



C O N T E N T S

	<i>Page</i>
Appointment of an acting chairman	217
Human rights: Recommendations concerning international respect for the self-determination of peoples (E/2256, annex V, A/2165, A/2172, chapter V, section I, A/C.3/L.293/Rev.1) (<i>continued</i>).....	217

Chairman: Mr. S. Amjad ALI (Pakistan).

In the absence of the Chairman and of the Vice-Chairman, Mrs. Harman (Israel), Rapporteur, took the Chair.

Appointment of an acting chairman

1. Mrs. HARMAN (Israel), Rapporteur, asked the Committee to appoint an acting chairman to replace the Chairman, who was absent, and the Vice-Chairman, who was ill.
2. Mr. NAJAR (Israel) proposed that Miss Bernardino (Dominican Republic) be appointed.
3. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) seconded the proposal.

In the absence of any objections, the proposal was adopted.

Miss Bernardino (Dominican Republic) took the Chair.

Human rights: Recommendations concerning international respect for the self-determination of peoples (E/2256, annex V, A/2165, A/2172, chapter V, section I, A/C.3/L.293/Rev.1) (*continued*)

[Item 30]*

GENERAL DEBATE (*concluded*)

4. Mr. CASTILLO (Ecuador) was glad to note the remarks of representatives of some other Latin-American countries on the question of human rights. There seemed to be a point of view common to all countries which had been able to free themselves from foreign domination and become separate nations and members of the international community by means of their cultural and economic development.
5. At its previous sessions, the General Assembly had adopted various resolutions with a view to finding

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

the best methods of securing the right of self-determination for peoples. In its resolution 421 (V), section D, of 4 December 1950, it had invited the Economic and Social Council to request the Commission on Human Rights to study those methods. As the Council had unfortunately not had time to do so before the sixth session of the General Assembly, the Assembly, in its resolution 545 (VI), had urged the Commission on Human Rights to prepare recommendations on the subject, and in its resolution 549 (VI) it had asked the Commission to give priority to the question. The Commission on Human Rights had adopted two draft resolutions (E/2256, annex V, draft resolutions A and B), which were before the Third Committee. While analysing those two texts, the Ecuadorean delegation reserved the right to discuss any concrete proposals which might be submitted later.

6. Ecuador had voted for the United Nations Charter at San Francisco in 1945 and for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights at Paris in 1948. In his country's view, the right of peoples to self-determination was the right of all developed countries to govern themselves, on the assumption that they had attained an adequate degree of political, cultural and economic development. The right should never be used to divide a nation or to enable a country to claim from another a territory which formed part of a homogeneous whole.

7. Like the Honduran representative, he was surprised that draft resolution A contained anachronistic expressions. The struggle against slavery in Central America had begun as early as 1823, and slavery had been abolished in Ecuador in 1852. He agreed with the substance of the first two paragraphs of the preamble to the draft resolution, but could not accept their form. He was also unable fully to approve of the text proposed by the United States for the operative part (A/C.3/L.294, point 4) but hoped that in the course of the discussion the Committee could improve and clarify certain expressions.

8. Draft resolution B, however, did not seem to give rise to any objections. The text proposed by Lebanon (A/C.3/L.293/Rev.1) differed from it very slightly.

9. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) considered that the main question was whether the recommendations drawn up by the Commission on Human Rights for the promotion of respect for the right of peoples to self-determination were adequate or not.

10. Some delegations, however, had raised the previous question whether the Third Committee was competent to consider and adopt the recommendations. In order to prove that the Committee was not competent, it was argued that the General Assembly, at its sixth session, had requested the Commission on Human Rights, first, to include an article on the right of peoples to self-determination in the draft covenants on human rights, and then to prepare recommendations for promoting respect for that right; according to those who opposed the draft resolutions, recommendations for measures of implementation of the article could therefore not be studied before the adoption of the covenants themselves. The latter argument was based on an erroneous interpretation, since the article and the recommendations constituted two separate methods. It should be noted that resolution 421 (V), section D, adopted by the General Assembly at its fifth session, had already invited the Commission on Human Rights to draft recommendations of the kind, without any reference to articles which were to be included in the covenant. Moreover, the covenants on human rights should contain provisions for implementation in their own text and there had never been any question that measures of implementation should take the form of separate recommendations. The Third Committee, therefore, certainly had the right to consider and adopt the recommendations before it.

