



C O N T E N T S

	<i>Page</i>
Factors which should be taken into account in deciding whether a territory is or is not a territory whose people have not yet attained a full measure of self-government: report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee on Factors (Non-Self-Governing Territories) (<i>continued</i>).....	55

Chairman: Mr. Santiago PEREZ PEREZ (Venezuela).

Factors which should be taken into account in deciding whether a territory is or is not a territory whose people have not yet attained a full measure of self-government: report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Factors (Non-Self-Governing Territories) (A/2428, A/C.4/L.272) (*continued*)

[Item 33]*

1. The CHAIRMAN called attention to the draft resolution submitted by the Brazilian delegation on the subject of factors (A/C.4/L.272).
2. Mr. FERREIRA DE SOUZA (Brazil) recalled that the Brazilian delegation had outlined its position on the question of factors at the Committee's seventh session (277th meeting).
3. After careful study of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Factors (Non-Self-Governing Territories) (A/2428) and after reading the many documents submitted to the Fourth Committee, the Brazilian delegation had considered it unnecessary to speak in the debate on that item of the agenda. It had taken the view that after three years' discussion the members of the Fourth Committee had reached an agreement on premises, on essential points and on preliminary considerations, so that long digressions on the merits, importance and limitations of scope of the list submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Committee could be avoided. Unfortunately, the Brazilian delegation had found that that was not so. Some speakers at previous meetings had practically reopened the entire question.
4. The Brazilian delegation was none the less more than ever convinced that it was unnecessary to study the bases of the question of factors or to digress into definitions. The criteria already listed satisfactorily met the purposes of the General Assembly in recommending the production of a list of factors which might serve as a guide to the Assembly in deciding whether to terminate the obligations imposed by Chapter XI of the Charter. The *Ad Hoc* Committee's report showed that the study of those factors had reached a point where no appreciable advance could be made. It was always

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

possible to make improvements to a work of that kind but any changes in the text or in the system would merely reflect personal preferences, and there was consequently a risk of inviting fresh differences of opinion rather than improving the chances of agreement. The Brazilian delegation had therefore been somewhat dismayed by the proposal to set up a third committee to prepare a third edition of the same list, on which fruitless discussions might continue *ad infinitum*.

5. If that vicious circle was to be broken, care should be taken not to attach undue importance to the list. It should be realized that political circumstances were bound to vary and would always resist the application of rigid methods and set principles. Consequently, the existing list could be considered good or bad only in so far as it fulfilled its purpose of serving as a reference and working document.

6. The main criteria which could be applied in judging the measure of self-government were well known to all. The obligations enumerated in Article 73 of the Charter could cease only when the people of a territory had themselves decided their future in full political freedom. Such a decision freely taken must necessarily bring the people in question to the status either of complete independence and admission into the United Nations or the status of association with a sovereign State. If the conditions of such association left the former dependent territory free to exercise political sovereignty within its own borders, the problem would cease to exist. It was not for the Fourth Committee to decide whether the choice of such association had been a wise one. It could only consider whether self-government in internal political affairs could lead to self-government in administrative, economic and social affairs. As long as a nation had no sovereign and absolute power within its borders, it would be useless to assert that the provisions of paragraph b of Article 73 of the Charter, which was the cornerstone of Chapter XI, had been applied. Such were the real criteria of the autonomy of a territory's population. The indications given by the list of factors were of a subsidiary nature and must never obscure the fundamental considerations.

7. The Brazilian delegation was therefore ready to support any draft resolution which would view the list of factors in that way and which would enable the list to be put to the test.

8. If the members of the Fourth Committee would analyse concrete cases objectively, differences on questions of principle would be greatly reduced and the resulting atmosphere of calm would be conducive to solutions in keeping with the spirit of the Charter and reflecting the aspirations of dependent peoples without prejudicing the just and legitimate interests of the Administering Members.

9. In that spirit the Brazilian delegation was formally submitting draft resolution A/C.4/L.272. Its aim was to reconcile the views expressed by several delegations at

recent meetings which were almost identical in several important respects with the views of the Brazilian delegation, particularly with regard to the manner of applying the factors. The draft resolution did not detract in any way from the value which those factors would have when it became necessary to decide the scope of the constitutional changes of which the United Nations was informed by Administering Members in accordance with resolution 222 (III), but it tried to define the spirit in which the newly-established political and juridical criteria should be applied and to stress their relative nature and the importance to be attached, in accordance with the principle stated in resolution 648 (VII), to the particular circumstances of each case.

