

ence and security of Ethiopia, and that the Government of that country was unable to participate in any way in the work of a body entrusted with the delimitation of the frontiers of Somaliland. The question would certainly arise when a Trusteeship Agreement for that territory was discussed by various organs of the United

Nations. The Ethiopian delegation would be obliged to maintain its position on that subject while the interests of the security of its country were not respected.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.

THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Friday, 11 November 1949, at 10.45 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Lester B. PEARSON (Canada).

Question of the disposal of the former Italian colonies (*continued*)

DISCUSSION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (*continued*)

1. Mr. EBAN (Israel), on a point of order, drew the Committee's attention to the procedural situation resulting from the vote on paragraph 7 (formerly paragraph 6) of section B at the previous meeting. He recalled that before the vote had been taken, he had suggested a new formulation of paragraph 3 of the annexure to section B according to which the Trusteeship Council and the Administering Authority would be guided by the principle of nomination and election in the constitution of the local council rather than by the principle of appointment. The author of the annexure to section B, referred to in paragraph 7 (formerly paragraph 6) of section B, the representative of India, had appeared to have been in favour of the proposed change, and therefore, Mr. Eban had voted on the proposal on the assumption that the change had been made. After the vote had been counted, however, the Chairman had ruled that the amendment did not exist. Mr. Eban reserved his delegation's opinion as to whether it was either possible or appropriate for the Committee not to vote on an amendment submitted by any delegation. In order to avoid prolonging the debate, he suggested that the report to the General Assembly should contain an account of the procedural steps which had been followed in respect of the Israel amendment, in order that it might be possible to raise the issue again at a later stage.

2. The CHAIRMAN agreed with the suggestion of the representative of Israel and thought that it would be possible to include a statement on the matter in the Committee's report.

3. Mr. BEBLER (Yugoslavia) considered that the report should refer to all amendments and divergent opinions expressed on the annexure to section B for the information of those who might work on this question at a later stage. He asked that the amendment of his delegation should be mentioned.

4. Mr. EBAN (Israel) commented that it was his understanding that the report customarily referred to all amendments which had been accepted or rejected. He had made a special request with regard to the Israel amendment because it did not fall in either category.

5. The CHAIRMAN said that the report would place it on record that suggestions had been made to the delegation of India for changes in the text, and that those suggestions had received ap-

proval from certain delegations. In that sense, the views of the various delegations would be made available to the authorities dealing with the question in the future. It should, however, be borne in mind that the annexure to section B was not an official text. Sub-Committee 17 had taken no decision on the text, nor had the Committee. Consequently, the annexure to section B was a text of the delegation of India and there could be no formal amendments to such a text. That was the sense of his ruling on the previous day.

6. The Chairman said that the Committee would now proceed to consider section C of the Sub-Committee's draft resolution. The first amendment to be examined was that proposed by the Polish delegation (A/C.1/529).

7. Mr. McNEIL (United Kingdom), on a point of order, said that he had not understood that section B had been disposed of. He asked for an assurance that, if the Committee proceeded to examine section C, delegations would still be able to propose additions to either of the preceding sections at a later time.

8. The CHAIRMAN recalled that he had stated at the previous meeting that, although section B had been disposed of, there still remained the task of adding to that section, or to a separate draft resolution dealing with the substance of that section, some paragraph relating to administrative and budgetary matters. As he understood the situation, the Committee had agreed to postpone consideration of organizational matters until after it had decided to submit to the General Assembly one inclusive draft resolution or three separate ones. He was aware of no other purpose which would require re-examination of section B.

9. Mr. ARCE (Argentina) observed that it might be necessary, in the light of forthcoming decisions, to adopt certain complementary provisions with regard to any of the three separate sections. As he understood the situation, no delegation could be prevented from returning to sections A and B at a later stage if it so desired.