11. The principal feature of the texts was that they related almost exclusively to Non-Self-Governing Territories. Draft resolution B related only to the States responsible for the territories and draft resolution A was addressed only to them, with regard to the practical application of the principle of the right of self-determination. For that reason, the two draft resolutions had given rise to strong objections from delegations which considered them to be contrary to the universality of the principle. The objections, however, seemed to confuse two clearly separate concepts. The theoretical and essential applicability of the principle should indeed be universal, but it was possible, in a given situation, merely to call for its application to several categories of cases. Such partial application not only did not lessen the possibility of applying the principle to all other categories, but seemed likely to make the general obligation even more imperative.

12. The objection that the two recommendations made by the Commission on Human Rights were contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, in that they discriminated against States responsible for the administration of Non-Self-Governing Territories, also seemed to be absolutely unfounded. The discrimination was not contrary to the Charter, but was a distinction which had to be drawn in order to take into account the difference between respective responsibilities and the requirements of the existing world situation. The administering Powers had assumed special respon-

sibilities and it was therefore natural to address special recommendations to them. The Charter itself had implicitly sanctioned that distinction, since two of its chapters were devoted to Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories and imposed special obligations on the States responsible for those territories.

13. Those who opposed the two recommendations also contended that they established another kind of reprehensible discrimination. According to them, the principle of the right of self-determination should be applicable to all peoples deprived of it and the recommendations should therefore relate to all such peoples. In order to reply to that argument, all the categories of possible cases should be considered before deciding whether the United Nations had valid reasons at the moment to ask that the principle should be applied to some categories only. For the sake of argument, six categories could be distinguished. The first comprised peoples which constituted independent and sovereign States, whose independence and sovereignty had to be respected. The second comprised the peoples of States which had lost their independence and sovereignty and wished to regain it; their independence should be given back to them. The third category comprised peoples which, although constituted in independent and sovereign States, were prevented by their own dictatorial governments from exercising their right of self-determination; their internal liberation should be achieved. The fourth category comprised peoples who formed an integral part of an independent and sovereign State, but considered themselves to be absolutely different from the other elements in that country and wished to set up a separate State; that was the case of some minorities, and the question was one of granting them the right of self-determination as peoples. The fifth category comprised peoples constituting States which were formally or nominally independent and sovereign, but whose independence and sovereignty were forcibly controlled by another State; such control had to be removed. The sixth category comprised non-self-governing peoples whose territories were administered by the so-called colonial Powers; they should be granted the right of self-determination, either immediately or gradually.

14. The United Nations should do all in its power to ensure universal and effective respect for the right of self-determination. However, it was dealing empirically with the problems submitted to it by its Members, who were themselves raising the problems which seemed to them to be the most urgent and important. It certainly had no right to evade such questions, as had been alleged by the delegations which considered it to be incompetent, at the particular stage at which the problems had been submitted, to ensure the universal application of the principles involved. Nevertheless, in order to avoid the charge of discrimination, it should spare no effort to extend the principle to all the other categories.

15. For four reasons the time had come for the United Nations to start considering in detail the problem of applying the self-determination of peoples in respect of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. First, it was a serious and urgent problem requiring speedy action by the United Nations. Secondly, the non-self-governing peoples themselves were turning to the

United Nations, which they regarded as their last resort. Thirdly, the United Nations would find it comparatively easy to act in the matter since the two chapters in the Charter wholly devoted to the non-self-governing peoples provided a firm foundation for such action by setting forth in detail the aims to be achieved and the obligations to be fulfilled. Fourthly, there was every reason to hope that the intervention of the United Nations would be successful, since the Powers administering Non-Self-Governing Territories belonged to the free world, in which government policy was normally directed by national public opinion. All those Powers had inherited great liberal traditions, which they would find it hard to repudiate, and were tirelessly defending the cause of international co-operation.

