

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
 ASSEMBLY**

FOURTEENTH SESSION  
 Official Records



**GENERAL COMMITTEE, 124th  
 MEETING**

Friday, 9 October 1959,  
 at 3.10 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	Page
<i>Consideration of the agenda of the fourteenth session and allocation of items: memorandum by the Secretary-General (continued) . . . . .</i>	11
<i>Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the fourteenth session: item proposed by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic. . . . .</i>	11
<i>Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the fourteenth session: item proposed by the Secretary-General . . . . .</i>	11
<i>Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the fourteenth session: item proposed by the Federation of Malaya and Ireland. . . . .</i>	11

**Chairman:** Mr. Víctor A. BELAUNDE (Peru).

**Consideration of the agenda of the fourteenth session and allocation of items: memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/151) (continued)**

**REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN ADDITIONAL ITEM IN THE AGENDA OF THE FOURTEENTH SESSION: ITEM PROPOSED BY THE BYELORUSSIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC (A/4233)**

*At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Kiselev (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) took a place at the Committee table.*

1. Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation had requested the inclusion in the agenda of the item "International encouragement of scientific research into the control of cancerous diseases" for the reasons stated in the explanatory memorandum submitted in support of its request (A/4233). Control of cancerous diseases was of international interest and a field in which the United Nations should play an important part. The measures proposed by the Byelorussian SSR would encourage scientific research and thus help to deliver mankind from the scourge of cancer which annually killed more than two million people.

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the item should be included in the agenda, for allocation to the Third Committee.*

*Mr. Kiselev (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) withdrew.*

**REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN ADDITIONAL ITEM IN THE AGENDA OF THE FOURTEENTH SESSION: ITEM PROPOSED BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/4231, A/4232)**

2. The CHAIRMAN said that he was certain the item "The United Nations Library: gift of the Ford Founda-

tion" would be received with great satisfaction by members of the Committee, who would have an opportunity of expressing their warm appreciation of the action of the Ford Foundation when the item was considered in a Main Committee or when it was finally dealt with at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the item should be included in the agenda, for allocation to the Fifth Committee.*

**REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN ADDITIONAL ITEM IN THE AGENDA OF THE FOURTEENTH SESSION: ITEM PROPOSED BY THE FEDERATION OF MALAYA AND IRELAND (A/4234)**

*At the invitation of the Chairman, Dato' Ismail (Federation of Malaya) and Mr. Aiken (Ireland) took places at the Committee table.*

3. Dato' ISMAIL (Federation of Malaya) said that he wished to explain more fully the reasons, briefly set out in the explanatory memorandum (A/4234), that had prompted his delegation to request the inclusion in the agenda of the item "Question of Tibet".

4. In March 1959 fighting had broken out between the Tibetan people and the armed forces of the People's Republic of China. The Tibetan uprising had been quickly and ruthlessly crushed and thousands of Tibetans had been killed in the fighting. However, the Dalai Lama, the temporal and spiritual leader of the Tibetan people, had succeeded, with the help of his loyal subjects, in fleeing to India where he had requested the Indian Government to grant him asylum. The Malayan Government had received information indicating that for some time the Tibetan people had been subjected by the authorities of the People's Republic of China to repressive measures which violated their human rights and fundamental freedoms. The official statements made by the Dalai Lama following his arrival in India and the appeal he had addressed to the Secretary-General on 9 September 1959 had confirmed that information. In its report entitled The Question of Tibet and the Rule of Law, published at Geneva in the summer of 1959, the International Commission of Jurists had confirmed the statements made by the Dalai Lama. On the basis of those statements and the Commission's report, the Malayan delegation was satisfied that there existed evidence of an attempt to destroy the traditional way of life of the Tibetan people and the religious and cultural autonomy which they had long enjoyed, as well as of systematic disregard for the human rights and fundamental freedoms set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The situation was a source of concern to all the freedom-loving peoples of the world and particularly to the millions of Buddhists in Asia and elsewhere.

5. For those reasons, the Government of the Federation of Malaya, as a staunch upholder of the United

Nations Charter, was convinced that the recent events in Tibet could not remain unheeded by the United Nations, one of whose stated aims was to promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion. His delegation therefore appealed to the General Committee to give careful consideration to its request and to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of the item in the agenda of the current session.