10. The CHAIRMAN agreed that that was possible because the sections had not been adopted as a whole.

11. In reply to a request for clarification from Mr. McNEIL (United Kingdom), the CHAIRMAN explained that the Committee would have to return to each section later when it came to vote upon them as a whole. At that time, the Committee would be able to deal with the various sections in any way it desired and, if it so decided, it could make additions.

12. Mr. C. MALIK (Lebanon) said that apparently the United Kingdom representative wished to add substantive texts to section B. In his opinion additions of substance should be considered at the present time. He asked further clarification from the Chairman on that point.

13. The CHAIRMAN was inclined to agree that an amendment of substance to section B should be discussed before the Committee commenced consideration of the following section.

14. Mr. BELAÚNDE (Peru) insisted that the matter had already been decided. It was still possible to propose additions to section B of a complementary, procedural or budgetary character. Amendments dealing with the substance, however, would require a two-thirds majority vote before they could be considered.

15. The CHAIRMAN said that, since section B had not been approved as a whole, if any delegation wished to add a new paragraph, it had the right to submit an amendment in that sense, either before the Committee opened consideration of section C or at a later stage in the debate.

16. Mr. ARCE (Argentina) agreed with the Chairman's ruling. The Committee had still to consider the problem of the delimitation of the frontiers of Somaliland, and the Argentine delegation intended to propose an addition to section B which would provide for the eventuality that the United Kingdom might wish to withdraw from Somaliland before Italy had taken over the trusteeship administration. Moreover, as the representative of Peru had pointed out, it might be necessary to add certain complementary provisions at a later time.

17. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would now pass on to consider section C of the draft resolution. The first amendment to be examined was that submitted by the Polish delegation.

18. Mr. WIERBLOWSKI (Poland) explained the purpose of his delegation's amendment (A/C.1/529). The proposal to establish a new commission of inquiry was merely a traditional delaying tactic which had been resorted to because the plan of certain delegations to dismember Eritrea had failed. The Sub-Committee's proposal was contrary to the terms of the Italian Peace Treaty, article 23 and annex XI of which clearly provided that the question of the disposal of the former Italian colonies should be dealt with as a single whole and that a solution for each territory should be reached simultaneously. The Sub-Committee's proposal in regard to Eritrea did not constitute a final settlement and, if the General Assembly were to adopt it, it would be violating its terms of reference. Failure to reach a final decision with regard to one of the former Italian colonies would make it impossible to solve the question as a whole. Therefore, adoption of the Sub-Committee's draft resolution with regard to Eritrea would mean that the Powers administering the former Italian colonies would continue to discharge their function and that the United Nations would thus be subordinated to the will of those Powers.

19. At the same time, postponement of the General Assembly's decision with regard to Eritrea could not possibly be acceptable to the population since it would leave the future of Eritrea in the balance. Mr. Wierblowski believed

that it would be unjust to disregard the aspirations and desires of the Eritrean people which, as had been clearly shown in the Sub-Committee as well as in the First Committee, sought independence. If, for certain reasons, that independence could not be granted immediately then the Eritrean people wanted a specific time-limit to be set, after which independence would be granted immediately. The Polish amendment took account of the real interests and desires of the people of Eritrea.

20. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said that the problem of the future of Eritrea had been thoroughly debated in the Sub-Committee. Several delegations had tried to find a satisfactory solution, but that had not proved possible because of a certain divergence of views regarding the proper interpretation of the available information as to the real desires of the population. On the one hand, the report of the Four Power Commission of Investigation alleged that the territory could not be considered as a single political unit because one portion was closely connected by ethnical, geographical and historical ties with Ethiopia, while another area was equally bound to certain other countries neighbouring Eritrea. On the basis of those considerations, the Four Power Commission of Investigation had recommended that Eritrea be divided. On the other hand, other sources, including certain representatives of the population, had urged that Eritrea could become a viable sovereign State and should be granted independence. In the face of that contradictory evidence, the only course which had been possible for the Sub-Committee was to seek further information and recommend a new investigation which would permit the General Assembly to reach a decision.