10. It was true that resolution 648 (VII), in enumerating the basic considerations to be taken into account in the analysis of any situation where a full measure of self-government might be alleged to exist, had referred rather too vaguely to the right of peoples to determine their own future. Moreover, the list of factors had not emphasized sufficiently or exactly enough the importance of that criterion. Consequently, the Brazilian delegation had considered it advisable to give pride of place to a respect for the right of the populations concerned to choose their political status, when considering what evidence was required to support the claim that a full measure of self-government had been reached.

11. He felt sure that many delegations would share his views and would accept the solution proposed in the Brazilian draft. That text repeated paragraphs 3 and 4 of resolution 648 (VII) since it appeared essential to restate the principles contained in that resolution, particularly the principle of the indivisibility of autonomy, which was restated in paragraph 6 of document A/C.4/L.272. That notion was not contested in international or national law, but the Fourth Committee had placed on it certain restrictive interpretations which the Brazilian delegation could not accept. Full political responsibility was the very essence of the concept of self-government as expressed in Article 73 of the Charter. It was true that the idea could have been expressed less vaguely than in resolution 648 (VII), but a new text which in the last instance would merely repeat the same thing might well have given rise to further discussions on the meaning of words, without any practical result.

12. The Brazilian delegation left the revision of the list of factors to the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories which, under resolutions 334 (IV) and 448 (V), was the competent body for initial examination of the information required under resolution 222 (III). Naturally, any final decision must be taken by the General Assembly since a delegation of powers enabling the Committee on Information to have the final word in such questions would be contrary to the principle of the stratification of powers, which must be maintained. On the other hand, it was impossible to exaggerate the importance of the functions of the Committee on Information with regard to the preliminary study of any case of the cessation of the transmission of information required under Article 73 of the Charter. The Brazilian delegation was submitting its draft resolution because it was its sincere desire to give that Committee a sound working document.

13. The Brazilian delegation would welcome any amendment designed to give greater force, precision or clarity to its text; but a resolution such as it was proposing would gain nothing by being overburdened with details or subsidiary considerations.

14. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) recalled the earlier discussions on the matter and urged that a list should be drawn up of factors to serve as a guide in determining whether the obligations set forth in Article 73 e of the Charter still applied. Such guiding principles should not, of course, be regarded as immutable criteria. In that connexion his delegation approved paragraph 9 of document A/2428. No matter how varied the circumstances peculiar to the different territories, however, one factor remained constant: the freely-expressed will of the peoples.

15. His delegation had two general observations to make on the proposed list of factors. First, the list, which was satisfactory on the whole, had in it shortcomings and gaps which could be remedied without referring the text to an *ad hoc* committee. In that respect his delegation agreed with the Guatemalan and Yugoslav delegations that any amendment which would improve the list should be supported. Secondly, no definition could be of permanent value in a world that was rapidly changing. The list would therefore have to be revised as and when circumstances demanded. It could be sent to the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, which could be guided by it and could draw attention to such imperfections as came to light in the course of its application.

16. The problem did not lie in the value of the list itself, which everybody agreed was to be considered solely as a guide, but in something more fundamental—the disagreement in the Fourth Committee on the interpretation of the obligations placed on Member States by Chapter XI. There was a fundamental difference of opinion between the Administering Members, on the one hand, which held that under Chapter XI it was their exclusive prerogative to say whether a territory was self-governing or not; and the non-administering Members, on the other, which maintained that under Chapter XI the General Assembly was clearly competent to adjudicate on that point. Syria took the latter view. It was not the exclusive prerogative of the Administering Member to decide whether a territory had or had not attained a full measure of self-government. Were it otherwise, the drafting of the list of factors under discussion would be a sheer waste of time and effort. His delegation did not wish to involve the Committee in a legal discussion, but felt called upon to reassert that the General Assembly could not shirk its collective responsibility towards the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

17. The Belgian representative had stated (322nd meeting) that it would not be logical to apply the list of factors to the cessation of the transmission of information referred to in Article 73 e of the Charter without also applying it to the commencement of the transmission of such information. He could hardly believe that the Belgian representative had thereby meant information on sovereign States, Members of the United Nations, and that he wished to apply the provisions of Chapter XI to such States. That would be stretching logic too far.