6. Mr. AIKEN (Ireland) said that the Irish delegation's purpose in requesting the inclusion of the item "Question of Tibet" in the agenda of the General Assembly was merely to draw the latter's attention to the violation of human rights in Tibet. It was not motivated by any desire to provoke an acrimonious debate or to revive the cold war. It hoped that the recent improvement in international relations might continue, and it would continue to give its untiring support to efforts aimed at the reduction of international tensions and the attainment of a just and stable peace through negotiation. It therefore greatly regretted that the action of the People's Republic of China should have been such as to embitter relations between peoples at a time when the leaders of the great Powers were making constructive efforts in the cause of peace. The Irish delegation firmly believed that respect for the principles of the Charter by every Member State was a basic condition of world peace and security and of understanding among nations. It would be an abdication of responsibility for the Assembly to avoid a discussion of the question of Tibet and to refuse to take the action which the situation called for. In other cases where human rights had been infringed, as in the case of race relations in the Union of South Africa, the Assembly had urged the State concerned to respect those rights. It would be unjust for the Assembly to ignore violations of human rights in Tibet. Its function should be to condemn a breach of the principles which every Member State was pledged to maintain and upon which were based all mankind's hopes for a better world.

7. The Irish delegation was aware that objections had been raised to the inclusion of the item in the agenda, based on the fear that it might lead to an acrimonious debate likely to revive the cold war. His delegation earnestly hoped that that would not be the case and saw no reason why the matter should not be discussed objectively in plenary session or in a Main Committee.

8. It appeared that four other objections had been raised to the inclusion of the item in the agenda. The first was that neither the victim State nor the aggressor State was a Member of the United Nations. But the mere fact that Tibet and the People's Republic of China could not participate in the debate would not justify the Assembly in ignoring what had happened in Tibet. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights drafted by the United Nations was, as its name indicated, a universal declaration, which meant that any violation of human rights must concern the United Nations, even where those responsible were not Members of the Organization.

9. The second objection was that the facts regarding the matter had not been sufficiently established. In the Irish delegation's view, the statements made by the Dalai Lama and the report published by the International Commission of Jurists on the events in Tibet constituted *prima facie* evidence of serious violations of human rights in that country.

10. The third objection was that any decision reached by the General Assembly or resolution adopted by it would most likely be ignored by the People's Republic of China. That fact, regrettable as it was, would not justify a refusal by the General Assembly to discuss the matter and to state its views to public opinion. There had been other cases where Member States had refused to accept the Assembly's recommendations, but the majority of the Member States had taken the view that no State in the modern world could afford to remain obdurate in the face of a firm expression of world public opinion, endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly. Such a verdict represented a force which had to be reckoned with.

11. The final objection was that inclusion of the item in the agenda might add to the difficulties of States which were neighbours of China and Tibet. Ireland had friendly relations with the States concerned and had no wish to add to their difficulties. In fact, the Irish Government did not believe that those difficulties would be increased by the Assembly's reaffirmation of the basic principle of respect for human rights in Tibet or anywhere else. It felt, on the contrary, that such a reaffirmation would be in the common interest of all States, including those that were neighbours of the States concerned.

12. He was confident that the General Committee, aware of the gravity of the matter, would recommend the inclusion of the question of Tibet in the agenda of the General Assembly.

13. Mr. BARCO (United States of America) recalled that on 9 September 1959 the Dalai Lama had appealed to the United Nations to intervene in view of the inhuman treatment to which the Tibetan people were being subjected and of the crimes against humanity and religion committed in Tibet. The Dalai Lama had stated that the armed forces of Communist China had attacked the lives and property of thousands of Tibetans, adopted cruel measures with a view to the total extermination of the Tibetan race, and sought to deprive the Tibetan people of their religious and cultural autonomy. The very nature of those serious accusations was sufficient to justify inclusion of the question in the agenda, and the United Nations could not remain deaf to the Dalai Lama's appeal. Furthermore the International Commission of Jurists had published a report on events in Tibet based on accounts by Tibetan refugees, and had stated that there was *prima facie* evidence that the Chinese Communists had committed in Tibet atrocities equivalent to the crime of genocide. The United Nations had often given expression to the profound anxiety felt by world public opinion at flagrant violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms whenever they occurred. The fact that attacks on human rights and fundamental freedoms had taken place in a remote and inaccessible part of the world was no justification for ignoring them. For the United Nations to close its eyes to such attacks would run counter to its purposes and principles.