21. Mr. Santa Cruz agreed with the Polish representative that it was the General Assembly's duty to take a decision on the entire problem of the disposal of the former Italian colonies but, lacking the necessary information, it was perfectly proper to call for a new investigation in Eritrea and it would be absurd, on that account, to postpone the decision with respect to Libya and Somaliland.

22. The Polish representative had stated that his proposal conformed with the expressed desires of the Eritrean population. Mr. Santa Cruz recalled that he had heard statements by some representatives of the indigenous population urging that a certain part of their country be annexed to Ethiopia. Likewise, other representatives had urged immediate independence. However, he had not heard any representative Eritreans request collective United Nations trusteeship as provided for in the Polish amendment. If the Polish delegation greatly desired immediate independence for Eritrea, the best procedure would be the establishment of a commission of inquiry which would permit the General Assembly to take a final decision at its following session and possibly to declare Eritrea independent prior to the time-limit proposed in the Polish amendment.

23. Mr. BELAÚNDE (Peru) recalled that he had been one of the first to press for a single inclusive resolution by the General Assembly dealing with all the former Italian colonies concomitantly. However, he did not agree with the Polish representative that adoption of the Sub-Committee's proposal in regard to Eritrea would mean divid-

ing the question. What the Sub-Committee had proposed was a decision of substance since it laid down the principle that the final settlement must be based upon the right of self-determination of the Eritrean people.

24. True, the decision would not be complete as regards Eritrea but that was because of the very complex problems involved as the result of different geographical, ethnical, religious and economic claims. Clearly it would be impossible for the General Assembly to be just to all concerned unless it had more complete information at its disposal. That information could only be obtained through a plebiscite carried through a United Nations commission.

25. Mr. Belaúnde urged the Committee to adopt the Sub-Committee's draft resolution and to reject the Polish amendment.

26. Mr. HENRÍQUEZ UREÑA (Dominican Republic) likewise believed that the complicated problem of Eritrea could not be solved satisfactorily without additional information which could be obtained only by a United Nations commission. The United Nations had already obtained a good result in a similar situation by adopting a similar procedure with regard to Palestine. Had it not sent a commission of investigation to the latter territory, the General Assembly would probably still be groping in the dark. It was quite true that the Sub-Committee's proposal would mean postponing the final settlement for Eritrea, but at least there would be an assurance that the final decision would be in accordance with the wishes of the population. Although the delegation of the Dominican Republic very much favoured granting independence to all peoples, it was of the opinion that it would be unwise to adopt such a measure until all the aspects of the situation had been investigated. He therefore strongly supported the Sub-Committee's draft.

27. Ato AKLILOU (Ethiopia) agreed with the Polish representative that there could be no global solution for the question of the disposal of the former Italian colonies so long as no final settlement had been reached with respect to Eritrea. However, the Ethiopian delegation was opposed to the granting of independence to that territory. While it fully supported the principles laid down in annex XI of the Italian Peace Treaty, the Ethiopian delegation felt that the wishes of the population were of paramount importance. The report of the Four Power Commission of Investigation showed that the majority of the population, amounting to 96 per cent of the people of the Eastern Provinces, which in turn amounted to 68 per cent of the total population, demanded union with Ethiopia. Hence, the proposal for independence did not take into account the wishes of the population. Likewise, it did not take into account the requirements of international peace and security or the interests of the countries concerned. Both at the present and at the previous sessions of the General Assembly, representatives of Eritrea had stated that, as far as they were concerned, self-determination implied union with Ethiopia and not the creation of a sovereign Eritrean State. The Ethiopian representative added that the proposal for independence of Eritrea, together with a grant of trusteeship of Italy over Somaliland, would constitute a terrible threat to the security of Ethiopia. He was

therefore strongly opposed to the Polish amendment.

