



**CONTENTS**

	Page
Agenda item 40:	
Question of the frontier between the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration and Ethiopia: reports of the Governments of Ethiopia and of Italy (continued) .....	483

**Chairman: Mr. Enrique de MARCHENA**  
(Dominican Republic).

*In the absence of the Chairman, Miss Brooks (Liberia), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

**AGENDA ITEM 40**

**Question of the frontier between the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration and Ethiopia: reports of the Governments of Ethiopia and of Italy (A/3463, A/3502 and Corr.1, A/C.4/L.481) (continued)**

1. Mr. NASH (United States of America) said that his delegation agreed that it would be highly desirable to obtain a solution of the frontier question before the Trust Territory of Somaliland attained independence and as far as possible in advance of that date. It further considered that that goal was most likely to be achieved by the course suggested in the three-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.485). Consequently, while it had no objection to the first of the Philippine amendments (A/C.4/L.484), it hoped that the second would be withdrawn. His delegation would support the six-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.481), as amended by the three Powers, and hoped that the action it recommended would be accepted by the parties concerned.

2. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) said that his delegation regarded the problem as one of the utmost urgency and hoped that it would be settled before the elections in the Trust Territory in 1958. It should be pointed out to the Ethiopian representative that the fear that the negotiations might fail was a very real one in view of the past history of the question. The General Assembly had adopted resolutions 755 (VIII), 854 (IX) and 947 (X) urging the two parties to expedite negotiations, yet the problem remained unresolved. Some provision had therefore to be made for the possibility that the negotiations might once again be unsuccessful. His delegation also agreed that it might be a good idea to give the two parties more time to work out a solution. For those reasons, it would vote in favour of the six-Power draft resolution as amended by the three Powers.

3. It had been stated in the Committee that neither party would object to mediation should the negotiations fail to achieve substantial results by the twelfth session of the General Assembly. Since Mr. Osman, speaking as the representative of Italy, had formally requested such mediation (642nd meeting), it could

be assumed that Italy had no objection; he would like to know if the same was true of Ethiopia.

4. In his delegation's view, the parties to the issue were not Ethiopia and Italy but Ethiopia and the people of Somaliland, whose welfare Iraq had very much at heart. He had listened with concern to the Ethiopian representative's remark that international intervention might very well result in another arrangement like the Hoare-Laval plan. Iraq had warmly supported Ethiopia in its defence against Fascist aggression in the League of Nations and he could assure the Ethiopian representative that his delegation had the interests of Ethiopia as much at heart as those of Somaliland. It was inconceivable that any such arrangement as the Hoare-Laval plan would be made by the United Nations.

5. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said that he would not press his amendments to the operative part of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.484, para. 2), since there appeared to be little support for them.

6. Ato DERESSA (Ethiopia) said that in his delegation's view the six-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.481) as it stood would satisfy all the requirements of the situation, for if the negotiations were unsuccessful the General Assembly would be fully aware of the fact at its twelfth session and would then be able to take a decision on the matter. Moreover, it was always better to avoid suggesting in advance that forthcoming negotiations might not be successful; nor did it seem wise for the General Assembly to lay down in advance the action it would take at its twelfth session. For those reasons his delegation, while appreciating the good intentions behind the joint amendments (A/C.4/L.485), considered them unnecessary.

7. The Philippine representative assumed that since three years had passed since the negotiations had first begun they must have failed. He had already pointed out, however, that active negotiations had not begun until June 1955 and that only three months of actual negotiating had taken place so far. He would not comment further on the Philippine amendments since the Philippine representative apparently did not intend to press them.

8. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) pointed out that the sponsors of the six-Power draft resolution had accepted the three-Power amendments. The Ethiopian representative had not stated his delegation's position on the draft resolution as thus amended.

9. It was his delegation's view that the Philippine amendments were premature at the present juncture. If the forthcoming negotiations were successful, there would be no need for them; if the negotiations failed, a draft resolution embodying the Philippine suggestions could be submitted at the beginning of the twelfth session and there would then be a better case for them. His delegation therefore associated itself with the

appeal made to the Philippine representative to withdraw his amendments.

