

GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

## SEVENTH SESSION

## Official Records



## FOURTH COMMITTEE, 289th

## MEETING

Tuesday, 2 December 1952, at 4 p.m.

Headquarters, New York

## CONTENTS

	Page
Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/2150) ( <i>continued</i> )	283

**Chairman: Mr. Rodolfo MUNOZ (Argentina).****Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/2150)  
(*continued*)**

[Item 12]\*

HEARING OF THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MERU  
CITIZENS UNION (A/C.4/221, A/C.4/L.242, A/  
C.4/L.243, A/C.4/L.244) (*continued*)

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Japhet and  
Mr. Seaton, representatives of the Meru Citizens Union,  
took places at the Committee table.*

1. Mr. CALERO RODRIGUES (Brazil) wished to make it clear that when he had asked at the 288th meeting whether the Tanganyika system was super-totalitarian, as it considered the uprooting of 3,000 members of the Meru tribe of no consequence, he had not intended to imply that such a system really did exist in that Trust Territory.

2. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) thanked the Brazilian representative for his statement.

3. Mr. CALERO RODRIGUES (Brazil) introduced the amendment (A/C.4/L.243) which his delegation and the delegations of Ecuador and Peru wished made to the eight-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.242). Brazil considered that paragraph 3 of the operative part was the main part of that joint draft resolution. Certain other paragraphs of the draft were, however, contentious or drafted in too strong terms.

4. There were serious objections to the fourth paragraph of the preamble. While it was true that the eviction of the Wa-Meru had resulted in their lands being transferred to European colonists, the Administering Authority had emphasized that the land transfer plan as a whole was in the interests of the indigenous inhabitants. There was, in any case, no need to mention that point in the draft resolution.

5. Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the operative part also seemed injudicious, as the Trusteeship Council had specially recommended that such evictions must not occur again. Lastly, he suggested the deletion of the clause in

paragraph 3 of the operative part referring to the restitution of the legal rights of the Meru tribe to the lands in question. That was a legal question which need not be mentioned in the draft resolution.

6. Mr. PANT (India) pointed out that he was personally acquainted with the country and the people in question. As regards the general problem of the economic and social development of Tanganyika, to which the representative of the United Kingdom had referred, he felt that if that difficult and complicated question was taken up in the right spirit, it could be solved and regrettable happenings such as the eviction of the Meru tribe avoided. The United Kingdom representative had referred to the development of cattle-breeding in the Territory and had implied that in order to attain that objective foreign capital and immigrants were necessary and that, if need be, certain groups of the population must be displaced. The carrying out of development projects sometimes called for displacements of that type in all parts of the world. They could however be effected without conflict, provided the administration co-operated with the indigenous population and did not commit serious administrative mistakes. If the Wa-Meru, the Masai and other tribes in Tanganyika were taught how to use modern farming methods, the problem of the development of cattle-breeding in the Territory could be solved without calling on immigrants for their assistance and dispossessing Africans.

7. The United Kingdom representative had said that to create tomorrow's ideal, some people might have to suffer today. That was a very dangerous doctrine. History showed that unless the methods to be used were chosen with much care, the objectives aimed at were never attained. It should not be more difficult to persuade the Wa-Meru to take part in the development of stock-raising than it had been to persuade other tribes to participate in developing sisal or coffee plantations.

8. The United Kingdom representative had also stated that the decision taken by the Tanganyika Government was irrevocable. He urged all Administering Authorities to repudiate such a notion, which could only cause trouble. History evolved rapidly and it was wise to adapt oneself to that evolution without renouncing any

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

principles. As to the question of prestige, he thought that the prestige of a person who acted justly and recognized past mistakes was bound to increase. He regretted that the Tanganyika Government, which at one time had assured the Meru tribe that it would not be expelled, had not kept to that wise decision.

9. As regards the joint draft resolution, India agreed with the aims of the authors of that draft, but considered that certain paragraphs could have been better drafted. He submitted an amendment (A/C.4/L.244) to paragraph 2 of the operative part, referring to the Trusteeship Council's decision. The Trusteeship Council was a permanent United Nations body. It was certainly not infallible, but the Fourth Committee should not blame it in such strong terms.

