



CONTENTS

Page

Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/1856) (continued)..... 261

Chairman : Mr. Max HENRÍQUEZ UREÑA (Dominican Republic).

Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/1856) (continued)

[Item 12]\*

JOINT DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY HAITI, INDIA, LEBANON, PHILIPPINES AND YEMEN (A/C.4/L.187, A/C.4/L.193) (continued)

1. Mr. MANI (India) supported the joint draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.187. That text was historic, since never before had attention been drawn to the need for fixing a time limit for the attainment of independence by the Trust Territories.

2. The first four paragraphs of the draft resolution were self-explanatory and had received wide support in the Committee.

3. With reference to the United Kingdom representative's statement (239th meeting), he felt that it should be possible to reach a compromise if both sides were willing to give way to some extent. As a gesture of conciliation, the Indian delegation would be willing to agree to the deletion of the words " taken or contemplated ", in sub-paragraph 2 (a), of the operative part of the text subject to the consent of the other sponsors and subject to the agreement of the United Kingdom representative that sub-paragraph 2 (d) should be retained. It was not in favour of the deletion of sub-paragraph 2 (d), as proposed by the United Kingdom representative. He fully realized that the various Trust Territories were in different stages of political maturity and that it would be impossible to apply uniform criteria, but on the other hand, unless some time limit were fixed, neither the peoples of the Trust Territories nor the Administering Authorities would attain the right psychological frame of mind for a transfer of power. In India's own struggle for independence, both parties had agreed to the need for a time limit. The United Kingdom representative had pointed out the necessity for taking into account the variety of opinion, with particular reference to the differences existing in Togoland, but India did not consider that undue importance should be attached

to such differences. The existence of differences was a sign of vitality.

4. He drew special attention to sub-paragraph 2 (b), the purport of which was that henceforward steps must be taken in all Trust Territories to ascertain the freely expressed wishes of the people. Naturally time would be needed, but a beginning should be made. The Administering Authorities should set up some kind of elective system which would form the germ of organizations in the Trust Territories through which political experience could be gained. His delegation attached great importance to sub-paragraph 2 (b).

5. He hoped that, in return for his willingness to delete the words " taken or contemplated " in sub-paragraph 2 (a), the United Kingdom delegation would withdraw its opposition to sub-paragraph 2 (d). He felt sure that the deletion of that sub-paragraph would create an adverse impression in the Trust Territories.

6. With reference to the opening phrase of paragraph 2, it was true, as the United Kingdom representative had said, that the United Kingdom Government did include in its annual reports information concerning the steps taken in the political field, and he appreciated that fact, but the paragraph had been drafted as a general statement covering all the Trust Territories.

7. He hoped that if sub-paragraph 2 (a) were amended as suggested, all the Administering Authorities would be able to support the draft resolution.

8. Mrs. COELHO LISBOA DE LARRAGOITI (Brazil), in reply to the United Kingdom representative, said that all members of the Committee appreciated the sacrifices made by the Administering Authorities in undertaking the responsibility of administering the Trust Territories. The world should be grateful for the political vision shown by the United Kingdom Government.

9. It had been asserted that the American nations were irreconcilable enemies of the colonial system, but she called attention to the fact that the great majority of the members of the Committee came from countries

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

which had been created by the political genius of the colonizing Powers. Brazil had had some difficulty in achieving independence from Portugal, and the other Latin-American countries had had even greater difficulty in freeing themselves from Spain. But of all the countries formerly under British administration, only one had broken away. That was the unequalled achievement of the United Kingdom's creative powers.

10. With regard to sub-paragraph 2 (a), the disclosure of useful measures taken or contemplated to lead the Trust Territories towards self-government or independence would be encouraging to the peoples whose fate the United Nations had placed in such capable hands and would stimulate other Administering Authorities to hasten progress towards the objectives of the Charter

11. She would vote for the draft resolution as it stood and against the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.4/L.193). To delete the words "taken or contemplated" in sub-paragraph 2 (a) would render the paragraph meaningless, and to delete sub-paragraph 2 (d) would render the whole draft resolution meaningless.

12. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) supported the joint draft resolution, which he considered to be one of the most constructive proposals ever laid before the Fourth Committee. At the time the first Trusteeship Agreements had been drawn up it might have seemed premature to set a time limit to the administration of the Trust Territories. He recalled the fact that in 1946 the United Nations had had to choose between accepting the Trusteeship Agreements as they were proposed or indefinitely postponing the establishment of the Trusteeship Council; it had preferred the former course, although the texts were not entirely satisfactory. After five years' experience a new stage had been reached, and the time had come for the Administering Authorities to set a time limit for the establishment of self-government or independence in the Trust Territories. If the draft resolution were adopted, it would give the peoples of the Trust Territories a new hope for the future, strengthen their faith in the United Nations and encourage them to co-operate with the Administering Authorities in the progressive development of political institutions.

13. He would oppose the amendment submitted by the United Kingdom representative.

14. Mr. PIGNON (France) sympathized with the generous motives which had produced the joint draft resolution, while deploring its somewhat suspicious attitude with regard to the Administering Authorities. Ever since 1946 France had been carrying out in the Trust Territories a series of extensive reforms including, *inter alia*, the setting up of representative assemblies with wide powers. There had been much progress in the political field, for example, the widening of the electorate and the establishment of *communes mixtes* and of regional or district councils; the indigenous inhabitants were thus being trained to assume political responsibilities. Still further reforms were being carried out. There was thus constant progress towards the objectives laid down in Article 76 of the Charter.

15. He pointed out to the sponsors of the joint draft resolution that France had consistently given account, both in its reports to the Trusteeship Council and in the Council itself, of the steps taken towards self-government or independence. The General Assembly received a considerable amount of information in the Trusteeship Council documents. If it were required, the French Government would give even more explicit and complete information.

16. He would make one reservation: the responsibility of consulting the inhabitants of the Territories could not be disassociated from the actual responsibility of government and it was for the Administering Authorities to judge what the extent of such consultations should be. The French Government did not believe it possible immediately to determine when the Trust Territories would be ready for self-government or independence. A period fixed in advance would probably be either too short or too long, and any change in the estimated time would have a very unfavourable effect on public opinion in the Territory concerned.

17. He agreed with Sir Alan Burns that the precedent of Somaliland under Italian administration was not really relevant, since the Trusteeship Agreements for the other Trust Territories had been drawn up on an entirely different basis.

18. The Territories under French administration had been "B" Mandates of the League of Nations, which meant that they had been entirely without state organization or political independence, and it had fallen to France to inculcate the idea of a higher entity than the tribe or race. France was carrying out that difficult task in good faith and in the interests of the populations concerned.

19. If the United Kingdom amendment was adopted, he would vote for the joint draft resolution, more because of the good intentions behind it than because he considered it to be of much practical use. If the United Kingdom amendment was not adopted, he would vote against the joint draft resolution and he would reserve his Government's full freedom of judgment as to its future decisions.

20. He asked that the draft resolution should be voted on paragraph by paragraph.

21. Mr. BALLARD (Australia) would support the joint draft resolution if the United Kingdom amendment was adopted. With regard to sub-paragraph 2 (d) of the operative part of the text, in his opinion even the most conscientious attempt to estimate the time that would be required for a Territory to be ready for self-government or independence could be no more than speculative, and in effect to adopt that sub-paragraph would be to promise something that it would be impossible to carry out.

22. The Administering Authorities had fully subscribed to the objectives of the International Trusteeship System, not only by adhering to the Charter but also by concluding Trusteeship Agreements and by supplying information in their annual reports to the Trusteeship Council. In the light of those considerations, sub-

paragraphs 2 (a), (b) and (c) might seem superfluous, but they would not prevent the Australian delegation from voting for the draft resolution.

23. U HLA MAUNG (Burma) said that he would vote in favour of the joint draft resolution and against the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom representative.

24. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) expressed his surprise that the Philippines, whose representative had taken an active part in the work of the Trusteeship Council for many years, should be a co-sponsor of the joint draft resolution. The Philippine representative must be aware, from the annual reports and the Trusteeship Council's discussions, of the measures taken by the Administering Authorities to lead the Trust Territories to self-government and independence.