14. The United States delegation welcomed the initiative taken by Ireland and the Federation of Malaya. It would vote in favour of the inclusion of the question of Tibet in the agenda and for its consideration by the General Assembly in plenary session.

15. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed regret that the General Assem-

bly should have to deal with a provocative question instead of concentrating on the important and urgent problems before them. The Soviet delegation opposed the inclusion in the agenda of the so-called question of Tibet, which the United States wished to force on the General Assembly in order to disturb the atmosphere there and halt the incipient improvement in international relations. Inclusion of the item would be illegal and contrary to the provisions of the Charter, especially Article 2, paragraph 7, which expressly provided that the United Nations was not authorized to intervene in matters which were essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State. In the present case, examination of the question of Tibet would constitute a flagrant and unwarranted intervention in the domestic affairs of the People's Republic of China. Since time immemorial Tibet had been an integral part of China. That was an irrefutable fact which no one, not even the delegations which had requested the inclusion of the item, could deny. The sponsors of the proposal had entrenched themselves behind what they claimed to be humanitarian considerations, and set themselves up as champions of political and religious rights, in order to cloak their aggressive intentions towards the Tibetan people. For that purpose they had invented and disseminated shameless slanders which constituted an act of provocation against Tibet. An analysis of the style of the Dalai Lama's statement, referred to in the explanatory memorandum, was enough to show how unfounded such allegations were; the statement had obviously been prepared by the State Department.

16. With regard to the facts, the Irish representative had himself admitted that some appeared doubtful and that the situation was unclear. There was nothing surprising about that, for the so-called facts had been fabricated out of whole cloth to suit the needs of the case. A touching concern had also been shown for a group of feudal overlords who, in Tibet, had committed crimes against thousands by imposing a system of serfdom—a system particularly cruel because not merely the land and livestock but also the peasants themselves had been the property of the feudal overlords, who had exploited them, oppressed them and subjected them to humiliating punishments. In contrast, all mention of the humanitarian and progressive measures taken by the Chinese Government to help the Tibetans to overcome their centuries of backwardness and to wipe out the feudal régime was deliberately omitted. Needless to say, the Chinese Government respected the humanitarian principles set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and that was just what had displeased those whose interest lay in preserving the outworn colonial system in Tibet. It was easy to guess for whom the Irish and Malayan delegations were acting. The request for the inclusion of the so-called question of Tibet in the agenda had been prepared unofficially long ago, and the manoeuvres resorted to in that connexion were well known. They had even been mentioned in The New York Times. Those supporting the inclusion of the item had several times referred to respect for human rights: should attention not be drawn to the regions of Asia and Africa where the most elementary rights of the human person were flouted, and where men were killed solely because they wished to free themselves from the colonial yoke and to live in freedom?

17. It was difficult to see how Ireland, which had struggled many years for its independence and had

suffered under the same forces of imperialism as the Tibetan people, could have taken such a step. What the imperialist circles really wanted was to smear China, to sow discord in Asia and to destroy the spirit of Bandung. By their subversive activities they were seeking to envenom the situation in South Korea, Taiwan, South Viet-Nam and Laos. Their purpose was to revive the cold war in the General Assembly in order to distract the attention of the United Nations from the important problems it was called upon to solve. The United Nations should not let itself be deflected from its constructive tasks at a time when prospects were favourable to the work of peace it had to perform. In the circumstances the Soviet delegation would vote against the inclusion of the question of Tibet in the agenda.

18. Mr. TSIANG (China) pointed out that Tibet was part of China, and that the whole Chinese people remained faithful to its traditions and condemned the atrocities committed in Tibet by Communist troops. The Chinese delegation considered that the Assembly could examine the question of Tibet without contravening the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. The United Nations could not remain indifferent to an attempt at total extinction of the Tibetan race. The Soviet representative had tried to justify the aggression committed in Tibet by saying that the Chinese Communists wanted to introduce reforms there. However desirable the reforms might be, they could not be imposed by force of arms. Several speakers had referred to human rights. What was meant by respect for human rights was merely a generally recognized rule of behaviour. Those who acted in contempt of such rights were failing to comply with the standards of civilization.

