

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



FOURTH COMMITTEE, 260th

MEETING

Friday, 31 October 1952, at 3 p.m.

Headquarters, New York

CONTENTS

	Page
Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter (<i>continued</i>)	81
Requests for oral hearings	86

Chairman: Mr. Rodolfo MUNOZ (Argentina).

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter (*continued*)

[Item 33]*

1. Mr. AVELINO (Brazil) said that the Belgian representative's ingenious suggestion that all countries with backward groups of population should submit information on their conditions quite ignored that Chapter XI of the Charter was a declaration regarding Non-Self-Governing Territories. The meaning of the word "territories" in that connexion was political entities distinct from the main State. Metropolitan countries and their colonial territories were considered in public law as separate bodies. There were in Brazil some social groups, such as the primitive tribes of the upper Amazon and Matto Grosso, which had not yet been brought into contact with modern civilization; but upon their contact with civilization they would immediately enjoy the rights and prerogatives of all Brazilian nationals. The same was not true of the primitive peoples in certain Non-Self-Governing Territories.

2. The Administering Members were required to submit information on conditions in their territories as a whole and not only among certain ethnic groups in those territories. The peoples in some Non-Self-Governing Territories, such as Morocco and Tunisia, were in no sense backward. They were covered by the provisions of Chapter XI solely because they were not yet self-administering. The Belgian representative was using the reference to backward peoples in sovereign countries as a weapon to intimidate the non-administering Powers. The non-administering Powers, however, had no desire to judge the administering Powers but merely to discuss their problems and to offer advice.

3. The Australian suggestion that the proposal to establish the Committee on Information on a permanent basis should be opposed because the Soviet Union was in favour of it was not acceptable. Many other representatives were in favour of such a plan, and they must

take the initiative and not allow the Soviet Union to pose as the most active defender of the rights of the dependent peoples.

4. Conditions were unsatisfactory in many independent countries, but that fact did not excuse shortcomings in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Efforts were being made to improve conditions everywhere. If the administering Powers were less impatient of criticism, the task of the United Nations on behalf of the non-self-governing peoples would be easier.

5. Mr. DJERDA (Yugoslavia) noted that the Polish and Byelorussian representatives had not sought to deny the exploitation of Eastern Europe by the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union posed as a supporter of independence for the Non-Self-Governing Territories, but at San Francisco, during the drafting of the Charter, the Soviet representative had claimed that the whole of Chapter XI was superfluous since its provisions were already contained in Chapter I and there was no need for a special chapter on colonial matters. The Soviet delegation had been the only one to take such a stand; in most quarters Chapter XI had been regarded as the first international colonial convention and one of the most progressive elements of the Charter. The attitude now adopted in the Fourth Committee by the Soviet Union was intended solely for propaganda.

6. Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) said that the Australian representative had to some extent misinterpreted the Cuban position on the Non-Self-Governing Territories. He himself had said, in his earlier statement for the Cuban delegation, that in colonial problems the Soviet Union's trump card was the suicidal conduct of the administering Powers themselves. The Cuban delegation sincerely believed that the work of the Committee on Information, which allowed administering Powers and non-administering Powers to co-operate freely, was an essential factor in resolving the dilemma of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. The Cuban representative in the General Assembly (379th plenary meeting) had said that Cuba must support the complete fulfilment of the terms of Chapter XI, in

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

view of the part it had played since 1940 in promoting resolutions by the inter-American community in favour of the self-determination of all peoples in the Americas, and the need to put an end to colonial régimes and foreign occupation in American territory.