10. India considered that the development of any territory could only be successfully carried out with the co-operation, goodwill and active support of the population of that territory. As regards the homogeneity of the areas of Tanganyika occupied by different races, the Indian delegation supported the development of a multi-racial integrated society. Europeans, Indians and Africans should be associated on an equal footing in the development of the Territory in all fields. Any other method, any attempt at coercion, would lead only to disorder and chaos.

11. India approved the general attitude taken by the authors of the eight-Power draft resolution, but requested that it should be put to the vote paragraph by paragraph.

12. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that the Meru tribe had the Belgian delegation's sympathy as it had been dispossessed of its ancestral lands and was convinced of its rights. The Belgian delegation, and all members of the Trusteeship Council, regretted what had happened, and thought that the matter had not been dealt with as it should have been and that unfortunate mistakes had been made.

13. When a difficult problem such as the redistribution of land in northern Tanganyika arose, a distinction should be drawn between steps which could be taken, those which might be taken in the future and those which should not be taken. It might for example become necessary to create forest reserves. If the indigenous inhabitants stubbornly refused to give up a part of their land for the creation of those reserves, it might be better to have patience and try to educate them and to convince them of the necessity of the measure contemplated. Similarly, should the destruction of a large part of the cattle belonging to certain tribes be desirable from the economic point of view, more harm than good would be done by trying to impose such a measure by force. In the present case everything should have been done to convince the Meru tribe of the importance of the government's cattle-raising project.

14. The Administering Authority must certainly regret, as did Belgium, that, in spite of the orders given to the police to act carefully, the Administration had allowed the situation to get out of hand owing to the systematic opposition of the tribe. It was also possible that certain friends of the Wa-Meru had not helped them by encouraging them to adopt an intransigent attitude.

15. He recalled, as had the representatives of France, the Netherlands and Canada, cases of expropriation for public purposes which had taken place in all civilized countries. It was often necessary to take such measures in spite of perfectly honest sentimental considerations. The question was therefore whether expropriation for the public good was or was not warranted. He was surprised, in that connexion, that none of the representatives who had criticized the Administering Authority had asked that the report of the Wilson Commission<sup>1</sup> on which the Administering Authority had based its action in taking the incriminating step should be consulted. No one who had read that report could believe that 3,000 indigenous inhabitants had been expelled merely to make room for thirteen European farmers. He pointed out that the White Paper<sup>2</sup> merely referred to a very small part of the general development plan mentioned in the Wilson report. The Wilson Commission's task had been to solve the problems created by the poverty of the soil and the population increase in northern Tanganyika. The greater part of the programme drawn up by the Commission had been carried out without the Tanganyika Government having to ask the Legislative Council for special powers. However, as the Wa-Meru had objected to their transfer to the southern part of the Territory, the Tanganyika Government had had to ask the Legislative Council for such special powers, and it was that question which had been examined in the White Paper.

16. It was also surprising that no member of the Committee had asked to consult the records of the proceedings of the Legislative Council of Tanganyika. That Council consisted of European, Indian and indigenous members, some of them elected and some nominated. The Legislative Council had unanimously approved the findings of the White Paper. Had those findings been contrary to the interests of the indigenous people, it was hardly likely that none of its members would have opposed them.

17. Prominence had been given to the fact that Judge Wilson himself had declared his opposition to the principle of homogeneous settlement of areas by different races. Judge Wilson had nevertheless been careful to say that he had endeavoured to conform with that principle whenever he had judged its application to be fair and possible, as in the case of the Wa-Meru. The Wilson Commission had weighed every possibility including the total eviction of Europeans from the area of the Meru and Kilimanjaro Mountains. Yet it had come to the conclusion that there was no other solution for the problem of over-population in northern Tanganyika but to spread out towards the vast plainlands. The Wilson Commission had also considered keeping the Wa-Meru in the Northern Reserve where farms No. 31 and No. 328, previously bought back by them, were situated. It had concluded, however, that that would merely be a temporary alleviation.

18. He pointed out that the long-term plans drawn up by the Wilson Commission included the allocation of some lands at present settled by the Masai tribe to the Wa-Meru and other tribes. Were it now to decide

<sup>1</sup> *Report of the Arusha-Moshi Lands Commission*, Government Printer, Dare-es-Salaam, 1947.

<sup>2</sup> See *The Meru Land Problem*, White Paper, Legislative Council of Tanganyika, Government Printer, Dare-es-Salaam, 1952.

in the Wa-Meru's favour, how would the General Assembly answer the Masai, should they one day appear to submit a petition protesting against their own eviction?