28. Mr. ARUTIUNIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had listened to all the arguments in favour of the Sub-Committee's draft resolution to establish a commission of investigation and to postpone the final decision regarding Eritrea but he had found no validity in those arguments. In his opinion the report of the Four Power Commission of Investigation provided ample information upon which a decision could be based. The fact that the First Committee had been satisfied with the Commission's information regarding Libya and Somaliland showed that in connexion with the question of Eritrea, the Committee was employing a different yardstick. To be candid, certain delegations were not basing themselves on the available information but on other considerations. Surely, there had been ample information showing that the people of Somaliland did not wish Italian trusteeship and insisted, if not on immediate independence, at least on a collective United Nations trusteeship. Of course, it was possible to disagree as to the proportion of the population of Somaliland that objected to Italian trusteeship but it was an indubitable fact, borne out by the recent disturbances in that territory, that a substantial proportion was actively opposed to any return of Italian rule. Nevertheless, in spite of the demands of the population, the First Committee, by a majority vote, had decided (321st meeting) to impose Italian trusteeship. Mr. Arutiunian believed that the complaints about the shortage of information regarding Eritrea were unfounded and were nothing less than a political manoeuvre. If, in the case of Somaliland, the Committee could adopt a solution contrary to the demands of the people, then it was no use complaining about the lack of information or the faulty quality of such information with respect to Eritrea.

29. The second argument adduced by supporters of the Sub-Committee's plan was that there had been some divergencies of opinion regarding the real desires of the people of Eritrea. Actually, those divergencies of opinion had really existed among the members of the First Committee. Nevertheless, there had been similar disagreements in the case of Somaliland and that had not prevented the majority from adopting a decision in disregard of the desires of the Somali people. Furthermore, even if such divergencies of opinion had to be taken into account that was not a logical reason for rejecting the Polish amendment. Once Eritrea had been declared a sovereign independent State, then the people of Eritrea would be free to make any adjustments they desired. If the majority wanted to be united with Ethiopia, then an independent Eritrea could easily solve that question on the basis of democratic methods.

30. Of course, the real reason for postponing the settlement was that the colonial Powers had failed to reach agreement on the disposal of Eritrea. Hence, those Powers were seeking to postpone the final decision in the hope that, during the interval before the next session of the General Assembly, they would be able to reach an understanding on Eritrea which would redound to their benefit. It was well known that the secret Bevin-Sforza Agreement lay at the basis of the decision adopted by the majority of the First Committee in connexion with Libya and Somali-

land. In the case of Eritrea, the Bevin-Sforza Agreement provided for partition and, largely on the initiative of the United States delegation, attempts had been made to implement parts of that agreement. However, partition had not been accepted and that was why the majority of delegations were trying to delay the final settlement in the hope that it would be possible to agree on partitioning Eritrea.

31. On the other hand, no attempt was being made to satisfy the claim of Ethiopia which had been the victim of Italian aggression. For his part, Mr. Arutiunian could not imagine how the General Assembly could solve the question of the disposal of the former Italian colonies without any concession to Ethiopia. The Committee had heard the Ethiopian representative's statement that the majority decision with regard to Somaliland represented a formidable threat to the national security of his country (317th meeting). What was the result of all the General Assembly's work on the question of the former Italian colonies as far as Ethiopia was concerned? Anxiety and concern was rapidly growing in that country as a result of the First Committee's decision. Mr. Arutiunian said that since one of the real sources of the Second World War had been Italy's aggression against Ethiopia, it was impossible to conceive that one of the last instruments for the solution of the problems arising out of the war should be so formulated as to aggravate Ethiopia's anxiety for its national security. That was another reason why the Soviet Union delegation disagreed with the proposal of the majority of Sub-Committee 17.