7. The Australian representative had called the proposal for a permanent Committee on Information a Soviet propaganda scheme, but twenty-one non-Soviet countries had put forward a proposal to establish the Committee on a permanent basis. There had been a Cuban proposal as early as 1946 to establish the Committee on a continuing basis until all Non-Self-Governing Territories had achieved independence. The Soviet Union had at that time opposed the Cuban proposal, but now, with its satellites, it wished to appear as champion of the colonial peoples and supported the idea of a permanent committee as a political manoeuvre. The Cuban delegation greatly regretted that propaganda motives had been allowed to intervene. It desired only the re-establishment of a committee on which administering and non-administering Powers were equally represented and which had done such harmonious and useful work in digesting for the General Assembly the immense mass of information coming from the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

8. Mr. JESSUP (United States of America) said that the Ukrainian representative had made certain errors in speaking of the American territory of Puerto Rico. His comments on the new Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, which had been freely adopted by democratic processes, had perhaps been due to his unfamiliarity with democratic constitutions. However, he had also misinterpreted certain statistical data. In his remarks on the extent of unemployment in Puerto Rico he had failed to note that the figures revealed that the labour force had increased by 44,000 over the previous year. He had also alleged that the majority of the Puerto Rican people were chronically undernourished. There was admittedly undernourishment, but the steps taken to deal with it included the provision of 35 million school lunches annually at a cost of 9 million dollars, an increase of almost 20 per cent over the previous year. He had said that the number of schools had decreased since 1950, but had failed to say that he was referring to rural elementary schools and that during the same period that decrease had been more than made up by the establishment of 157 new rural secondary schools. The total number of schools of all kinds had increased by 145 and the number of pupils by 8.5 per cent.

9. Mr. SALAZAR (Peru) said that the Peruvian delegation was unable to accept the argument of the Belgian representative, even in its modified form. The first suggestion had been that the sovereign States of Latin America should submit information on all their aboriginal peoples. Such information would affect 15 million citizens of sovereign nations. The Belgian representative had then proposed to limit the information to peoples completely out of contact with civilization, such as the savage tribes of the upper Amazon and Orinoco, numbering some hundreds of thousands only. Those tribes were in fact protected by all the legislation of the sovereign States of Brazil, Colombia, Venezuela and Peru.

10. The Belgian representative had referred to a General Assembly resolution (275 (III)) adopted in 1949

on the study of the social problems of the aboriginal populations and other under-developed social groups of the American continent. That resolution, however, had not been adopted in the Fourth Committee. It was connected with technical assistance and constituted quite a different approach to the problem. Peru had been glad to receive the assistance of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, including the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, the Food and Agriculture Organization and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, in economic and social matters; but it would not accept the obligation which the Belgian representative had tried to impose.

11. Mr. KHATTAK (Pakistan) remarked that some representatives of administering Powers, presumably wishing to stress that backwardness was not confined to Non-Self-Governing Territories, had regretted that the Committee was not authorized to make comparisons between conditions in the Non-Self-Governing Territories and those in certain sovereign States. That was, of course, true; but many sovereign States were backward today because they had been Non-Self-Governing Territories or semi-colonial countries until quite recently and had not yet had time to wipe out the results of centuries of foreign rule. No one could deny that they had made remarkable progress during their few years of independence. In any event the analogy was not sound. A country was entitled to squander its own resources if it wished, but not resources it held in trust for others.

12. The administering Powers had done much to benefit the Non-Self-Governing Territories, but much remained to be done. Those Powers were not in the Non-Self-Governing Territories from altruistic motives or at the invitation of the inhabitants, but because they had been strong enough to take possession. True, they had honourably discharged their obligations towards the inhabitants, but they had also derived corresponding or greater advantages from their connexion with the territories. Perhaps some territories were a financial drain on the resources of the metropolitan country, but they might have a strategic value which could not be computed in money.

13. The administering Powers were obliged to free the Non-Self-Governing Territories as soon as possible. A foreign occupation should not be prolonged once the inhabitants had become clearly capable of governing themselves. The people of Morocco and Tunisia belonged to an ancient civilization and were quite capable of managing their own affairs efficiently, as was proved by the strength of their nationalist movement. So far that movement had been suppressed by force of arms, but sooner or later France would have to bow before the united front of those people, supported by nations all over the world.