19. The Chinese delegation would vote in favour of the inclusion of the question of Tibet in the agenda.

20. Mr. LOUW (Union of South Africa) said that the United Nations often had difficulty in drawing the line between sentiment and respect for the rules of the Organization. The issue at present under discussion was a case in point.

21. If the articles in the Press and other reports on the situation in Tibet were to be believed, the events that had occurred in that country were indeed deplorable. On the other hand, the actual international status of Tibet should be determined in order to ascertain whether the United Nations Charter permitted the United Nations to intervene in the case. The General Committee would do well to resolve that question before recommending the inclusion of the question of Tibet in the agenda of the General Assembly.

22. During the general debate the Chinese representative had stated (812th meeting) that article 120 of the Constitution of the Republic of China provided that the self-governing system of Tibet was to be safeguarded. In that connexion it should be noted that the term "self-governing" did not always imply sovereign independence. It appeared that Tibet was under the sovereignty or suzerainty of another Power and, that being so, the question arose whether the General Committee could recommend to the Assembly the inclusion of the item in the agenda without contravening Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. The explanatory memorandum submitted in support of the request for inclusion circumvented the difficulty by referring to "the traditional way of life of the Tibetan people" and to their "religious and cultural autonomy". Traditions un-

doubtedly represented precious values in the life of any people, but it was difficult to see how their suppression could form the basis of a charge against any State, whether it was a Member of the United Nations or not, without contravening the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter.

23. As a further justification for placing the proposed item on the agenda, it was claimed that there existed *prima facie* evidence of a systematic disregard for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It was not the first time recourse had been had to that argument in an attempt to circumvent the explicit provisions of Article 2 paragraph 7. The records of the San Francisco Conference of 1945 showed that delegates to that Conference had been determined to safeguard the basic principle stated in that paragraph, and Mr. Dulles, the United States delegate at that Conference, had in that connexion issued a warning against any interference in the economic and social life of Member States. The question had been raised again when Committee 3 of Commission II of the San Francisco Conference had discussed Articles 55 and 56 of the Charter relating to human rights and fundamental freedoms. It was clear from the Conference records that delegations had feared that those articles might be interpreted as an exception to the operation of Article 2, paragraph 7, and might lead to interference in the domestic affairs of Member States. That was why Commission II had stated in its report that nothing contained in Chapter IX of the Charter could be construed as giving authority to the Organization to intervene in the domestic affairs of Member States.<sup>1/</sup> Although the records of the San Francisco Conference did not have the force of law, they clearly testified to the intentions of the founders of the United Nations, namely that the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter could not be circumvented by considerations of safeguarding "the traditional way of life" or "the religious and cultural autonomy" of a particular people. What was even more important was the fact that the founders of the United Nations had thought it necessary that it should be stated in the records of their meetings that the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, could not be evaded by means of Articles 55 and 56 relating to human rights and fundamental freedoms.

24. In view of the uncertainty as to the status of Tibet and the applicability of Article 2, paragraph 7, in a case of suzerainty, the South African delegation would abstain when the question of the inclusion in the agenda of the item concerning Tibet was put to the vote.

25. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom) said that public opinion in the United Kingdom had followed the events in Tibet with particular concern since the two countries were linked by long-standing friendship, and he recalled that on 17 September [798th meeting] Mr. Lloyd had said how grieved he was to see the Tibetan people oppressed and deprived of their ancient liberties.

26. Turning to the actual request for the item's inclusion in the agenda, he observed that that question raised certain legal problems. If it were admitted that the People's Republic of China exercised sovereignty over Tibet, it might be asked whether the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter—to which the Government of the United Kingdom attached great importance—were applicable to the case. The question

of Tibet was particularly complex, and it was undeniable that on the legal level a certain number of important aspects were obscure. Whilst not departing from its general attitude towards Article 2, paragraph 7, Her Majesty's Government believed there must be some doubt whether this provision applied in the present case.

27. In his statement the Dalai Lama had spoken of cruel and inhuman measures aimed at the extermination of the Tibetan race as a whole. There had occurred a human tragedy which had shocked the opinion of the entire world. If the item were inscribed, the Asian representatives would be the first to express their distress about what had happened. Although his delegation did not necessarily support the contents of the explanatory memorandum nor commit itself in favour of any particular resolution, it considered it right that the world should know exactly what was happening in Tibet. It would therefore vote in favour of inscription.

28. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) said that he was opposed to the inclusion of the question of Tibet in the agenda of the fourteenth session. A debate on that question would constitute unwarrantable interference in the domestic affairs of the People's Republic of China, as well as a violation of the spirit and letter of the United Nations Charter. Tibet had been part of Chinese territory from time immemorial. Certain imperialist circles, however, which had instigated the request for the item's inclusion, wished to extend open protection to the handful of Tibetan reactionaries who, betraying their country, had trampled underfoot the Sino-Tibetan agreement of 1951.<sup>2/</sup> That clique, which was hated by the working population of Tibet, had attempted, last March, to stir up a rebellion aimed at preventing democratic reforms in the country. It wished to keep the Tibetan people under a backward régime of bondage, characterized by rigorous class distinctions and tortures of notorious brutality. Those were the civil freedoms which certain persons claimed to be defending. As for religious freedoms, no one denied that they ought to be protected. But in Tibet many heads of monasteries had, even more cruelly than the nobles, exploited the serfs whom they had owned. The lower-ranking lamas themselves had been subjected to frightful maltreatment. Today, on the other hand, after the failure of the rebellion, the Tibetan people was advancing toward a prosperous life, thanks to the reforms which the Government of the People's Republic of China was introducing.

29. The request for the item's inclusion was really no more than a manoeuvre by the champions of the cold war, who wished to increase international tension and annihilate the hopes for peace. At the first stage in the exchange of visits between the most powerful Heads of State, when the latter were preparing conferences for the discussion of urgent questions, an attempt was being made in the United Nations to diminish the Organization's prestige by making it into an instrument of the cold war. For all those reasons, the Czechoslovak delegation would vote against the request for the item's inclusion.

30. Mr. UNDEN (Sweden) thought that where there was any doubt about the Assembly's competence, a request for the inclusion of an item in the agenda

<sup>1/</sup> United Nations Conference on International Organization, II/3/27.

<sup>2/</sup> Agreement of the Central People's Government and the local Government of Tibet on measures for the peaceful liberation of Tibet, signed at Peking on 23 May 1951.

should be supported; he would, therefore, vote for the inclusion of the Tibetan question.

31. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) said that he could not associate himself with the request for the item's inclusion, the results of which might well be more unfortunate than desirable. His delegation wished to emphasize that it was by no means opposed to the free discussion of any important world problem, since such discussion was the best way of arriving at a settlement of those problems. A discussion was not free, however, unless all the States concerned could take part in it, and in the present instance the accused State would not be in a position to plead its case. It was hardly possible to consider the question of Tibet in the absence of the People's Republic of China, and it was regrettable that the General Assembly had again decided to postpone the question of that country's participation in the work of the United Nations. By doing so, the Assembly had deprived itself of its sole means of clarifying the situation in Tibet.

32. The relaxation of tension between the great Powers had been warmly welcomed by all Governments, and care should be taken not to compromise that improvement in the international situation by a debate which might disturb it. The Indonesian delegation, therefore, would vote against the item's inclusion in the agenda.

33. Mrs. CISELET (Belgium) said that the events in Tibet had aroused strong feeling in her country. On the other hand, in view of the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, there was some uncertainty about the Assembly's competence. The Belgian delegation had serious doubts on that point, and it was therefore with an express reservation concerning the question of competence that it would vote for the inclusion of the item.

34. Mr. BARCO (United States of America) said that the whole world had been shocked by the fate of the brave Tibetan people. He deplored the outrageous attacks directed by the Soviet delegation against the United States and the authors of the request for the item's inclusion, and he formally denied all the charges which had been made by that delegation.

35. Mr. BRUCAN (Romania) recalled that it had been decided long ago to raise the question of Tibet in the United Nations, as was apparent from a statement made on 12 September 1959 by Mr. Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary of State of the United States of America. Why had there been such a long delay? Firstly, those responsible for that step had preferred to wait until the question of the representation of the People's Republic of China had been shelved, since they preferred to challenge an opponent in his absence. Secondly, the idea of including the question of Tibet in the agenda of the present session had met with considerable opposition because it carried the dishonourable stigma of the cold war. It was strange that that question, after being put off for so long, should now suddenly have become a matter of extreme urgency in the eyes of certain persons at a time when the General Assembly was preparing, on the proposal of the Soviet Union, to discuss general and complete disarmament, and at a moment when the conversations between Mr. Khrushchev and President Eisenhower were giving grounds for the greatest hopes. A debate on the question of Tibet could only serve to poison the atmosphere of the General Assembly, and might dis-

credit the United Nations in the eyes of world public opinion.