16. For all those reasons, and not from any desire to discriminate, the Lebanese delegation was asking the United Nations to concern itself immediately with the particular application of the principle to the non-self-governing peoples. Draft resolution A did not in any way infringe the universal applicability of the principle but stated that "the States Members of the United Nations shall uphold the principle of self-determination of peoples and nations and respect their independence". The Lebanese delegation was prepared to give favourable consideration to any practical suggestion likely to help peoples, irrespective of the category to which they belonged, to obtain self-determination. The fact that the principle did not lend itself to immediate application in all cases did not seem to be a sufficient reason for failing to take any action.

17. The second feature of the recommendations submitted to the Committee for consideration was that they dealt in general terms with the application of the principle of the right of peoples to self-determination without trying to establish the specific conditions in which the right should be exercised. The delegations opposed to the two draft resolutions had raised innumerable hypothetical questions in order to prove that the Committee could undertake to make recommendations only after it had cleared up all the difficulties. That attitude seemed incompatible with their general attitude, and their reasoning seemed to be based on a serious error. Their view was that the terms "people" and "self-determination" should not be used without being defined. He asked why they had not raised the same questions during the drafting of the Charter of the United Nations, since the words were used there without any further explanation. They had also approved many other United Nations recommendations in which similar terms appeared; that was particularly true of the recommendations designed to promote friendly relations among the nations. The delegations which were opposed to the recommendations seemed no longer able to distinguish between theory and practice. If the term "people" was to be defined theoretically, it embraced an almost infinite number of cases. If, however, peoples were regarded as what they actually were, there were found to be a limited number of real and specific cases. It was true that there remained some border-line cases hard to decide, but the Power which had dependent on it a group of human beings, who claimed to constitute a people, would always be entitled to establish that the claim was not well-founded. The

United Nations had shown that it considered each case on its merits when it had decided that each of the three former Italian colonies should have a different future.

18. The two contentions upheld by the administering Powers were that, on the one hand, they did not think that they were bound to lead the peoples of the territories they administered to independence, but merely to ensure their capacity for self-government; and, on the other hand, they regarded themselves as the sole judges of the degree to which that capacity had progressed. It was thus in their view solely a bilateral link, of indefinite duration, unless the administering Power of its own accord saw fit to liberate the people under its administration. That being so, it was easy to see why the administering Powers were so vehemently opposed to the recommendations.

19. With regard to the first contention, it should be remembered that the principle of the self-determination of peoples, which implied the right to choose independence, was proclaimed in the Charter of the United Nations as a universal principle. Moreover, the Charter had stated that the basic objectives for the peoples under the Trusteeship System were either self-government or independence, and it was inconceivable that it should refuse that choice to the non-self-governing peoples, whose political development was sometimes far more advanced. Finally, the administering Powers relied on Chapter XI, Article 73, paragraph b, of the Charter, under which they undertook both to develop the capacity of the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories for self-government and to take due account of their political aspirations. Yet they interpreted the paragraph incorrectly, since it did not in any way prohibit the alternative between independence and self-government but rather implied that there was such an alternative. That first contention, then, was baseless.

20. The second contention was based on the fact that the Charter had placed upon the administering Powers the obligation to transmit regularly statistical and other information of a technical nature relating to economic, social and educational conditions, without mentioning political information. Undoubtedly the administering Powers were not bound to transmit political information regularly, but the text did not prohibit the United Nations from asking for it. Moreover, the fact that the Declaration regarding Non-Self-Governing Territories appeared in the Charter proved that the administering Powers were responsible to the United Nations for the fulfilment of the obligations they had assumed. They could not take shelter behind Article 2, paragraph 7, which forbade the United Nations to intervene in matters which were essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State, as it would be absurd to regard the future of a people as essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of a State alien to it. The second contention, then, was as shaky as the first.

21. He hoped that he had succeeded in showing that the two recommendations of the Commission on Human Rights were appropriate, but he believed that they were not sufficient to ensure international respect for the self-determination of peoples, and he expressed the wish that the United Nations would continue to give the problem all the consideration it warranted.

22. Mr. LAMBROS (Greece) said that Greece had for a century been in the forefront of the proponents of freedom and self-determination. The Greek insurrection of 1821 had deeply stirred all liberal Europe. In the past forty years Greece had had only twenty-three years of peace; not that the Greek people liked war, it hated it; but it hated it less than it loved freedom. Whenever it had taken up arms, self-determination had been at stake, and the last struggle it had waged in defence of its right to choose its own institutions had ended barely three years previously.