19. The area of the two farms bought back by the Wa-Meru was only 5,800 acres. The other lands from which they had been evicted formed the Sanya Corridor and had an area of 78,000 acres. In its report, the Wilson Commission had stated that those lands were very poor and could at best be used for sheep-raising. Of the people affected by the Wilson Commission plan, the Chagga, the Masai and the dispossessed Europeans had accepted the decision taken in their regard. The Wa-Meru alone had taken up a wholly intransigent attitude.

20. The Belgian delegation would vote against the joint draft resolution, whereby the General Assembly would be condemning the Administering Authority before the Fourth Committee had made an adequate study of the problem.

21. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) expressed his delegation's sympathy for the Wa-Meru in the love and strong attachment which they showed for the land so long inhabited by them. The Union of South Africa was sure, however, that the Administering Authority had taken that aspect of the matter fully into account and had been regretfully forced to conclude that transfer of part of the Meru tribe had become necessary in the Territory's general interest.

22. With regard to the eight-Power draft resolution, the South African delegation considered that its adoption by the Fourth Committee without a careful examination of the general problem of the development of Tanganyika would be an interference in the actual administration of the Territory. He cited the provisions of Article 79 of the Charter, recalling that the Trusteeship Agreement concluded in accordance with that article gave the United Kingdom Government full administrative powers over the Territory. The General Assembly could express an opinion regarding development plans drawn up by the Administrative Authority, but a request to the Authority to cancel a decision taken as part of a general development plan would constitute interference that was incompatible with the provisions of the Trusteeship Agreement. Operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution would undoubtedly mean such interference.

23. He also drew the Committee's attention to the consequences that such a decision would have for the future. If the General Assembly could at any time invite an Administering Authority to cancel measures that it had taken, it would become impossible for the Administering Authorities to lead the Trust Territories towards self-government or independence with the necessary prestige and continuity.

24. The authors of the joint draft resolution proposed in addition that disapproval of the Trusteeship Council should be expressed in strong terms, without taking account of the Council's recommendations as set forth in resolution 468 (XI). Nor did they bear in mind the decision taken by the Legislative Council of Tanganyika. Although it was true that its members were nominated, not elected, the establishment of the Council had nevertheless marked a step forward in the Terri-

tory's development and the United Nations would not be helping that development by showing distrust of the Legislative Council. In that connexion, he reminded the Committee that one of its previous decisions taken at the request of some petitioners had aroused a protest from a legislative organ of another Trust Territory.

25. The draft resolution would in fact transform the Fourth Committee and the General Assembly into a tribunal. The Committee had neither the authority nor the detailed knowledge of the problem needed to assume the function of a tribunal. The Administering Authority, before taking any decision, had made a lengthy and thorough study of all aspects of the matter. The Committee should not take any decision in an opposite sense after a comparatively short discussion devoted chiefly to hearing the views of one of the parties concerned. If in the future the Committee was thus to assume the role of tribunal in all cases of disagreement between an Administering Authority and groups of the population in a Territory, the Administering Authorities would no longer be in a position to lead the Trust Territories along the path mapped out for them in the Charter. The South African delegation would vote against the joint draft resolution.

26. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) stated that the joint draft resolution dealt with a very specific matter—the eviction of a fairly large number of the inhabitants of a Trust Territory from their ancestral lands. It made no reference to the Wilson report, passed no judgment upon it nor recommended that effect should not be given to its recommendations. It merely recommended that the Administering Authority should suspend the execution of any plan for the redistribution of land which would entail the eviction of indigenous inhabitants. The draft resolution's basic purpose was to remedy a situation involving a violation of human rights.

27. The most serious objection that had been raised against the draft was that members of the Fourth Committee had not studied the Wilson report thoroughly. He did not think that there was any need for the Committee to examine every detail of the plan recommended by that report. There was, in fact, no justification whatever for the measures taken by the Administering Authority and the Committee could in no event endorse them. The objection had also been made that the legislation of every country contained provisions concerning expropriation for public purposes. In such cases, however, the public interest had first to be proved. In the event of dispute, the case was brought before a court and expropriation took place only by virtue of an enforceable judgment. Thus the argument adduced was not valid. Furthermore, there was a wide difference between dispossession of individuals with the object of building a canal or a dam, and dispossession of indigenous people for the purpose of handing over their lands to European settlers.