14. The United Kingdom deserved praise for voluntarily abdicating its power in Pakistan, India, Burma and Ceylon, thus winning the friendship of the people of those countries. That was an example which other administering Powers would do well to follow.

15. Mr. SHEIKIN (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) held that the Yugoslav representative's further statements concerning the USSR and the peoples' democracies were slanderous and entirely irrelevant.

Their object was to conceal from the Yugoslav people the truth of their betrayal to the Anglo-American imperialists. Only a few years earlier Marshal Tito himself had said that the Western democracies, in asserting that Yugoslavia was a satellite country of the Soviet Union, were slandering both countries, and had added that Yugoslavia was walking hand in hand with the USSR because from there it heard the voice of peace whereas from the West it heard of nothing but the atom bomb and threats of war.

16. Mr. YURANS (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, according to the Yugoslav representative, the USSR delegation was the only one that criticized conditions in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. That was patently untrue; a number of other delegations had expressed dissatisfaction with the situation in the Non-Self-Governing Territories and had quoted figures in support of their arguments. The Australian representative had accused the Soviet Union representative of indulging in propaganda, but the sources from which his alleged propaganda statements had been drawn were official documents based on information supplied by the Administering Members themselves.

17. The Yugoslav representative had attempted to compare conditions in the Non-Self-Governing Territories with conditions in countries where Europeans lived all their lives as neighbours and where they had been born and would doubtless die. He had said that officials and experts from the Soviet Union received higher pay than the local inhabitants. It was quite proper that a person sent away from his own country to work should receive a living allowance, just as did United Nations officials on mission. Furthermore, the Yugoslav representative had stated that the Soviet Union had voted against the adoption of Chapter XI of the Charter at San Francisco. If the records of the San Francisco Conference had been available, Mr. Yurans would have been able quite easily to refute that assertion. The Yugoslav representative's assertion that at the San Francisco Conference Mr. Sobolev, the USSR representative, had objected to the inclusion in the Charter of Chapter XI, on Non-Self-Governing Territories, was false. Neither Mr. Sobolev nor any other representative of the USSR had made any such statement. Furthermore, the USSR representative in Committee II/4, which dealt with questions of trusteeship and Non-Self-Governing Territories, had been, not Mr. Sobolev, but Mr. Novikov.

18. The remarks of the Cuban representative had illustrated how any statement or attitude of the USSR was misinterpreted. Apparently the Cuban representative was annoyed because the original proposal that the Committee on Information should be continued had been attributed to the Soviet Union instead of to him. The Soviet Union delegation had not, however, laid any claim to the proposal; it had been attributed to the USSR by the Australian representative. Apparently representatives did not yet understand that the Soviet Union was genuinely anxious that conditions in the Non-Self-Governing Territories should improve and would support any proposal to that end.

19. Mr. GAJEWSKI (Poland) protested strongly against the allegations made by the Yugoslav representative, which had no connexion with the item under

discussion. In making his unfounded and provocative remarks on the situation in Poland, he had not only disregarded the rules of procedure, but had also attempted to mislead the Committee.

20. Mr. TAJIBNAPIS (Indonesia), in reply to the representative of Belgium, maintained that the Indonesian Government's resettlement scheme was no more within the Committee's competence than would be a plan of the Belgian Government to move large numbers of Flemish peasants to the part of Belgium inhabited by Walloons.

21. The Australian representative's remarks had obviously been designed to praise the colonial system and to impress the members of the Committee with the lofty ideals which inspired the administering Powers. There was nothing new in that; many books had been written on the subject, but the fact remained that domination of one people by another was unjust and deprivation of human rights and racial discrimination were offences against humanity.

22. Mr. ULLRICH (Czechoslovakia) protested against the slanderous references that had been made to the relations between the USSR and the countries of the peoples' democracies. The friendship of the Czechoslovak people for the people of the Soviet Union was not recent but was based on their common history. During the Second World War the two peoples had fought side by side and 80,000 Soviet troops had fallen in Czechoslovakia.