23. History had taught the Greek people that self-determination always had to be bought at the cost of heavy sacrifice of life. There had, however, been an instance in Greek history which showed that a people could obtain the fulfilment of its national aspirations without bloodshed. In 1864 Great Britain, under no other pressure than the clearly expressed wish of the inhabitants, had returned the Ionian Islands to Greece. Since then the United Kingdom had recognized and applied the principle of self-determination in other cases, the most recent being that of the Sudan. The example of the Ionian Islands was particularly significant. Many years before the establishment of the United Nations, it had been a demonstration of the spirit which was later to find expression in Articles 1, 55, 73 and 76 of the Charter.

24. The position then taken by the United Kingdom Government (444th meeting) implicitly answered the questions which the representative of that country had asked during the general debate about the precise definition of certain terms and about the conditions a people would be required to fulfil in order to qualify for self-determination. The United Kingdom and Greece had been allies during the two world wars. That showed that the timely application of the principle of self-determination strengthened the ties of friendship between nations and was a factor in international stability.

25. In the light of those considerations, the Greek delegation did not think that legalistic discussion of the two draft resolutions before the Committee could further clarify the issue. Some of those who had criticized the draft resolutions said that the draft covenants on human rights should be prepared before the Committee went any further. But, pending the final elaboration of the covenants, the United Nations should not remain inactive. Any attempt to shelve the recommendations of the Commission on Human Rights might result in the submission of less conciliatory texts leading to unnecessary controversy. The United Nations had gone a long way since 1950 and could not turn back. The Greek delegation would therefore not take part in arguments on technicalities which had aptly been described as "hair-splitting." For his part, he could not accept the subtle distinctions drawn by some representatives between individual and collective human rights and between "internal" and "external" self-determination. Ultimately, the subject of any human right was the individual. While that might seem to be a new concept, in reality it stated clearly an old idea. Respect for the rights of the individual was the basis of democracy.

26. The problem of the right of peoples to self-determination was of basic importance to the future of

mankind, and the questions related to it could not be evaded. Moreover, as the United States representative had said, the Committee should not take decisions limited only to certain peoples, but should adopt a universally applicable resolution. The fear had been expressed that the United Nations might deal with the problem too rashly. There was no ground for such concern, if the problem was viewed in all its amplitude and in the proper perspective.

27. The concept of self-determination of peoples had progressed during the past century and particularly since the end of the First World War. The Atlantic Charter, the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, General Assembly resolution 421 D (V), the draft article to be included in the international covenant or covenants on human rights, and, lastly, the two draft resolutions before the Committee, were so many milestones on the road leading to the universal recognition and application of the right of peoples to self-determination.

28. By adopting the draft resolutions, the United Nations would be laying the constitutional groundwork of the right. It would still be necessary to develop its principles and to formulate measures of application, which would call for safeguards against infringements. The process would of necessity be long. Suitable criteria would have to be adopted. It might be advisable to allow a reasonable time to enable the administering Powers and the non-self-governing populations to reach direct agreement. Such agreement would, of course, require goodwill and moderation on both sides, and adequate safeguards would be needed. The administering Powers might be tempted to postpone indefinitely direct consultations with the population desirous of exercising its right of self-determination, to drag on the talks indefinitely, or even to go on year after year proclaiming that the population concerned had not reached the requisite degree of development and maturity. It was true that some peoples could not yet be regarded as mature, but there was at least one territory where the population was persistently described as childish, although it had reached its majority some thirty centuries before: the island of Cyprus. Cypriots were no more "children" than the other Greeks. They were certainly no less adult than the inhabitants of the Ionian Islands had been in 1864, or than they themselves had been in 1915 when the United Kingdom Government had offered to give Cyprus back to Greece if it would then join the camp of the Allies.

29. He agreed with the Pakistani representative that the text of the recommendations made by the Commission on Human Rights should not be considered sacrosanct. It was the right of self-determination itself that was sacrosanct. The Greek delegation had been favourably impressed by the United States amendments (A/C.3/L.294), most of which were acceptable and which had been drafted in a spirit of conciliation. The Norwegian representative had shown the same spirit and had justly pointed out that a wholly negative attitude towards the right of self-determination might cause certain countries to doubt the worth of Western democratic principles.