28. Although it was true that the General Assembly was not a tribunal, it was not correct to claim that it had no right to express opinions contrary to those of its subsidiary bodies. The Charter stipulated that the Trusteeship Council should act under the authority of the General Assembly. It might be assumed when the General Assembly remained silent that it approved the

recommendations of the subsidiary organ concerned; but in the present instance, it could not do so.

9. The question of the Wa-Meru was highly complicated and raised a moral problem involving the prestige of the United Nations itself, which had to ensure, under the Trusteeship System, the protection of the indigenous peoples. It was therefore essential for the United Nations to be able to count on the support of the peoples of the Trust Territories and to gain their confidence, and it would be unable to do so if it did not right the wrongs to which those peoples might be subjected. The United Nations, which was composed of representatives of peoples, would be heading for disaster if it were to lose their confidence.

10. The Guatemalan delegation was unable to accept the amendments proposed jointly by the Brazilian, Ecuadorean and Peruvian delegations (A/C.4/L.243). The fourth paragraph of the preamble was essential, for it was on that paragraph that the whole draft resolution rested. The most he could accept would be the deletion of the last clause, "with the purpose of transferring these lands to European settlers". He also opposed the deletion of operative paragraphs 1 and 2, but would be prepared to accept the text proposed by the Indian delegation in substitution for paragraph 2.

11. The authors of the eight-Power draft resolution had been moved solely by the desire to remedy an injustice, and he was ready to support any final text that would reflect that desire.

12. Mr. TAJIBNAPIS (Indonesia) had been surprised to hear the Netherlands representative attempt to justify the steps taken against the Wa-Meru since, at the time of the San Francisco Conference, it was the Netherlands delegation who had had inserted, in the report of the Rapporteur of Committee II/4,<sup>3</sup> the interpretation given by the United States representative, that the protection of indigenous inhabitants against abuses included particularly protection of the arable land and of indigenous inhabitants. It was true that that had been an interpretation of Article 73, but the principles proclaimed should with all the more reason apply to the Trust Territories.

13. According to the provisions of national legislations concerning expropriation, individuals could be dispossessed of their property if that were in the public interest. The removal of the Wa-Meru from their lands was, however, not in the public interest, but in order to transfer the lands to private individuals. That was an unparalleled case. He wanted to make it clear that, contrary to certain implications that had been made, no transfers of population had been carried out by force in Indonesia, at any rate under the present régime.

14. The Canadian representative had declared that the General Assembly was not a tribunal. That was true, but the Assembly was bound to see to it that the Trusteeship System operated smoothly, and there was no doubt that it had a perfect right to review the Trusteeship Council's decisions and to take its own decisions regarding certain petitions. The French representative had referred to the high sense of responsibility displayed by the members of the Trusteeship Council.

<sup>3</sup> See *United Nations Conference on International Organization*, II/4/44(1)(a).

Did that remark mean that as a whole the members of the Fourth Committee had a lesser sense of their responsibilities than the members of the Trusteeship Council? The Council's failure in the case on hand was not due to inadequate understanding of the problem but to the fact that the principle set forth in its own resolution (468 (XI)), namely the necessity for obtaining the collective consent of the people, had not been applied. The French representative had also said that the Administering Authority's decision had been perfectly legal. Could the legal basis for that decision be the recommendations of the Legislative Council of the Territory? That body was composed solely of appointed members.

15. In reply to the Belgian representative, he would say that the Indonesian delegation was not systematically opposed to plans for the redistribution of land. It was opposed to such plans only when they implied the forcible removal of certain sections of the population. It was essential to adhere to the principle of the prior consent of the parties concerned. In any case, a plan for the redistribution of land should not result in a reduction of the area of fertile land reserved to the indigenous inhabitants. He drew the Committee's attention in that connexion to the large number of Wa-Meru who were to settle on inferior land as compared with the small number of European colonists who were settling on the good land from which the Wa-Meru had been expelled.