23. ✓ Mr. BAZHAN (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) replied to the United States representative that the data he had given about Puerto Rico were quoted from the information supplied by the administering Power. Perhaps free school meals were issued to the children of Puerto Rico, but the need for them proved that the people were undernourished and helped to explain why child mortality was four times higher in Puerto Rico than in the United States. The United States representative could not deny that the number of primary schools had fallen, whether more secondary schools had been opened or not. He had said that the new Constitution had been hailed with joy by the whole population, but had omitted to mention the large number of Puerto Ricans who had been imprisoned for infringements of the Constitution.

24. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) said that in view of the situation that had arisen during the general debate on the first item of the agenda and, after the close of the debate, by the exercise of the right of reply under rule 114 of the rules of procedure, and in view of the terms of rule 109, particularly its second part, and of rule 112, his delegation would later raise the whole question of the application of those rules.

25. The CHAIRMAN called on the Committee to consider draft resolutions A and B, part one, annex II, of the report of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/2219 and Corr.1); the amendment to draft resolution B submitted by the United Kingdom delegation (A/C.4/L.214); and the joint draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Brazil, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Iraq, Pakistan and the Philippines (A/C.4/208).

26. Mr. HOPKINSON (United Kingdom) said that he had no comments to make on draft resolution A, which had been accepted by the United Kingdom representative in the Committee on Information.

27. His delegation had also voted for draft resolution B, and hoped to be able to do so again. As had been explained in the Committee on Information (A/AC.35/SR.70), however, the United Kingdom vote had certain reservations attached to it, the most important of which was that a matter of universal concern such as discrimination between individuals and groups on grounds of race and religion should be dealt with not in a narrow context but on a universal basis. His delegation was prepared to take part fully in such discussions and to support recommendations calculated to eradicate such practices throughout the world. Subject to that reservation, and without prejudice to his delegation's attitude to the functions and status of the Committee on Information, he would vote for the draft resolution.

28. He suggested, however, that the words "the indigenous inhabitants" in the third paragraph of the preamble should be replaced by the words "sections of the population" (A/C.4/L.218). Protective measures in territories under United Kingdom administration were designed to protect all sections of the population which might be exposed to abuse.

29. The other two amendments he proposed to draft resolution B appeared in document A/C.4/L.215, which read:

"1. Amend paragraph 2 of the operative part by adding at the end the words 'of a racial or religious character'.

"2. Amend paragraph 3 of the operative part by inserting between the words 'racial' and 'grounds' the words 'or religious'."

30. He considered that those amendments would make the resolution more comprehensive and useful, but his support of the resolution would not at the present stage be conditional on their acceptance. While the recommendation in operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution B reflected the general policy of the United Kingdom Government, there were frequently local and physical difficulties which made its immediate observance impracticable in certain limited areas.

31. Mr. PIGNON (France) said that he would abstain from voting on draft resolution A for the reasons he had explained in the Committee on Information (A/AC.35/SR.70).

32. With regard to draft resolution B, the French delegation had told the Committee on Information that in its opinion the problem of race discrimination, like all other questions affecting human rights, called for a universal solution and could not be examined piecemeal, since a partial solution might well become a biased solution. Furthermore, his delegation had already deprecated the practice of raising the same or related questions simultaneously in several United Nations organs, some of which were not competent to deal with them. That practice confused the issue and detracted from the force of any solution. It was a dangerous gamble and a mistake to try to study race discrimination in its restricted application to the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Confusion would cer-

tainly ensue and might indeed be welcomed since it would ultimately lead to the astonishingly simple deduction that colonization was tantamount to racial discrimination.