30. In the Greek delegation's view, the right of peoples to self-determination was one of the most important issues before the United Nations. In a way,

it was a permanent issue. It had already arisen in the past, and would arise in various forms in the future. So long as freedom-loving human communities lived side by side, they would have periodically to review their institutions and their way of life. The permanence of the problem, however, in no way minimized its current importance. The defenders of the right of self-determination, forced for a long time to operate in the underground, were fighting in the open, and the day was coming when each case would be considered democratically according to objective criteria set by the United Nations.

31. Warnings had been heard of the danger of disruptive and separatist forces to the free world. That danger certainly existed, but it would only be increased by frustrating aspirations for self-determination. It was a great mistake to refuse to act when action was imperative. The example of Southeast Asia at the end of the Second World War proved that, when timely action was taken, the constructive elements prevailed. Secessions might take place, but countries would also unite. The history of the United States of America afforded an example of a nation which had developed harmoniously owing to the respect of the right of self-determination. What had happened in America could be repeated on the international scene. Far from being a cause of disintegration, the right of self-determination could become an element of integration, conducive to better mutual understanding and greater solidarity. Even the narrow, selfish interests of the administering Powers would be served thereby, as their prestige, influence and economic power would be enhanced. Great Britain, through its gesture in 1864, had won the alliance of Greece, and the new shape of things in Southeast Asia was likely to result in similar advantages.

32. The peoples of the Western democracies, justly proud of their free institutions, should realize that their way of life was still enjoyed by few. Theirs was a democracy in an ivory tower, a democracy for the most fortunate. It would become democracy for all only when all peoples and all nations were granted the right of self-determination, for democracy, like peace, was indivisible.

33. Mr. DEDIJER (Yugoslavia) recalled that in the course of the general debate (448th meeting) he had mentioned infringements of the right of self-determination in certain Eastern European countries. The Ukrainian representative had replied to those remarks by insults, thereby showing the weakness of his position. Abusive language would only poison the atmosphere; it could not alter the fact that the peoples of eastern Europe wanted freedom. The phenomenon was of world-wide occurrence. Colonialism was a lost cause. The peoples of eastern Europe would not accept the yoke of a new colonialism. Any attempt at oppression, by whatever means, was ultimately doomed to failure. The peoples wished to determine their own future and nothing would stop them.

34. Mr. AZMI (Egypt) had intended to point out that the recommendations of the Commission on Human Rights were not measures of implementation of an article in the draft covenants, to remark that some distinction should be drawn between States which

administered Non-Self-Governing Territories and States which did not, and to comment on the provisions of Article 73 e of the United Nations Charter, but the Lebanese representative had done it for him.

35. With regard to the covenants on human rights and the measures of implementation, the questions arose when those instruments would be submitted to the General Assembly and when they would be signed and ratified, so that the right of peoples to self-determination would become a reality. He had taken the pessimistic view that the texts would not be ready for the seventh session, and he feared that they might not be ready for the eighth. Consequently, if the General Assembly did not study the recommendations of the Commission on Human Rights, which represented the least the United Nations could do to encourage respect for the right of peoples to self-determination, denial of that right would continue.

36. Some representatives had said with apprehension that the draft resolutions before the Third Committee would justify secession and association. That was certainly the intention underlying the draft resolutions but there was no ground for fear. The right of peoples to self-determination was the right to free expression of the popular will. Whether that will was in favour of secession or association, it had to be respected. On the one hand there was the example of the Statute of Westminster, the constitution of the British Commonwealth, which went so far as to allow the existence of a sort of royal republic, India, and its neutrality; and, on the other hand, the French Constitution under which no territory could be added to the Republic without a clear and definite expression of the people's will. Consequently, two great free countries, the United Kingdom and France, in spite of the attitude they sometimes took towards matters overseas, unreservedly admitted the possibility of secession.