*Mr. de Marchena (Dominican Republic) took the Chair.*

10. Mr. GRILLO (Italy) said that the importance of finding a solution to the frontier question had been underlined by nearly all delegations. As an independent State, Somaliland would be the creation of the United Nations, which bore a twofold responsibility towards it: firstly to ensure its present development and secondly to ensure its future viability. Italy had assumed responsibility for the present development of the Territory and the report of the Trusteeship Council (A/3170) was sufficient evidence of the manner in which it was discharging that responsibility. It must be stated emphatically, however, that final responsibility for the future of Somaliland rested wholly with the United Nations. The problem of the frontier must be viewed in that light. As the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory, Italy considered that it was impossible and dangerous to leave the new State with the two major problems of its economic weakness and the frontier issue. Moreover, a solution to the frontier question was urgently needed, since elections were to be held in the Territory in 1958 and it was only logical that the frontier should be fixed before that time.

11. He agreed with the Ethiopian representative that Italy and Ethiopia had made a compact not to refer to the past and that Mr. Osman's reference at the 646th meeting to a certain telegram was therefore out of order. He would point out, however, that the Ethiopian representative's statements had contained a number of references to Fascist times. Thus both sides had broken the agreement and he would suggest that both should resolve not to do so again, but rather to fix their attention on the present and the future.

12. The Italian delegation had submitted to the General Assembly, in document A/3463 and Corr.1, an objective and factual report without expressing any opposition of principle to any recommendation which the General Assembly might wish to make for the solution of the frontier question. The Ethiopian report (A/3502) contained a statement of a clear and explicit position with regard to the procedure for continuation of negotiations or otherwise. Moreover, the Fourth Committee had heard a statement by the Italian delegation, a statement by the Ethiopian delegation and two statements by the Chairman of the Somali Legislative Assembly as a member of the Italian delegation. Both parties had therefore done their utmost to give the members of the Committee a clear picture of the situation. A number of divergent views had been expressed by various members of the Committee. The Italian Government's responsibility as Administering Authority was to lay the facts before the General Assembly and leave it to make recommendations as it deemed fit.

13. To maintain friendship with Ethiopia and to leave that friendship as a legacy to the independent State of Somaliland was the firm resolve of the Italian Government. Speaking in the dual capacity of representative of the Administering Authority and representative of the Somali people, he emphasized that a solution of the frontier problem was a matter of urgency.

14. It had been asserted that a date was already fixed in the joint amendments to the draft resolution. In fact two dates were fixed—1959 and 1960. Those

dates related, however, not to the negotiations but to the submission of a plan for the transfer of functions of government to the independent Government of the Territory and to the achievement of independence respectively.

15. The Administering Authority had interpreted the previous resolutions of the General Assembly to the best of its ability and would do so in regard to any resolution that might be adopted at the present session.

16. It had been argued that a request for mediation by one party, if not accepted by the other party, might cause the relations between the two parties to become embittered. As a responsible body the Fourth Committee should also face the possibility that after further negotiations according to its directives neither party might request mediation.

17. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) observed that every effort should be made to solve the frontier problem, for the sake of the tribes living in the area and in order to eliminate friction between the States concerned and to avoid the economic burden on Somaliland of the supervision of a frontier which was not clearly delimited. Nevertheless the possibility that direct negotiations might achieve results should be explored as far as possible. For those reasons he would support the joint draft resolution with the three-Power amendments, which had considerably improved the original text.

18. All delegations were concerned by the fact that the date of Somaliland's independence was approaching and that the grave problem of the frontier had not yet been solved. He felt sure that many delegations would be prepared to consider proposals such as those in the Philippine amendments at a later date should direct negotiations not prove successful.

19. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said that in order to simplify the discussion and in deference to the wishes of the Ethiopian representative he would withdraw his amendments to the operative part of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.484, para. 2).

20. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that she would vote against the Philippine amendment to the preamble (A/C.4/L.484, para. 1), not because she disagreed with it in principle but because it was very similar to the last paragraph of the preamble proposed in the three-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.485, para. 2).

21. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland) asked for a separate vote on the new operative paragraph proposed in the joint amendments (A/C.4/L.485, para. 3).

22. The CHAIRMAN called upon the Committee to vote on paragraph 1 of the Philippine amendments (A/C.4/L.484), paragraph 2 having been withdrawn.

*At the request of the Philippine representative a vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Luxembourg, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Nepal, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Egypt.

*Against:* New Zealand, Sudan, Sweden, Argentina, Burma, Ceylon, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, Greece, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Liberia.

*Abstaining:* Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Yemen, Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, China, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lebanon.

*The amendment was not adopted, 14 votes being cast in favour and 14 against, with 36 abstentions.*

23. The CHAIRMAN called upon the Committee to vote on the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.481) as revised by the amendments proposed by the delegations of Argentina, India and Syria (A/C.4/L.485).

