Is there anything of a frontier, so to speak, existing in the territory now?

Mr. HALLIGAN: No.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): Then how do you mark the part that is under administration control and the part that is under the administration of the natives, so to speak?

Mr. HALLIGAN: The administration has defined certain parts as being an uncontrolled area. It is delineated in a document, but, actually, on the ground, it will be a certain village. I do not know that it is not possible to go there. The natives are not lined up/<sup>waiting</sup>to resist, but it is just not an area, beyond that certain village, that they can go further, because the natives there are not under the control of the administration. There is nothing in the nature of a frontier.



Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): Are there frequent incidents, or have there been any incidents between one part of the territory and another part of the territory?

Mr. HALLIGAN: That is, as between the natives?

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): No. Perhaps I did not make myself clear. The special representative stated that beyond a certain village, one could not go. That is to say, your administration does not extend beyond there. Well then, supposing, for the sake of argument, you draw a line there. That would be, roughly speaking, a frontier in one sense or another. Have there been any incidents between this part and the other part?

Mr. HALLIGAN: There have been incidents as between natives. Over the years, and from 1921, the major task of the administration was to proceed, particularly in that area which I have described, to put down inter-tribal warfare. Inter-tribal warfare was very right and, as such, was confined to a comparatively <sup>small</sup> / area and, for reasons known to them, the tribes attacked their neighbors. The task of the administration was, and it is, practically, except in this closed area that I speak of, to suppress that inter-tribal warfare. Incidents do occur, however, in the areas that are under partial control and have been penetrated by patrols.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): I understand then that there were incidents of tribal warfare between your part and their part, is that correct?

Mr. HALLIGAN: One cannot quite describe it as that, between one part of the territory and another.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): You said that you have one part under your administration, and the other part, as Mr. Tsarapkin insisted, was under the administration of the natives, and you have said so. That is to say, it was not under your administration.

Mr. HALLIGAN: Inter-tribal warfare does not occur between the part of the administration under control and the part not under administration control. An inter-tribal fight could occur in the part, as we know about it -- and no doubt, inter-tribal fighting occurs and probably still does -- in the area over which we have not established control or have no knowledge of. No doubt, in the ordinary course of village life that occurs. But I am trying to correct any impression there might be that on the one side the natives not under control are at war with the natives under control. That is not the case.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): Therefore, no incidents have occurred along that line?

Mr. HALLIGAN: I shall get away from the idea of any direct violence. Incidents do occur.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): Not a line in the proper sense; I am speaking in the figurative sense. Along the line of your argument, no incidents have occurred, is that correct?

Mr. HALLIGAN: I do not like to reply directly to that. When you describe a line, it gives the impression that there are two armies standing up and facing one another, and there is nothing like that existing at all. A village on the outside of the area recently brought under control, may decide to have a fight with its neighbour next door, but I am just trying to remove any impression that there might be an area under administration control which is constantly fighting with people in an area not under control. That is not the case.

It looks as if we are at last at the conclusion of the examination of the political part of the Report. It is five minutes to six, it seems highly purposeful to begin discussion of the other functional fields. I would, therefore, suggest that we adjourn the Trusteeship Council until Monday, and I would also announce that the Drafting Committee on Ruanda-Urundi Report will meet on Monday morning at 10:30 in Conference Room 7.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I understand that the Australian Government Information Bureau has some moving pictures of conditions in New Guinea, and I wonder whether, through their courtesy, it might not be possible to arrange to show those during our intermission, either on Monday afternoon or Tuesday afternoon, if that would be more convenient. I think we would get a much clearer idea of the actual conditions in this territory if we saw pictures of them.

Mr. FORSYTH (Australia): I shall be glad to make inquiries concerning these moving pictures; I understand that there are such film. Whether they would be available at the precise time stated by Mr. Sayre, I do not know but I can inform the President and Secretariat.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): Might I suggest that Mr. Forsyth might, after finding that information, get in touch with the Secretariat and they can make arrangements to exhibit the films some afternoon during the intermission if possible?

Mr. FORSYTH (Australia): If you indicate that to be the wish of the Council Mr. President --

The PRESIDENT: Is that agreeable to the Council?

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): I hope it is not the one we have already seen.

Mr. HALLIGAN: The picture in mind is entitled "Native Birth."

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): It was a picture made by one of the officials.

Mr. HALLIGAN: It lasts about twelve minutes, it is a film made by the Department of Information in conjunction with the External Territory Department, and I understand that there is a film here in New York, a copy of it.

Mr. CARPIO (Philippines): I appreciate the efforts naturally to present pictures of that kind, but let me warn the Council. The Filipinos during the past ten or fifteen years have sometimes been pictured in pictures, in shows, as nothing more than head-hunting tribes, and yet these pictures were taken in the most remote places, so that if we see a picture like that, we hope that it will be a representative picture, just as New Guinea looks today rather than selected pictures taken from the wildest forms of life and presented here as typical of life in the community in New Guinea. I have had that in mind all along because we have been misrepresented so often, and they want to prepare the minds of the Council so that they may guard against possibilities of that kind, not that I think that the Australian representative would go as far as that, but just so that we can use our proper discretion in evaluating a picture of that kind.

Mr. FORSYTH (Australia): Do I understand it to be your wish that we shall make this arrangement?

The PRESIDENT: I believe so. I think Mr. Carpio has raised no objection. He only gave a warning.

Mr. CARPIO (Philippines): I raise no objection.

The PRESIDENT: Needless to say, I can be confident that members of the Council will be able to adjudge these conditions not on the basis of a film but on the basis of the report, and they will not be swayed by any visual medium. Therefore, I do not see any objection to them.

The Council will meet again at 2.00 p.m. on Monday.

The Council rose at 6.02 p.m.