37. There had been objections to the use of the word "slavery" in draft resolution A. The Commission on Human Rights had used it to express the feeling of the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories in general, the feeling described by the Pakistani representative in the Economic and Social Council when he had spoken of the humiliation of peoples which might be called enslaved since they were unable to shape their own destiny. Moreover, delegations frequently used the term "slavery" when speaking of the conditions of people in other countries. Lastly, it should suffice to recall a decree of 16 March 1922 of the Belgian Congo which was entitled "Labour contract between Natives and civilized masters" and which therefore regarded the indigenous inhabitants as little better than slaves.

38. He was, however, grateful to the United States representative for submitting an amendment (A/C.3/L.294) avoiding the use of a term which was not acceptable to the majority. He would be glad to support that amendment.

39. Where draft resolution B was concerned, the question was nearly solved. The Fourth Committee and the Special Committee on Information transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter had drawn up a questionnaire containing questions to which answers were required and optional questions. The questions to which answers were required were not limited to

economic and social information; the administering Powers would have to provide information on the extent to which human rights were respected in the territories under their administration. The optional questions dealt with political information. Even if draft resolution B served only to encourage the administering Powers to follow the example set by the United States of America and Denmark, which, as the United States representative had pointed out, already provided political information, it would still deserve the Committee's support.

40. As regards the French representative's statement (445th meeting), he had read the chapter on the right of self-determination in Professor Scelle's book *Précis de droit des gens* in its entirety, he had had no intention of misrepresenting its content to the members of the Committee, and he had merely been seeking definitions in it. Moreover, he had never meant to imply that the members of the Committee were not well versed in the subject.

41. As a member of the Commission on Human Rights and a champion of justice, he affirmed that the Commission did not deserve the criticism levelled against it by certain representatives. It had faithfully carried out the two tasks entrusted to it by the General Assembly: it had drafted an article for the draft covenants and two recommendations, which had been transmitted to the General Assembly.

42. He noted with satisfaction that the general debate on the right of peoples to self-determination had enabled the members of the Committee to study the question broadly. He congratulated the members on the interest they had shown in a question which was, in his opinion, the most important matter under consideration at the current session. He was proud to be a member of the Third Committee.

43. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) was glad to note the serious and thoughtful attitude of most of the members of the Committee during the debate and their interest in an understanding of the amendments submitted by the United States. Some delegations, however, had attempted to discredit her Government's motives and its policy, particularly in the territories under its administration. Although all the attacks followed the same pattern, it was necessary to reply to them so that representatives to whom they were not familiar should not be misled.

44. The Byelorussian representative had spoken (444th meeting) of deplorable conditions in Puerto Rico and had maintained that the country's national culture had been reduced to nothing. Yet the fact was that after fifty-four years of United States administration, less than 25 per cent of the population of Puerto Rico spoke English well. English was taught in the schools, but Spanish was the predominating language. The preamble to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, promulgated in 1952, recognized that one of the determining factors in the national life of the country was the co-existence of the two great cultures of the American hemisphere. The existence of a dual culture, with complete freedom of choice, was recognized in Puerto Rican political life, as each member of the legislative assembly had to be able to read and write either English or Spanish.

45. The Byelorussian representative had said that the economy of Puerto Rico was adapted solely to United States needs. That statement was contradicted by the fact that the current programme of economic development in Puerto Rico had been drawn up by a Puerto Rican Government freely elected by Puerto Ricans. The Byelorussian representative had said that many Puerto Ricans had been deprived of their lands, but had made no reference to the agrarian reform introduced in 1941 with the creation of a Land Authority which was responsible for enforcing the law prohibiting the possession of more than 500 acres, as well as for helping peasants who owned no land to acquire it.

46. The Byelorussian representative had cited some unemployment statistics. It was true that unemployment was a serious problem, but it should be recalled that that problem had arisen as a result of an improvement in the general situation and a resulting increase in the population. The Puerto Ricans were engaged in solving that problem, with the aid of the United States of America; the number of persons employed had increased by more than 44,000 in 1951 as compared with the preceding year. The Byelorussian representative had also ignored the substantial progress made in health and education by the Governments of Puerto Rico and the United States of America, which made no attempt to conceal their difficulties.

47. The reason the Byelorussian representative had failed to understand the democratic methods by which elected representatives of the people of Puerto Rico had drawn up a new constitution and an overwhelming majority of the people had adopted the Constitution through a referendum was probably that such democratic methods were strange to him.