36. As to the pretext advanced for the item's inclusion—the alleged wish to restore "the traditional way of life of the Tibetan people"—that way of life should be called by its true name: it was serfdom, a system which could certainly not be defended in the name of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the United Nations Charter.

37. It was unnecessary to dwell at length on the illegality of the request that the item be included. It was most unfortunate that too often, in the United Nations, there was one law for friends and another for foes. Three weeks earlier, a majority in the General Committee had supported a recommendation aimed at preventing a debate on the representation of China; but today, when an attempt was being made to calumniate China, that same majority advocated the most thorough discussion. Such a procedure was repugnant to the peoples' sense of justice. If it was desired to be fair, such closely related questions could not be considered separately. It was the Charter as a whole, and not any particular one of its principles, which was at stake; and the Charter should not serve as a screen for such flagrant injustice. The Romanian delegation would, therefore, vote against the item's inclusion in the agenda.

38. Mr. DE FREITAS-VALLE (Brazil) considered that rule 40 of the rules of procedure had been infringed by over-long discussion on the substance of the matter. He did not think that the request for the item's inclusion had come too late, since a request for the inclusion of another item had been made on the same day by the Byelorussian delegation. His delegation would vote in favour of the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

39. Mr. KING (Liberia) said that an effort should be made to preserve the atmosphere of relaxation which had begun to make itself felt in international relations. His delegation did not, therefore, consider it advisable to vote for the inclusion of the item proposed.

40. Mr. ESIN (Turkey) thought that the question of Tibet might raise the issue of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. Nevertheless, in view of the violations of human rights which had been committed in Tibet, his delegation would support the request for the item's inclusion.

41. Mr. BEN ABOUD (Morocco) recalled that his delegation had always, in the United Nations, voted in favour of proposals calculated to enhance respect for human rights and enable the peoples to exercise their right of self-determination. Nevertheless, the question before the General Committee was very complex and difficult to decide because of the variety of its aspects. For that reason, his delegation would abstain from voting.

42. Mr. HERRARTE (Guatemala) said that he would vote for the inclusion of the question of Tibet in the agenda, because he considered that the United Nations had a moral and legal duty to safeguard respect for human rights.

43. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the question of Tibet was merely a means employed to revive the cold war and spread a spirit of hatred. The delegations which had tried to have that question included in the agenda had obviously

been handicapped by the inconsistency of their own arguments. The statement by the United Kingdom representative in certain respects transgressed the laws of logic, since he had arrived at somewhat unexpected conclusions. While in speech the United Kingdom delegation was defending the rights of the Tibetan people, in fact it was defending those of the reactionary group which had held power in Tibet, and it must therefore be supporting the maintenance and strengthening of that group's régime.

44. As for the principle of the self-determination of peoples, and for human rights, he cited the example of Oman, where the people were fighting to free themselves from the yoke of colonialism. He also quoted the cases of Northern Ireland and the Belgian Congo.

45. The CHAIRMAN asked the Soviet representative to moderate the tone of his remarks and avoid any reference to matters not related to the item under discussion.

46. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the previous speakers had touched on the substance of the question. He said that his country was ready to co-operate with the United Kingdom, the United States and all countries of the world in serving the cause of peace and international co-operation, but that he did not wish to see the General Assembly veering towards the cold war by considering a question which could only poison the atmosphere of its discussions.

47. Mr. DELGADO (Philippines) said that the question of Tibet should be considered from a humanitarian standpoint. It was a duty towards world public opinion to hear an appeal concerning a violation of human rights. The Philippine delegation therefore, without prejudging the question of whether that appeal was well founded, would vote for the inclusion of the question of Tibet in the agenda. It trusted the good sense of all representatives to ensure that the debate on the matter in plenary meeting would remain objective and devoid of animosity.