18. In the present eventful times, it was tragic to note that many countries still thought fit to prolong the discussion on the peoples' desire for freedom, as though what was only temporary could continue indefinitely. Men must pray God to give them the courage to endure what could not be changed and to change what could, and the wisdom to distinguish between the two.

19. Mr. BENITES VINUEZA (Ecuador) stated that the problem of determining the factors in question was

one of the most difficult ever placed before the General Assembly, for on its solution depended the realization of the hopes of millions of human beings living under subservience to foreign governments, although some Administering Members had striven to lead them to independence. Colonialism was an anachronism and the survival of the colonial idea could be only temporary.

20. His delegation reserved the right to submit observations on the draft resolution before the Committee. It would, for the present, confine itself to commenting on the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee.

21. To begin with, he desired to congratulate the Committee on the work it had accomplished. The problem of factors comprised two distinct elements: on the one hand, the determination of the factors; on the other, the determination of criteria for their application. In regard to the second element, each specific case should be considered and decided on its own merits, and it went without saying that the list of factors could serve only for general guidance in arriving at a decision.

22. The *Ad Hoc* Committee had come to the conclusion in its report that it was not possible to find a satisfactory definition of the concept of a full measure of self government. That was a logical conclusion, for the task was an extremely difficult one, consisting first in analysing the features of self-government and then of making a synthesis of them. The *Ad Hoc* Committee had accomplished the first part of that task, but the list it proposed was not final because it was not complete. The principle of the self-determination of peoples and the principle of self-government were two intimately allied and inseparable concepts. Self-determination presupposed complete freedom. Any pressure would distort the principle of the right of peoples to self-determination. Accordingly, improvements should be made in the list of factors.

23. With regard to the application of the criteria, his delegation had no intention of evading the consideration of that burning problem. On the question which of the two—the Administering Members or the General Assembly—was competent to decide whether a territory had or had not attained a full measure of self-government, he stressed that by signing the Charter the Member States had assumed under Chapter XI, as under the other Chapters, a series of obligations constituting an indivisible whole. From the legal viewpoint, there could be no doubt as to the nature of the obligations under Chapter XI. According to the Administering Members, Chapter XI did not embody legal obligations but was a mere expression of goodwill, a moral declaration, as was clear from the very title of the Chapter: "Declaration regarding non-Self-Governing Territories". The French representative had stated (322nd meeting) that the criteria applied by certain delegations in resolving the question of competence were not legal but political, and he had asked what were the legal arguments it was intended to use in order to interpret Chapter XI as imposing obligations on the Administering Members. The reply was very clear. To begin with, the title of Chapter XI did not in any way change the legal nature of its content. The declaration was not unilateral; it appeared in the Charter, a legal instrument which a number of States had signed and which, for that reason, implied multilateral undertakings. The nature of those undertakings derived from the actual wording of Article 73, which spoke of Member States which had or assumed responsibilities for the administration of Non-Self-Governing Territories. The idea of responsibility excluded the possibility of unilateral action on the part

of the Administering Members. By signing the Charter, those Powers had agreed to report to the United Nations on their administration of the Non-Self-Governing Territories; they had recognized the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of the territories were paramount. It did not constitute an infringement of their sovereignty to invite them to fulfil their obligations, which would not end until the United Nations and the Administering Member concerned had jointly agreed that the provisions of Chapter XI had ceased to apply to a given Non-Self-Governing Territory. The General Assembly was therefore competent in the matter. Furthermore, delegations should not be reproached for invoking both legal and political criteria at one and the same time because the obligations under the Charter were implemented at one and the same time on the political and legal levels.

24. Mr. LYNKOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) thought that if all States had strictly applied both the letter and the spirit of the Charter, and if the Administering Members had respected the provisions of Article 73 in their administration of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, the number of such territories would have dwindled daily. His delegation would have been the first to welcome such a development, because it would have been not the result of an arbitrary, unilateral decision unmatched by any *de facto* change in the condition of a Non-Self-Governing Territory, but evidence of the natural advancement of the peoples to self-government and independence. The Committee's discussions would have become pointless, and it would not have been necessary to draw up the list of factors which the Committee was now considering.