16. Turning to the amendments submitted by Brazil, Ecuador and Peru (A/C.4/L.243) to the joint draft resolution, he agreed with the Guatemalan representative that the deletion of the last paragraph of the preamble would take away all meaning from the draft resolution. The draft text requested the Administering Authority to return immediately to the members of the Meru tribe the lands from which they had been expelled because the tribe had been expelled by force. He saw no objection, however, to deleting the words "with the purpose of transferring these lands to European settlers". With regard to paragraph 2 of the operative part of the draft resolution, he was prepared to accept the Indian delegation's amendment. In respect of paragraph 3 of the operative part, he was prepared to accept the amendment proposed by the three delegations (A/C.4/L.243, para. 3) if it appeared that the draft resolution would thereby receive wider support.

17. Mr. DJERDA (Yugoslavia) said that the documents available to the Committee, and in particular the statement of the representative of the Meru Citizens Union (286th meeting), clearly showed that the solution of the problem under consideration would affect not only the fate of the Meru tribe but also the application of the basic principles which the United Nations and the Administering Authority were to put into operation with a view to attaining the objectives of the Trusteeship System. The Wa-Meru question was a test for the United Nations and the Administering Authority. Moreover, the solution worked out for that problem would show the extent to which the peoples of the Trust Territories were justified in having confidence in the United Nations.

18. His delegation supported the draft resolution before the Committee for it called for the redress of a wrong which had been done the Wa-Meru by depriving

them of their ancestral lands. The injustice was all the more serious as that expropriation had resulted in physical and mental suffering and considerable loss for the persons concerned. Moreover, the draft resolution related to an event which had occurred in a Territory under the august legal and moral protection of the United Nations. If the Organization did not take favourable action on the Meru tribe's request, the members of the tribe and all the indigenous inhabitants of the other Trust Territories would hold the United Nations responsible for the conditions now obtaining in the Territories.

39. Mr. Djerda had been deeply impressed by the statement of Mr. Japhet, who had shown not only the nature of the problem itself but also the capabilities of the petitioner and his understanding of the problems affecting his tribe and the Territory as a whole. The Yugoslav delegation had already emphasized the need for ensuring the systematic training of indigenous administrative personnel in the Trust Territories, stressing that the indigenous inhabitants showed that they had a sufficient awareness of reality and maturity for that purpose. He was happy to note that Mr. Japhet's statement had borne out that viewpoint. If the principle had been applied in the Trust Territories, the General Assembly would not be faced with problems such as the one before it and would receive no more petitions, inasmuch as the true representatives of the indigenous inhabitants would resort to other means of settling problems concerning the local populations. Moreover, there would no longer be any need to fear the effect of situations of that kind on future relations between the African peoples and immigrants from other continents, particularly European settlers.

40. He reserved the right to explain his views on the amendments submitted by Brazil, Ecuador and Peru in due course.

41. Mr. N. RIFAI (Syria) said it was hardly necessary to discuss any further the principles and aims of the joint draft resolution. The text proposed the only solution which, in the view of the majority of the Committee, the General Assembly could adopt.

42. The United Kingdom representative had reapproached the sponsors of the draft resolution with having prepared their text before hearing his statement (287th meeting). The United Kingdom delegation had already distributed copies of the White Paper on the subject and the United Kingdom representative himself had said that he had little to add to that paper. Moreover, the statement of the petitioners had confirmed the fact that the situation remained unchanged. The sponsors of the draft resolution had therefore considered that the United Kingdom representative would not bring out any really new elements.

43. The statement of the United Kingdom representative had actually been quite disappointing. He had said that in condemning the Administering Authority's policy, the Fourth Committee would prejudice the progress of the peoples of the Territory. Apparently, the sponsors of the draft resolution and the United Kingdom representative had entirely different concepts of what was meant by progress. To the authors of the draft resolution it would be "progress" to consider the Wa-Meru as full citizens of their country, to give them the same rights as the other inhabitants of the Terri-

tory, not to persecute them because of the primitive conditions in which they were kept and to open the door for them to compete with European settlers on at least an equal footing in cattle-raising. Progress did not mean giving the indigenous inhabitants a secondary role in the economy and in the political, economic and social advancement of their country. The Administering Authority had expressly undertaken to help them to attain a position of equality with the other inhabitants despite the present superiority of Europeans in financial, technical and social questions. If the Europeans refused to assume that obligation, they would have no choice in the end but to leave the Territory.

44. The United Kingdom representative had also said that in disapproving of the Administering Authority's action the Committee might place it in a delicate position. The Syrian delegation did not understand how the Administering Authority had been unable to foresee that it would place itself in a situation of that kind by persisting in an attitude which public opinion would obviously have to condemn. The delegations of countries friendly to the Administering Authority had themselves conceded that it had made a mistake. Furthermore, the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in East Africa, 1951, had drawn attention in its report on Tanganyika (T/946 and Corr.1) to the dangers involved in that act of injustice.