32. Mr. Arutiunian gave his delegation's support for the amendment of the Polish delegation.

33. Mahmoud FAWZI Bey (Egypt) said that although his delegation wished a final solution regarding Eritrea, it could not agree to the contention that the United Nations was bound to come to a final solution for each of the former Italian colonies at the present session. That fact was borne out by paragraph 3 of annex XI of the Treaty of Peace with Italy, which envisaged the possibility of the four powers finding a solution for one or two territories only. Moreover, his delegation could not support the views expressed by certain delegations that, if no solution was recommended with regard to Eritrea, any recommendation regarding Libya, for example, should be postponed. There was no logic in such a reasoning. His delegation was well aware of the fact that despite the strenuous efforts of the Sub-Committee, no acceptable solution concerning Eritrea had commended itself to a majority of that Sub-Committee. The creation of a commission of investigation, therefore, was the only acceptable alternative. It could not be said that such a decision amounted to a postponement of the question; on the contrary, that was a positive step since the commission of investigation would ascertain fully the real wishes of the inhabitants of Eritrea whose representatives had so far expressed conflicting views before the First Committee. His delegation, accordingly, would vote against the Polish amendment, as well as against any other attempt to prevent the establishment of such a commission.

34. Mr. DE MARCOS (Cuba) declared that the present political evolution in international relations witnessed the twilight of colonialism.

Although his delegation was always in favour of the principle of independence for all peoples, it could not acquiesce to the Polish amendment, in view of the claims of the Ethiopian representative to the effect that the majority of the Eritrean people desired annexation to Ethiopia. In view of the serious doubts entertained by his delegation with regard to those wishes, it preferred to support the establishment of a commission with a view to ascertaining the real wishes of the inhabitants.

35. Finally, as regards the statement of the representative of the USSR to the effect that one of the causes of the Second World War had been the Italian aggression against Ethiopia, he wished to appeal to the members of the First Committee to work for the future without going back to past memories.

36. Sir Mohammad ZAFRULLA KHAN (Pakistan) said that since the Polish amendment was in accordance with the wishes of the majority of the Eritrean people, his delegation would support it, or, in case of its rejection, would vote in favour of the establishment of the proposed commission.

37. Mr. WIERBLOWSKI (Poland) said that although he agreed with the representative of Cuba that the era of colonialism was coming to an end, the solutions proposed by the First Committee merely constituted an old-fashioned redistribution of colonies. Moreover, he could not support the appeal of the Cuban delegation regarding oblivion of past memories, since Poland had suffered heavily from the events of the Second World War. On the contrary, in disposing of the former Italian colonies, the First Committee should take into account the experiences gained from studying the causes of the Second World War.

38. The representative of Egypt had contended that the stipulations of paragraph 3 of annex XI of the Peace Treaty with Italy did not prevent the United Nations from recommending partial solutions to the problem under discussion. Yet, he did not take into account the fact that the very text of that paragraph stipulated that, in case the four Powers disagreed among themselves, the General Assembly might adopt a recommendation regarding the question of the disposal of the former Italian colonies as a whole and not regarding any particular territory.

39. In so far as the statement of the representative of Peru was concerned, to the effect that the proposed solution regarding Eritrea constituted a substantive decision, his delegation could not acquiesce in that interpretation since, in its opinion, the establishment of the commission would amount to a procedural decision as to the method whereby a solution was sought.

40. His delegation supported the contention of the representative of the USSR that the establishment of a commission regarding Eritrea was due to the disagreement prevailing among the colonial Powers and not to a lack of information with regard to that territory.

41. Mr. BELAÚNDE (Peru) said that in disposing of Eritrea, the First Committee could not apply principles similar to those taken into account while solving the problem of Somaliland. Whereas the unity of Somaliland had not been questioned, with regard to Eritrea, three different proposals

had been submitted, namely, the Sub-Committee's recommendation, the Polish amendment for its independence, and the Ethiopian claim for the incorporation of the territory into Ethiopia. Moreover, the report of the Four Power Commission of Investigation had itself acknowledged the complexity of the problem, thereby necessitating a different approach to the question. Therefore, the need for ascertaining the real wishes of the population through a commission was obvious. On the contrary, the solution insinuated by the representative of the Soviet Union, namely a solution without prior consultation of the population would be an old-fashioned one. Moreover, in issuing certain specific directives to the proposed commission, the General Assembly would then be adopting a substantive and not merely a procedural decision.