25. Such was not the case, and it was therefore important to draft a list of factors which, if applied, would prevent the Administering Members from arbitrarily ceasing to transmit the information referred to in Article 73. The list drafted by the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Factors was an advance in the right direction, but it was far from complete and certain improvements should be made. Moreover, some of the *Ad Hoc* Committee's conclusions were unacceptable. In particular, it should not be impossible to find a satisfactory definition of the concept of a full measure of self-government; the absence of such a definition was a serious shortcoming. The *Ad Hoc* Committee had not, therefore, fully discharged the duty the General Assembly had assigned to it.

26. His delegation was able to accept the factors enumerated in the first part of the list in principle, but was opposed to the adoption of those included in the second and third parts; those parts gave the Administering Members an opportunity to interpret and apply the factors in such a way as not to guarantee either the right of peoples to self-determination or their attainment of independence.

27. With regard to the question of competence, the problems of the Non-Self-Governing Territories were international problems. The Administering Members could not therefore unilaterally decide that a territory had attained a full measure of self-government, nor could they cease, on their own initiative, to transmit information on the territory. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic had made its position clear in a letter to the Secretary-General dated 29 April 1952 (A/AC.58/1/Add.2) that position was similar to that of the Soviet Union. In his delegation's opinion the Administering Members could not stop transmitting information until the Committee on Information from Non-Self-

Governing Territories, after studying developments in the territory concerned, had recommended to the General Assembly that Article 73 should cease to apply and until the territory in question had become a sovereign State in which the indigenous population fully exercised the executive, legislative and judicial power. It was useless for the Administering Members to try to give a restrictive interpretation to Chapter XI by alleging that the United Nations was not competent to adjudicate on the political advancement of a territory because the information referred to in Article 73 e related solely to economic, social and educational conditions. In point of fact, under Article 73 a the Administering Members were required to ensure the political advancement of the indigenous peoples.

28. Like the Polish delegation, his delegation wished the question of factors to proceed from the theoretical level, at which it had remained so far, to the practical level of specific decisions. It therefore considered the Belgian representative's view, as set forth in paragraph 40 (c) of document A/2428, unacceptable. It was convinced that a useful purpose would be served by continuing the work undertaken and clarifying and improving the list approved by the Committee, which had itself recognized that the list was by no means perfect.

29. In conclusion it was to be hoped that the list on which the Committee was working would make it possible to help the populations of the Non-Self-Governing Territories to attain independence.

30. Mr. ARAOZ (Bolivia) said that the progress made could be seen from the records of the meetings the various organs of the General Assembly had devoted to the question of factors and from the reports and decisions of those organs. It would seem that the international system drawn up for the benefit of Non-Self-Governing Territories might be applied in practice. The future of over 200 million people was bound up with that of the United Nations. Obligations under the Charter could not be nullified by a unilateral decision which certain States had taken solely on the basis of their own interests. The General Assembly was competent in the matter and could lead the dependent peoples toward the objective laid down in the Charter.

31. The list of factors drawn up by the *Ad Hoc* Committee was not final. In approving it, the Fourth Committee would merely be reaffirming the need for practical use of the criteria contained in the report in order to take a better-founded decision in each case. The list was a guide and each case should be dealt with in the light of its own circumstances, including historical circumstances. The Bolivian delegation would support any proposal to continue United Nations supervision until the objectives laid down in Chapter XI had been achieved and peoples subjected to colonial oppression for centuries had become completely self-governing.

32. Definition of the concept of full self-government was the first stage to be reached. The nations represented in the United Nations were able to maintain their national unity because they enjoyed not only economic and social independence, but also political independence. It was erroneous to allege that the application of economic and social criteria was enough to determine whether a territory was fully self-governing. Political independence was a prerequisite of economic and social independence. The peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories should determine their future for themselves, with the assistance of the Administering Members and the United Nations. The list drawn up by the *Ad Hoc*

Committee contained criteria relating to political conditions which seemed to constitute a definition of the concept of full self-government. Agreement seemed to have been reached on that point.

33. Among the criteria which the Assembly had to apply, there was one to which the Bolivian delegation attached great importance, that of respect for the principle of the right of peoples to self-determination. That right was understood to be the achievement of the aspirations of a large majority and not the prerogative of small minorities representing foreign interests. The criterion relating to universal suffrage therefore seemed to be especially important, since universal suffrage enabled the whole population to express its will freely, without any discrimination whatsoever. In that connexion, universal suffrage must not be restricted by introducing the concept of "educational opportunities" referred to in sub-paragraph (c) of point C in paragraph 15 of the report because that might enable minorities to interfere with the development desired by the population as a whole.