45. Despite their protests, the Wa-Meru had been expelled from their land. The Trusteeship Council had apparently been unable to redress the wrong but it had nevertheless felt obliged to call the Administering Authority to order by recommending, in its resolution 468 (XI), that that Authority should be guided in future schemes by the principle that African communities settled on the land should not be moved to other areas unless a clear expression of their collective consent had been obtained. The purpose of the joint draft resolution before the Committee was to help the Administering Authority to extricate itself from its present delicate position by the only method of which public opinion would approve.

46. He accepted, though without a great deal of enthusiasm, the amendments submitted by Brazil, Ecuador and Peru. In doing so, he was not departing from the principle that he proposed to maintain at all costs, but he was falling in with a well-considered opinion on the means to use in solving the problem. He hoped that the Administering Authority would have no difficulty in acting in the spirit of the draft resolution and thus reaching a satisfactory solution to the problem.

47. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) said that the problem under consideration was one of the most serious which the Fourth Committee had ever had to solve and might have the most far-reaching consequences on the future approach to questions relating to the competence of the Trusteeship Council. As a member of the Council, his delegation had assumed its share of responsibility in the discussion of the Wa-Meru question.<sup>4</sup> He had been a member of the Visiting Mission sent to Tanganyika in 1951 and had endorsed its conclusions. The Trusteeship Council had itself endorsed those conclusions and the 1951 Visiting Mis-

<sup>4</sup> For the discussion of the question in the Council, see *Official Records of the Trusteeship Council, Eleventh Session*, 431st, 432nd, 442nd, 451st and 452nd meetings.

sion had been able to note with satisfaction that the Administering Authority had shared its viewpoint on many important questions. He had stated in the Trusteeship Council that the Wa-Meru case also occurred in most of the somewhat over-populated regions of Africa. If political and ideological considerations were mixed with economic and social issues in such a matter, however, the future of the Trust Territories might be prejudiced.

48. Following the sending of the petition by the Wa-Meru tribe (T/Pet.2/99 and Add.1 to 7) the Standing Committee on Petitions had recommended to the Trusteeship Council the adoption of a draft resolution which had later become Council resolution 468 (XI). His delegation had not been completely satisfied with that draft resolution. It would have preferred it if, while regretting that the Administering Authority had deemed it necessary to move a section of the population and to resort to their forcible expulsion, the Trusteeship Council had avoided recognizing that the removal of the Meru tribe formed part of a larger scheme already in an advanced stage of implementation. He would also have preferred the Council not to say that the general plan had been "advantageous to the majority of the indigenous inhabitants". The Council had not been in a position to give an opinion on that point as it had not had the necessary information to do so and it should have abstained from prejudging the results of the scheme. Certainly, while some plans were advantageous to the peoples of the Trust Territories, their success depended largely on the agreement between the Administering Authority and the population. His delegation had pointed out that there was a difference between "consent", which must be given before,

and "assent" which comes after, an act. All the proposals submitted by the Dominican Republic to the Council on those various points had been rejected. Accordingly, although it had voted in favour of the Council resolution, it had formulated express reservations so that it could speak in the General Assembly on any aspect of the question which it deemed appropriate to raise.

49. The facts had proved that his delegation's position had been justified. He could not, however, disassociate himself from the Trusteeship Council and agree to the condemnation of decisions it had taken. Such an attitude would have extremely serious consequences for other United Nations organs and would result in a total negation of the Trusteeship Council's authority. He imagined that the sponsors of the joint draft resolution had seen only the immediate results of their proposal and had not weighed its subsequent consequences. Moreover, the draft did not take into account certain aspects of the situation, including the fact that several recommendations contained in the Council's resolution had not yet gone into effect. He had asked the petitioners to explain their position very clearly in order to bring out that point. True, the Trusteeship Council should act under the authority of the General Assembly, but the Assembly should demonstrate that authority by helping the Council to carry out its task. He feared that the joint draft resolution might give rise to interpretations that might seriously prejudice the entire situation. He would therefore vote against the text. He would in due course give his opinion on the amendments submitted by Brazil, Ecuador and Peru.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.