42. Mr. MORALES MARENCO (Nicaragua) said that his delegation would vote against the Polish amendment, not because it was opposed to granting Eritrea its independence, but because it favoured the creation of a commission to ascertain the real wishes of the local inhabitants. Of course, should the proposed commission recommend independence for the territory, his delegation would support that recommendation. Moreover, although it recognized the claims of Ethiopia, it would reserve its position regarding that matter, pending the report of the commission of investigation.

43. Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) pointed out that the present deliberations resorted to procrastinations and postponement in dealing with the problems arising from the defeat of the axis Powers. That was remi-

niscient of the methods of the old-fashioned diplomacy. Moreover, Mr. Kiselev contended that the postponement of the Eritrean question was not due to lack of information but merely to disagreement among the colonial Powers themselves, and he gave a detailed description of the proceedings of the Sub-Committee in support of that contention.

44. The representative of Peru had contended that, in solving the problem, due account should be taken of the real wishes of the inhabitants of Eritrea. But those wishes had been conveyed in a letter addressed on 10 November 1949 to the Chairman of the First Committee by the Eritrean Bloc for Independence, wherein the Bloc expressed its regret for the failure of the Committee to adopt a decision and protested the doubts, artificially raised, as to the reality of their unanimous will for independence.

45. His delegation agreed with the views expressed by the representative of Poland with regard to the necessity of remembering the causes of the Second World War, since a fair recollection of the Italian attack on Ethiopia would greatly contribute to the understanding of Ethiopia's apprehensions as a result of the proposed solution for Somaliland.

46. Since the Polish amendment was in accordance with the real wishes of the population of Eritrea, his delegation would vote in favour of it and would remind the First Committee that the adoption of the majority proposal would merely lead to a repetition of the events of 1936.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.

THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Friday, 11 November 1949, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Lester B. PEARSON (Canada).

Question of the disposal of the former Italian colonies (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN said the discussion would deal with that part of the Polish amendment (A/C.1/529) to section C of the Sub-Committee's draft resolution (A/C.1/522), which dealt with Eritrea. He recalled that that important problem had already been fully debated in the First Committee and expressed the hope that delegations would confine their observations strictly to the amendment.

2. Mr. ARUTIUNIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he had intended to reply to the Peruvian representative, but in view of the Chairman's remarks he would refrain from taking the floor, the Peruvian representative's speech (322nd meeting) having dealt mainly with matters extraneous to the debate.

3. Mr. WIERBLOWSKI (Poland) asked for separate votes on paragraphs 1, 2 and 7 of point 6 of his amendment, which dealt with Eritrea.

4. The CHAIRMAN put paragraph 1 of point 6 of the part of the Polish amendment (A/C.1/529) related to section C of the Sub-Committee's draft resolution to the vote.

Paragraph 1 was rejected by 27 votes to 10, with 14 abstentions.

5. The CHAIRMAN put paragraph 2 to the vote.

Paragraph 2 was rejected by 30 votes to 11, with 13 abstentions.

6. The CHAIRMAN put paragraph 7 to the vote.

Paragraph 7 was rejected by 17 votes to 15, with 22 abstentions.

7. The CHAIRMAN put paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 6 of that part of the Polish amendment (A/C.1/529) which dealt with Eritrea to the vote.

Paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 6 were rejected by 35 votes to 6, with 13 abstentions.

8. The CHAIRMAN said the Committee would next vote on paragraph 1 of section C as it appeared in the report of Sub-Committee 17 (A/C.1/522). He recalled that the Burmese delegation had submitted an amendment to that paragraph (A/C.1/535).

9. Mr. DE FREITAS-VALLE (Brazil) said that his delegation, as previously indicated during the general debate in Sub-Committee 17, was in favour of the Sub-Committee's draft resolution. Accordingly it would vote for the establishment