34. The Bolivian delegation was prepared to accept the list of factors drawn up by the *Ad Hoc* Committee. Nevertheless, it did not consider that the Fourth Committee's task would stop there. The problem was closely connected with that of the cessation of the transmission of information. It was for the General Assembly to decide. He would therefore support the proposal made by the Mexican representative at the 322nd meeting for the requirements of national defence must not lead to measures contrary to the principle of sovereignty.

35. With regard to the title of the second part of the list, the word "continuing", which was used to describe the association of the territory with the metropolitan country, should be deleted. The population should remain free to express, by democratic means and without any pressure, its views on the form of government it wished; that was implied in respect for the right of people to self-determination.

36. Finally, Mr. Araoz said that he would support the Guatemalan representative's suggestion, contained in paragraph 28 of the *Ad Hoc* Committee's report.

37. The United Nations must be on the watch and must work out the principles which would promote the non-self-governing peoples' attainment of full self-government. Bolivia was the more prepared to help in that work because, in the same spirit, it had undertaken, together with other Latin-American countries, to struggle for as long as was necessary to achieve the independence of the populations of the regions of Latin America which were still occupied by Powers foreign to the Latin-American cultural sphere.

38. The arguments which the Belgian representative had used with such acumen to defend his theory could only add to the complexity of the problem before the Committee, and were legally unfounded. Moreover, there was an obvious contradiction between sub-paragraph (b) and sub-paragraph (e) of paragraph 40 of document A/2428, where the Belgian delegation's thesis was stated. The Bolivian delegation could not admit the principle of applying the provisions of Chapter XI to metropolitan territories because that principle was absolutely incompatible with its own national traditions and with the spirit of the Charter, which made it incumbent on every Member State to respect the great concepts of non-interference in the internal affairs of States, of the right of peoples to self-determination and of freedom. In no case should a sovereign State

agree that its metropolitan territory should be subject to the provisions of Chapter XI of the Charter. Bolivia, which was pursuing its struggle towards economic independence, would never allow itself to be regarded as a colony or territory.

39. In a spirit of co-operation, the Bolivian delegation was prepared to consider favourably any draft resolution or amendment which would take account of the principles he had stated.

40. Mr. FERNANDEZ (Uruguay) pointed out that the problem the Committee was endeavouring to solve was noteworthy both for its importance and for its complexity. The fate of 200 million people was involved and the United Nations had devoted years of study to the problem without being able to find a solution satisfactory to all.

41. General Assembly resolution 66 (I) listed seventy-four territories with respect to which the Administering Members had undertaken to transmit information. That number had subsequently decreased, but the Administering Members had not seen fit to indicate why the territories concerned no longer came within the scope of Chapter XI of the Charter. It was, of course, desirable that the number of Non-Self-Governing Territories should steadily decrease, in so far as the cessation of the transmission of information really meant that those territories had attained independence or self-government and were occupying their rightful place in the community of nations. Nevertheless, it was plainly the duty of the United Nations to ensure that a Non-Self-Governing Territory was not unduly deprived of international protection. Anxiety on that score should not be taken as signifying distrust of the Administering Members, but rather as an expression of the General Assembly's zeal in putting the principles proclaimed in the Charter into practice. It was precisely with a view to helping the General Assembly and the Administering Members to perform their tasks as satisfactorily as possible that a list of factors should be established which could serve as a guide in determining whether a territory had attained self-government.

42. The drawing up of a list of such factors raised two separate problems: the compilation of the list proper and the selection of the authority which was to decide whether a territory was self-governing. The Administering Members claimed that they had exclusive competence in the matter and that they alone could decide whether to continue or to cease transmitting information concerning the territory. It had always been the Uruguayan delegation's view, stated in the Fourth Committee (216th meeting) by Mr. Mattos as early as the sixth session, that the United Nations, and particularly the General Assembly, should examine the situation in a given territory with a view to deciding whether it had attained self-government; it was inadmissible that the Power administering the territory should be able to decide the question unilaterally. By assuming the obligations set out in Chapter XI, the administering Powers had recognized the competence of the international Organization. Moreover, the United Nations had assumed the task of helping the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories to attain their freedom by democratic and peaceful means.