25. The words of the Charter were not reproduced exactly in operative sub-paragraph 2 (a) of the operative part of the draft resolution. Admittedly, it was the duty of the Administering Authorities to promote the advancement of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories towards self-government or independence within the shortest possible time. But that was not synonymous with the achievement of self-government in the shortest possible time, which would, indeed, mean immediately. No responsible person would maintain that any one of the Trust Territories was today capable of governing itself in the true democratic sense or of maintaining its independence. It was in fact the duty of the Administering Authorities to develop in the peoples of the Trust Territories the capacity to govern themselves and to enjoy independence, and the steps taken to that end were fully described in the relevant annual reports and were subject to the vigilant scrutiny of the Trusteeship Council.

26. The Philippine representative's contention that political advancement was a prerequisite for advancement in other fields was a controversial point. Mr. Ryckmans believed, on the contrary, that the surest basis for political advancement was economic, social and cultural development, which would in fact inevitably result in the development of a political consciousness.

27. With regard to the provision in sub-paragraph 2 (b), it would appear to be the result of a misinterpretation of the terms of the Charter. The references in Article 76 b to the particular circumstances of each Territory and its people and their freely expressed wishes related to the form of self-government eventually to be granted, and would be applicable at that time. Those considerations did not apply to measures for the achievement of that objective.

28. Referring to sub-paragraph 2 (c), he was able to affirm immediately that the provisions of the Trusteeship Agreement for Ruanda-Urundi were completely adequate with respect to the factors cited in the draft resolution. The idea underlying the Trusteeship Agreements was that they should serve without modification as a constitution for the government of the Trust Territories throughout the whole period of

trusteeship, until self-government or independence was attained.

29. The possibility of fixing a time for the attainment of self-government had been fully explored during the preparation of the Trusteeship Agreements, and the inherent difficulties had led to the conclusion that that would be impossible. Some Territories were likely to reach the ultimate objective earlier than others. Moreover, although certain goals could be clearly foreseen, there were economic factors that might profoundly affect the question which were wholly outside the Administering Authorities' control. It should be recognized that premature emancipation would not be of advantage to the peoples concerned, while the fixing of an over-distant date might, on the other hand, tend to retard rather than promote development.

30. If the United Kingdom amendment was adopted, the Belgian delegation would abstain during the vote on the joint draft resolution as amended; otherwise, it would vote against it, being of the opinion that any additional information thought necessary could be obtained by extending the scope of the Trusteeship Council's Questionnaire.

31. Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland) said that the adoption of the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.187) would give the peoples of the Trust Territories a new hope and belief in the United Nations. It was understood that every Trust Territory should achieve self-government or independence as soon as possible, but the existing position was far from satisfactory. The Administering Authorities were not fulfilling their obligations under the Charter and many delegations which were reluctant to accept their vague assurances of eventual self-government would prefer that the time and manner in which that objective was to be achieved should be defined. As the draft resolution pointed out, only the Trusteeship Agreement for Somaliland under Italian administration set a specific period for the achievement of independence. The draft resolution would partly remedy the omission in the other Trusteeship Agreements. The Polish delegation would therefore vote in favour of the joint draft resolution and against the amendment submitted by the United Kingdom, which would destroy the value of the resolution by deleting its most important proviso, sub-paragraph 2 (d).

32. Mr. SERRANO GARCIA (El Salvador) said that it was his delegation's policy to support all measures designed to benefit the peoples of Trust Territories. It would therefore warmly support the draft resolution as a step forward in achieving the aims of the International Trusteeship System. The United Kingdom amendment, on the other hand, would destroy the force of the resolution, and his delegation could not support it. A definite time limit for the achievement of independence would keep alive the hopes of the peoples of the Trust Territories and would also help the other Members of the United Nations to appreciate the good faith of the Administering Authorities.