48. Mr. BERARD (France) said that the sufferings of the Tibetan people had aroused deep feeling in his country, as Mr. Couve de Murville, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, had explained to the General Assembly (814th meeting). Public opinion in France condemned the violence to which the Tibetan people had been subjected and hoped that civil and religious freedoms would be restored in Tibet. However, the French delegation was unable to support the request for the item's inclusion in the agenda, since from the legal standpoint there was, in the Charter, insufficient justification for giving effect to that request. The French delegation would accordingly abstain from voting.

49. Mr. AIKEN (Ireland) said that the USSR representative had first denied that anything had happened in Tibet, and had then, in substance, maintained that the People's Republic of China was carrying out a civilizing mission among a people with a backward social system. The leaders of the Tibetan people, including the Dalai Lama, had admittedly emphasized that changes in the country were necessary; but all that had been offered to the Tibetan people was so-called progress imposed from without, the people not being allowed to say what ends were to be pursued or who was to be entrusted with the task. That type of "progress" presented the worst features of nineteenth-

century imperialism. Nowadays there were better means of achieving progress. The United Nations itself was dedicated to the principle of peaceful progress by mutual consent, a principle eminently demonstrated in the work of the Trusteeship Council and in the technical assistance programmes. The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union and the President of the United States of America had subscribed to the same principle when, in their communiqué of 27 September 1959, they had agreed that all outstanding international questions should be settled not by the application of force but by peaceful means, through negotiation.

50. It was to be hoped that the delegations of countries which had at one time been colonies would not be prepared to accept, in the case of Tibet, the same type of action that they had so often condemned on other occasions. Ireland, which had a long history of resistance to outside interference in its own affairs, could not remain indifferent to the appeal of the Tibetan people. It also hoped that there would be a wide response elsewhere, especially in Asia, to the appeal by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Federation of Malaya.

51. The problem went beyond the interests of a particular area, since the question was one of principle. The Suez affair and the whole history of the League of Nations showed that the power and prestige of an international organization increased or decreased according to how far it succeeded in winning respect for its principles. In the case of Tibet the question was one of basic human rights, and the defence of those rights ought to take precedence of every other consideration. The United Nations risked being discredited if it proclaimed the principles of the Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights without protesting against their large-scale violation. Those who today were unwilling to listen to the Tibetan people's cries of distress ran the risk that world opinion might remain deaf to their own appeals if tomorrow they called to it for help. If the question were included in the agenda, and if a resolution calling for the respect of human rights in Tibet obtained broad support, public opinion would in the future constitute a proportionately more powerful protection against further violations of those rights.

52. Mr. BRUCAN (Romania) said that the authors of the request for inclusion of the item (A/4234) had based their request on the statements of the Dalai Lama. The latter had said that, according to his information, the Panchen Lama had been arrested by the Chinese authorities. In fact, the Panchen Lama had recently taken part, at Peking, in ceremonies celebrating the tenth anniversary of the People's Republic of China. Were those the trustworthy reports relied upon by the signatories of document A/4234? What reliance could be placed on their statements, if their chief item of evidence was shown to be valueless?

53. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to vote on the request for inclusion in the agenda of the fourteenth session of the item "Question of Tibet" (A/4234).

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour: Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, China, Guatemala, Philippines, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of*

Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Austria.

Against: Czechoslovakia, Indonesia, Liberia, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Burma, France, Morocco, Union of South Africa.

*The Committee decided, by 11 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions, to recommend to the General Assembly that the item should be included in the agenda.*

54. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) protested against the manner in which the debate had been conducted, saying that representatives supporting the inclusion of the item had been allowed to speak at length, whereas those who had opposed the inclusion of the item had been cut short.

55. The CHAIRMAN said that on the contrary he had shown considerable restraint; if he had interrupted all speakers who had touched on the substance of the question he would have had to do so many times.

56. He invited the members of the Committee to vote on the proposal that the question of Tibet should be considered by the General Assembly in plenary session.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*The United States of America, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

In favour: United States of America, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, China, Guatemala, Indonesia,<sup>3/</sup> Philippines, Sudan, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Burma, France, Liberia, Morocco, Romania, Union of South Africa.

Present and not voting: Czechoslovakia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

*The Committee decided, by 12 votes to none, with 6 abstentions,<sup>3/</sup> to recommend to the General Assembly that the item should be considered by the General Assembly in plenary session.*

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.

<sup>3/</sup> After the meeting, the representative of Indonesia informed the Secretariat that he wished to have his delegation recorded as having voted against.