43. It was therefore the right and the duty of the United Nations most carefully to examine the constitutional reasons advanced by a Power responsible for the administration of a Non-Self-Governing Territory as grounds for ceasing to transmit information concerning that territory. Chapter XI would become completely

meaningless if an Administering Member were able unilaterally to withdraw from the obligation it had assumed.

44. He wished to assert once again that the theory of the universality of Chapter XI had no legal value. Article 74 of the Charter made a very clear distinction between Non-Self-Governing Territories and metropolitan territories. Clearly, therefore, in drafting Article 73, the authors of the Charter had at all times had only the non-metropolitan territories in mind. The theory of universality was unacceptable; it could not be applied in determining either the territories towards which obligations existed under Article 73, or the factors by which the purpose of those obligations could be clearly defined.

45. Referring to the list of factors in document A/2428, he wished to congratulate the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the care and intelligence with which it had performed its task. As the situation varied considerably from one territory to another, it was impossible to establish criteria which would apply rigidly to all Non-Self-Governing Territories; hence, the list of factors should, as the *Ad Hoc* Committee stated in paragraphs 9 and 13 of its report, merely serve as a guide permitting consideration of each concrete case in the light of the particular circumstances of that case. While his delegation had no basic objection to the list of factors proper, it was nevertheless prepared to support any proposal aimed at improving the list.

46. He reserved his delegation's right to speak on that subject in the course of the discussion.

47. Mr. CALLE Y CALLE (Peru) supported the Brazilian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.272), the operative part of which, and particularly paragraphs 3, 4 and 6, embodied eminently acceptable principles. A number of considerations should be borne in mind when studying the draft.

48. First, Article 73 of the Charter and the obligations it imposed could not be affected by the adoption of the list of factors. Secondly, the *Ad Hoc* Committee had studied the possibility of defining the concept of a full measure of self-government and not of defining self-government proper. Thirdly, while each of the factors enumerated in the list represented one aspect of a full measure of self-government, all the factors so listed could not altogether be regarded as constituting a final definition of a full measure of self-government. Fourthly, the fact that the list was in three parts by no means meant that there were three or more systems of self-government; in fact, self-government was indivisible. Fifthly, the list should be entitled: "Factors indicative of the attainment of a full measure of self-government", since there could be no independence, continuing association or free association unless a territory had attained a full measure of self-government. If, on the other hand, it was thought that a full measure of self-government was achieved only with independence, the list should refer to other "degrees" rather than to other "systems", of self-government. Sixthly, the voluntary limitation of sovereignty, as a number of delegations had pointed out, was an attribute of a full measure of self-government and certain systems of association could come about at the very moment when the territory attained self-government.

49. In short, the list before the Committee contained no major improvements as compared with the previous list, given in the annex to resolution 648 (VII). In view of the further fact that the *Ad Hoc* Committee had failed to establish a definition of the concept of

a full measure of self-government, the Peruvian delegation could not give final, but merely provisional, approval to the current list as a body of guiding principles.

50. His delegation reserved the right to speak again later.

51. Mr. L. S. BOKHARI (Pakistan) considered that the discussion had shown that it was pointless at that stage to carry the study of the question of factors any further and that it would be sufficient to amend the existing list if examination of a particular case so required. The Brazilian draft resolution would not appear to be controversial and the Pakistani delegation intended to support it. It was clear from the discussions, both at the current session and at previous sessions, that there was a wide divergence of views between the Administering Members and the other Member States with regard to the interpretation of the Charter. It was time to settle that disagreement, and the Pakistani delegation accordingly called upon the Administering Members to undertake to continue the transmission of information

if the United Nations, after examining the relevant documents, decided that a particular territory had not yet attained a full measure of self-government. He appealed to the good will of the Administering Members and assured them that the United Nations was well aware that it was impossible to apply rigid criteria to each individual case. Relations between individuals as well as between communities, especially political relations, were in a constant state of change. The Administering Members could be sure that the United Nations would examine each case with the greatest impartiality. If, however, they were unable, for reasons which the Pakistani delegation failed to see, to act on its proposal and to trust the United Nations, the opposing parties would have to be referred to the highest existing court, the International Court of Justice.

52. The CHAIRMAN said that he proposed to close the list of speakers at the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.