33. The Committee on Information, to judge by its report, had nearly always attributed the differences in status between the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories and of the administering State to racial discrimination. Such a categorical and general formula lacked foundation and could be exploited only too easily by those who were systematically hostile to the administering Powers. Racial discrimination existed only if a person or ethnic group was deprived of certain political or civil rights or placed at a disadvantage because of race or colour. There was no racial discrimination if the limitations imposed on a person or ethnic group were merely a temporary result of the person's lack of qualifications or the group's backwardness. Had the Committee on Information adopted that approach, it would have been fully supported by the French delegation, since France was essentially and instinctively opposed to racial discrimination.

34. The French Constitution proclaimed that all human beings, without distinction as to race, religion or creed, possessed inalienable and sacred rights and that France guaranteed to all free access to public office and the individual or collective exercise of rights and freedoms. Those principles had been put into effect: for example, under the Lamine-Guèye Act of 30 June 1950 all officials of the Ministry for French Overseas Territories were paid on an equal footing whatever their origin; the principle of equal access to public office had been given effect by several decrees; all the major schools, universities and examinations were open to all without distinction; a growing number of Africans sat in the French Parliament each time that body was renewed and the President of the Council of the Republic was a coloured man, as were several governors of overseas territories. The human dignity of any individual, whatever his race, creed or colour, was respected in the territories for which France was responsible and with the necessary qualifications he could attain the highest positions and responsibilities.

35. France had often been accused of assimilatory tendencies in its policy towards its overseas territories. To condemn a policy for being at one and the same time assimilatory and racial seemed utterly illogical.

36. The French Government punished severely any act expressing racial prejudice that was brought to its attention. Such acts, however, were becoming increasingly rare because the Africans, as a result of their French education, were no longer prepared to tolerate them. The Africans in the French territories were fully aware of their human dignity. Their behaviour was not servile; it was the behaviour of free men.

37. There was no question of racial discrimination in wages: qualifications were the sole criterion. Businessmen were concerned first and foremost with output and, given equal qualifications, would prefer to employ indigenous rather than European workers because while paying them the same salary they would save the costs of transport and home leave.

38. The problem affected communities in a different manner from individuals, and many studies would have to be made before scientific laws could be established in such a complex and fluid matter. The Peruvian representative had rightly stressed the need for objective sociological research divorced from all ideological considerations. Certain facts had emerged from experience and must be taken into account. There should be no question of considering a race to be under any permanent disability as such; the point at issue was a community's degree of evolution and its sense of responsibility. To say that a gap of several centuries could not be filled in a few months or even a few years was not to allege racial superiority but merely to state simply an obvious sociological fact. Furthermore, indigenous societies in Non-Self-Governing Territories, like other societies, must not be considered in isolation but in relation to their wide geographical environment, which merged almost imperceptibly into the world as a whole. Values had changed, and the principle of nationalities valid at the time of Napoleon III or even of President Wilson could no longer be accepted.

39. One of the most vital and urgent problems in indigenous societies was the part to be played by the élite, or the more advanced individuals. No rigid principle could be laid down; many factors must be taken into account, such as the proportion of advanced to backward people, the attitude of the masses to the élite, and the sense of responsibility of the élite. His experience showed that the élite in every territory unconsciously developed a sense of responsibility. It had been found that democracy could best be taught from the bottom up, and that was the idea underlying the establishment in all French territories of representative institutions at every stage of central and local government. The élite had their place both in their own country and in the French Union, where they could already attain the highest responsibilities. The French Government never opposed legitimate ambitions, which were natural and even necessary. It was, however, duty bound to oppose the irresponsibility of those who demanded all or nothing. The French Government neither despised nor hated the indigenous élite; on the contrary, it was extremely proud of them and did everything within its power to lead them from the narrow paths of semi-medieval nationalism to the wider concept of human destiny expressed in the United Nations. That did not mean that the French Government would act to the detriment of the basic and lasting interests of the indigenous masses or stifle that local patriotism which it had itself promoted by putting an end to internecine rivalries and quarrels.