33. Mr. SOHL (Lebanon) said that he had listened attentively to the views of the United Kingdom

representative. He sympathized with the latter's attitude, but reminded him that the position of the United Kingdom was somewhat exceptional. He regretted that the Lebanese delegation was unable to accept the proposed amendment (A/C.4/L.193).

34. In reply to the Belgian representative, he said that the Lebanese delegation, which was one of the co-sponsors of the joint draft resolution, had in fact read the Trusteeship Council's report with attention and had closely followed the progress made towards the achievement of the Charter's purpose in setting up the International Trusteeship System. The draft resolution had been submitted to the Committee because the Trusteeship Council's report had revealed no signs of a major advance towards the speedy achievement of self-government or independence. The Belgian representative had suggested in addition that it would not be in the interests of the peoples of the Trust Territories to grant them immediate self-government. The draft resolution did not advocate immediate steps, but merely asked for information on the measures, taken or contemplated, which were intended to lead the Trust Territories to self-government or independence. He could not agree with the Belgian representative that a time limit might act against the interests of the peoples of the Trust Territories. If an Administering Authority fixed a longer time than ultimately proved necessary, it would always be at liberty to bring about independence at an earlier date. The Belgian representative had also been doubtful whether Trust Territories which received premature independence would be able to maintain it. That argument had often been raised in the League of Nations, but the countries about which similar doubts had been expressed had, in fact, retained and benefited from their independence.

35. Mr. MAVROS (Greece) said that the joint draft resolution was a contribution towards achieving the purposes of the Charter and coincided entirely with Greek policy in that respect. He would therefore vote in favour of the joint draft resolution and against the United Kingdom amendment.

36. Mr. MANI (India) said that, since the United Kingdom had not agreed to his offer of a compromise, he would withdraw his acceptance of paragraph 1 of the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.4/L.193) and vote in favour of the draft resolution as it stood.

37. Mr. TARAZI (Syria) whole-heartedly supported the joint draft resolution. Under the Charter, it had not been intended that the Trust Territories should retain their trusteeship status indefinitely; on the contrary, that instrument laid down as a basic objective of the International Trusteeship System the progressive development of the inhabitants of Trust Territories towards self-government or independence. The United Kingdom amendment would destroy the value of the resolution by removing the reference to a time limit, and he would therefore vote against it.

38. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) agreed that the status of Trust Territories was provisional. It was the Administering Authorities' duty to exercise temporary administration and promote the advancement of the

peoples of the Trust Territories towards self-government or independence. The draft resolution would make an effective contribution towards the achievement of that aim. It made allowance for the particular circumstances of each Territory by making it clear that self-government or independence was to be achieved as soon as was in practice possible. The Venezuelan delegation would vote in favour of the joint draft resolution and against the United Kingdom amendment.

39. Mr. ZARUBIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was in favour of the draft resolution and would support it in its entirety. The amendment proposed by the United Kingdom would remove all important points from the resolution and his delegation would therefore vote against it.

40. Mr. SCHNAKE VERGARA (Chile) said that the purpose of the joint draft resolution was to make the ideals of the Charter a reality by promoting the speedy achievement of self-government by the peoples of the Trust Territories. In asking the Administering Authorities to give an estimate of the time which would be required to achieve that end, the draft resolution was not attacking them. There was no doubt of the Administering Authorities' sincere desire to fulfil their undertaking to help the Trust Territories to become capable of self-government or independence as soon as possible. Nevertheless, it was the duty of the United Nations to observe the course of the progress towards self-government which the Administering Authorities were achieving in their Trust Territories and also its moral duty not merely to observe, but to stimulate and facilitate such progress. The draft resolution would be of assistance in carrying out both those duties.