48. It was unnecessary to reply to the charges of the Byelorussian and Ukrainian representatives about the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under United States administration; they had already been made before the Trusteeship Council and been answered fully and frankly by the United States representatives. After examining the most recent report, the members of the Trusteeship Council, with the single exception of the USSR representative, had noted with satisfaction the results obtained in political, economic and social advancement and in education during the period dealt with in the report.

49. Mrs. Roosevelt commented on the bitter irony of having certain representatives support the self-determination of peoples when others were convinced that the system they represented was devoted to the systematic denial of that principle. She quoted the statement made by Mr. Acheson, Secretary of State of the United States, at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly, to the effect that whole nations had been swallowed up by a new colonialism or reduced to a state of servile dependence; and that those tragic events were in stark contrast to the evolutionary progress towards self-government in Non-Self-Governing Territories.¹ She felt sure that no one would be deceived by the pretended support of self-determination by representatives of a movement which purged all those who sought any form of self-determination which differed from that dictated by their leaders.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventh Session, Plenary Meetings*, 380th meeting, para. 91.

50. She urged the members of the Third Committee not to be diverted from the fundamental task before them and not to press for extreme positions. As the Committee had been wisely reminded, what was sought was not a paper victory, but effective progress. On an issue concerning which there was such general agreement in principle, it would be a great pity if differences as to method were pushed so far as to weaken that popular faith in the United Nations without which none of its goals could be achieved.

51. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) concluded from the general debate that the two draft resolutions under consideration would almost certainly be adopted by a fairly large majority. He was not entirely satisfied, however, for he recalled the Norwegian representative's comment that it was of little use to adopt resolutions which were not respected by those to whom they were addressed. He could not believe that the administering Powers, even though maintaining that they were bound by so-called legal considerations, would remain deaf to the arguments put forward during the discussion and blind to the danger of bloody revolt. Unless they changed their attitude, the bloodshed would increase; but the determination of those who were fighting for their independence would not be lessened. He had seen many instances in which repression had only aggravated the situation; the struggle had continued, the spirit of independence had spread, and eventually the metropolitan Power had been forced to give way. He appealed once more to the administering Powers to apply the principle instead of evading it. They refused to see the force of the facts; they even refused to allow them to be mentioned in the United Nations. But he had been in contact with persons who had come to defend their cause before the United Nations, and who had declared themselves ready to lay down their lives for it. The obstinacy of the administering Powers could only increase the misery of the peoples, and truth would out. He therefore renewed his appeal.

52. He reserved his right to comment later on his own amendment (A/C.3/L.296) and those of the United States (A/C.3/L.294).

53. The CHAIRMAN called on those representatives who had invoked the right of reply under rule 114 of the rules of procedure.

54. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) wished to clarify one point for the benefit of the Uruguayan representative, who had referred to his first speech. To his mind the right of peoples to self-determination was the same in the economic as in the political sphere. The right to economic self-determination was inseparable from political independence and sovereignty; and he noted with satisfaction that he and the Uruguayan representative were in agreement on that point.

55. Mr. DERINSU (Turkey), referring to the Greek representative's statement, pointed out that Cyprus was not inhabited entirely by Greeks; there had also been Turks there for some centuries. Consequently, any consultations which might be arranged in the future by the Power administering the island should be so organized that the inhabitants of Turkish origin would have an opportunity to express their views. Turkey would support their rights in that respect.

56. Mr. LAMBROS (Greece) observed that Greece and Turkey were two friendly countries which, by their current close association following on past enmity, were a worthy example to the international community.

57. The population of Cyprus, which was under British administration, was five-sixths Greek and one-sixth Turkish. When the United Kingdom allowed the inhabitants to express their will freely and granted them their rights, the inhabitants of Turkish origin would certainly be able to express their views like the others and would receive equal treatment.

58. The CHAIRMAN noted that two new amendments had just been circulated, one submitted jointly by Costa Rica, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras and Nicaragua (A/C.3/L.295), the other by Saudi Arabia (A/C.3/L.296).

59. Mr. DEDIJER (Yugoslavia) thanked the Chairman for the competent way in which she had conducted the meeting.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.