40. The Haitian representative had stated that there seemed to be a relationship of cause and effect between colonization and racial discrimination. Racial discrimination, however, had existed and still existed quite apart from colonization. One had only to recall the sufferings of the Jewish people and many other ethnic and religious communities, some of which had been practically exterminated in recent times. Leaving aside the question of minorities within a country, the phenomena to which the Haitian representative had referred did not illustrate cause and effect, but were merely coincidental. Racial discrimination could be alleged only if there were a conscious attempt to

perpetuate the *status quo* in the name of racial superiority or racial egoism.

41. There was a very real and serious danger in racial prejudice in reverse. Every form of racial discrimination must without doubt be eradicated, but it would be extremely dangerous, even for noble ideological reasons, to extend the concept of racial discrimination beyond what experience and reason showed to be its true limits. That could not fail to lead to distrust and ultimately to open xenophobia. It would be tragic if the thoughtless intervention of the United Nations should poison the atmosphere of co-operation that must exist between the peoples of the world.

42. Those were the reasons why his delegation had refused to uphold the report of the Committee on Information, and why it could not vote for draft resolution B. It would be against all French traditions to vote against any resolution intended to combat racial discrimination. He would very willingly have supported a resolution consisting only of the universally recognized principles stated in paragraphs 4 and 6 of the draft before the Committee; such a resolution would not have been outside the Committee's competence. He could not, however, agree to any intervention in the legislative field properly reserved to sovereign States. France would gratefully accept sincere advice and comments, but could not agree to open the way to a type of control whereby debatable rules which were not universal would be applied to certain States alone, or to the possibility of intervention in France's domestic affairs. Frenchmen, who knew nothing of racial discrimination, could never understand that they were subject to the control and judgment of certain countries which practised such discrimination. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote on draft resolution B.

43. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that his Government was determined to suppress all discrimination contrary to the Charter in the administration, legislation and life of the Belgian Congo. Belgium had signed the Charter and would abide by it. The discussion in the Commission on Human Rights, however, had shown how difficult it was to translate general principles into specific rules. His delegation had not had time to consider all the repercussions that draft resolution B would have in a country like the Congo, where local customs determined the personal status of the indigenous inhabitants. The Belgian delegation might have been able to accept a resolution binding on all Members of the United Nations, but the present resolution would bind only the Administering Members, who must therefore be particularly wary. His delegation was quite unable to accept any measures which were not universal. Furthermore, draft resolution B touched on the political field, which was not within the Committee's competence and on which Belgium submitted no information. He would therefore abstain from discussing and from voting on draft resolution B. To do so implied no change whatever in Belgium's support of the principle that racial discrimination should be eradicated throughout the world.

44. Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand) said that his delegation's silence in the general debate should not be interpreted as evidence of any lack of interest in the

welfare of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. He appreciated the efforts of the Administering Members to promote the well-being of the territories under their responsibility. On the whole the debate had been useful and constructive. If the suggestions made by certain representatives were put into effect, the welfare of the non-self-governing peoples would be promoted. He would therefore support draft resolution A and the joint draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/208, which was a natural and logical consequence of Article 73 e and in no way infringed the rights or responsibilities of the administering Powers; it would enable the Committee on Information to discharge its task more fully and effectively.

45. Draft resolution B represented a praiseworthy attempt to solve a very delicate problem. The measures recommended were consistent with the Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Buddhist principle of tolerance, and social concepts in Thailand.

46. His delegation favoured the continuation of the Committee on Information, which had proved ex-

tremely helpful to the dependent territories and the administering Powers. It would support any amendment to that effect.

Requests for oral hearings

47. Mr. BENSON (Secretariat) read two telegrams requesting oral hearings: one from the Traditional Assembly of the People, Douala;¹ the second from the Territorial Assembly of the Cameroons under French administration.²

48. The CHAIRMAN said that if there were no objections those telegrams would be circulated as official documents.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

¹ Subsequently distributed as document A/C.4/214.

² Subsequently distributed as document A/C.4/213/Rev.1.