41. The rest of the United Nations was prepared to co-operate with the Administering Authorities in their great task. It had never wished them to bear the whole burden. There were many difficulties facing the Administering Authorities, which demanded many sacrifices. Those difficulties were small, however, as against the danger of the conflicts that might break out unless progress was made towards self-government or independence. Irresistible changes had occurred in the post-war world and the desire for independence could not be stifled. The status of the Trust Territories would be changed in the end, either by violent action on the part of the peoples against the Administering Authorities, or by the Administering Authorities' faithful fulfilment, in the shortest possible time, of the aims of the International Trusteeship System. No responsible person could prefer the first alternative to the second. There could be no doubt that the Administering Authorities did intend to fulfil their obligations, but one of their responsibilities was to determine, even if only approximately, the end of the period of trusteeship. The adoption of the draft resolution would foster that fund of goodwill and desire for peace and order which was the world's best hope. If the Administering Authorities fulfilled their part of the bargain by promoting the speedy independence of the Trust Territories, they would be rewarded by the gratitude and continued friendship of the latter.

42. In view of all those considerations, it seemed essential that the Administering Authorities should make an attempt to fix a time for the end of the period of trusteeship, as a contribution towards general peace and security. The Chilean delegation would therefore vote in favour of the joint draft resolution as it stood.

43. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) stated that his delegation would be able to support the joint draft resolution only if the United Kingdom amendment was approved; otherwise, he would have to vote against it. For reasons already explained by the French, Belgian and United Kingdom representatives, he too considered that it would be neither useful nor possible for the Administering Authorities to fix a time for the expected attainment of self-government or independence by the Trust Territories. Nevertheless, he would assure the Committee that the New Zealand Government would continue to promote the political advancement of the inhabitants of the Trust Territory under its administration and their progressive development towards the ultimate objectives of the International Trusteeship System.

44. Mr. TAJIBNAPIS (Indonesia) felt that only one interpretation could be placed on the joint draft resolution before the Committee. It was the logical outcome of Article 76 b of the Charter, which proclaimed that the ultimate objective of the International Trusteeship System was self-government or independence for the peoples of the Trust Territories. In those circumstances, it was not unreasonable to ask the Administering Authorities to estimate the time required for the attainment of that objective and to outline the measures taken or contemplated to that end.

45. The precedent established by an overwhelming majority in the case of Somaliland, at the time of the adoption of General Assembly resolution 289 A (IV), justified the raising of the issue in respect of the remaining Trust Territories. The fact that a time limit was not specified in the Trusteeship Agreements—cited as grounds for objection by the United Kingdom representative—was the very basis for the submission of the draft resolution. The psychological effect of the draft resolution, if accepted and implemented by the Administering Authorities, would be far-reaching and would do much to remove the apprehension existing in the Committee and among the peoples of the Trust Territories. He would accordingly vote for it and against the United Kingdom amendment, which was

nothing but an attempt to defeat the whole purpose of the resolution.

46. Mr. ORDING (Norway) observed that the main purpose of the joint draft resolution was to express the impatience felt at the obstacles still in the way of the Trust Territories' development towards self-government or independence. The background to the problem was the present world trend in favour of far-reaching reforms, and, obviously, the sooner the desired changes could be effected, the better for all concerned. The crux of the matter, however, was how to bring about the agreed objectives. Although in full sympathy with the object of the joint draft resolution, he was nevertheless unable to overlook the grave difficulties in the way of fixing a time-table for the attainment of self-government or independence by the Trust Territories. The complexity of the question precluded any definite conclusion on that point; many unforeseeable factors and prior conditions for a settlement were involved. On the other hand, the psychological impact of setting even a target date would be tremendous.

47. Accordingly, in an attempt to take account of all relevant considerations, he submitted, on behalf of his own and the Danish and Swedish delegations, an amendment (A/C.4/L.194) to the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.187). He urged the representatives of the Administering Authorities to give that amendment careful consideration. It would obviously have been easy for them to accede to the request in the original draft resolution, but their sense of responsibility had undoubtedly prevented them from taking such an easy way out.

48. Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) said that he would have pleasure in supporting the joint draft resolution in its original form, since it reproduced ideas repeatedly defended by his delegation in past years.

49. Mr. STARY (Czechoslovakia) thought the joint draft resolution fully consistent with the principles and objectives of the International Trusteeship System. Sub-paragraph 2 (d) of the operative part, in particular, met the wishes of the indigenous inhabitants of the Trust Territories as expressed in many petitions and, in view of that special significance, he would oppose the United Kingdom amendment.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.