*The preamble was adopted by 61 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

*Operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 62 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

*Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 45 votes to none, with 19 abstentions.*

*The revised draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 60 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

24. Mr. QUIROS (El Salvador) stated that he would have voted in favour of the first Philippine amendment had it been the sponsor's intention that it should replace the last of the three paragraphs of the preamble proposed in the three-Power amendments. As an additional paragraph, however, it would have been redundant and he had therefore voted against it.

25. Mr. HAMILTON (Australia) said that his delegation was aware that both parties to the dispute would be faced with the harsh necessity of making important concessions involving the sacrifice of territorial claims. While he agreed that a settlement should be reached as quickly as possible he hoped that the urgency of the situation would not lead the General Assembly to try to impose either a particular solution or a procedure for reaching such a solution, regardless of the rights and legitimate interests of either party. The General Assembly, moreover, could scarcely impose the condition that the frontier must be settled before Somaliland became independent. The provision concerning mediation in General Assembly resolution 392 (V), which had served as the basis of the present discussion, was merely a recommendation and was based essentially on the idea that there should be agreement between the parties with regard both to the procedure to be adopted in seeking a solution and to the final solution itself. He wondered, however, whether the emphasis on mediation was helpful at the present time, for while it would keep open the possibility of adopting an alternate course of action, it might tend to encourage one or both parties to maintain their original positions in the hope of being supported by the mediator. He therefore considered that mediation should be urged only if and when it became desirable and not before.

26. He had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole because he wished to associate his delegation with the others in urging on both parties the importance of reaching an early and final settlement. With regard to the first paragraph of the preamble, however, he would point out that the important recommendation in General Assembly resolution 854 (IX), to the effect that a mediator should be appointed if negotiations had failed to achieve results by July 1955, had already

been disregarded. He had abstained from voting on operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution because he had reservations concerning not so much the text itself as its implications. The words "if the negotiations should fail" seemed to imply that it would be for the Assembly rather than for the parties concerned to determine when the time had come to adopt a new procedure, and to that extent it would have the effect of amending resolution 392 (V). The use of the phrase "it will be necessary" seemed to impose in advance the position the General Assembly was to adopt at its twelfth session, leaving it no possibility of departing from the provisions of resolution 392 (V). Yet it might well be that by the time the twelfth session opened circumstances would have wholly ruled out mediation, for one or both of the parties might have rejected it in favour of arbitration, for example, a procedure which under the terms of resolution 392 (V) could be adopted only after mediation had been tried and had failed. With regard to the words "in the interests of achieving a final settlement" it was to the interests not of any single party but of all parties concerned that the resolution should refer. The words "laid down" were too strong, since the earlier resolution had merely made a recommendation. Finally, the words "avail themselves of the procedure" were not quite appropriate, for the first of the procedures recommended in resolution 392 (V) had already been adopted and there was nothing to prevent the parties from requesting mediation immediately, without waiting until the twelfth session, if they so desired.

27. Mr. THORP (New Zealand) explained that although he had supported the draft resolution as a whole he had abstained from voting on operative paragraph 2, for a number of reasons. Firstly, it seemed to have been introduced for reasons not entirely germane to the requirements of the situation. Secondly, its reference to the procedure recommended in resolution 392 (V), which had been mentioned in the preamble, was worded in such a way as to commit the twelfth session of the General Assembly to a particular course of action; the Assembly's responsibilities were quite clear and could be exercised at the twelfth session as required. Finally, in view of the vagueness of the words "substantial results" the matter would in any case have to be referred back to the Fourth Committee for interpretation. His delegation would have been ready to leave to the discretion of the parties concerned the determination of what steps should be taken in the period before the next Assembly.

28. He had had no objection to the substance of the Philippine amendment and if it had been adopted he would have voted against the corresponding paragraph of the three-Power amendment had it been put to the vote separately.

29. Mr. VELANDO (Peru) said that he had abstained from voting on the draft resolution because he had not had time to receive instructions from his Government, but his delegation would make its position clear when the matter came up in the plenary meeting. He had voted in favour of the Philippine amendment out of courtesy to that delegation.

30. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said that he had abstained from voting on the draft resolution because he had interpreted the vote on the Philippine amendment to mean that the majority of delegations were not convinced that an early settlement of the important

frontier problem was in the best interests of all concerned.

31. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq), who would be unable to attend the final meeting of the Committee, said he wished to pay a tribute to the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur for the able manner in which they

had conducted the Committee's meetings, as well as to the Under-Secretary and other members of the Secretariat who had contributed to the success of the current session.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.