

GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

## FIFTH SESSION

## Official Records



Saturday, 2 December 1950, at 3 p.m.

Flushing Meadow, New York

## CONTENTS

	Page
Former Italian colonies: (d) report of the United Nations Commission for Eritrea and (e) report of the Interim Committee of the General Assembly on the report of the United Nations Commission for Eritrea: reports of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Political Committee (A/1561 and Add.1) and the Fifth Committee (A/1574) ( <i>concluded</i> ) .....	539
Postponement of the consideration of the question of the admission of new Members to the United Nations .....	547
Report of the Trusteeship Council: report of the Fourth Committee (A/1546) .....	547
Former Italian colonies: (c) draft trusteeship agreement for the Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration: reports of the Fourth Committee (A/1550) and the Fifth Committee (A/1573) .....	550
Place of meeting of the sixth session of the General Assembly .....	552

*President:* Mr. Nasrollah ENTEZAM (Iran).

**Former Italian colonies: (d) report of the United Nations Commission for Eritrea and (e) report of the Interim Committee of the General Assembly on the report of the United Nations Commission for Eritrea: reports of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee (A/1561 and Add.1) and the Fifth Committee (A/1574) (*concluded*)**

[Agenda item 21]

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): We shall continue to hear the representatives who wish to explain their votes on the Eritrean question.

2. Mr. ICHASO (Cuba) (*translated from Spanish*): I should like very briefly to explain why the Cuban delegation very firmly maintains the position that it took in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee on the question of Eritrea.

3. My delegation considers that in such delicate and complex problems as those affecting a people's future, the resolutions which are adopted should not be peremptory in character but should take the form of recommendations.

4. We cannot conceive of federation between an independent State and a non-independent State. We understand by an agreement of federation an instrument in which each party is fully conscious of its feelings, its

ideas and its convictions. We are ardent defenders of the principle of the self-determination of peoples. We also consider that the United Nations should assist all colonial territories to obtain their independence sooner or later, as circumstances may require.

5. The draft resolution approved by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, which provides for federation, closes all roads to Eritrean independence, whereas the proposal for independence presented by the delegation of Pakistan, which we supported, does not close the road to federation, but simply leaves that matter to the free determination of the Eritrean people.

6. A particular political system must not be imposed on a people, even a former colonial people. They must be given the opportunity to choose freely, by a vote, the system they consider most appropriate to their traditions, ideology, requirements and interests.

7. I feel that to give independence to Libya and Somaliland and not to give the same treatment to Eritrea constitutes an act of discrimination in the solution of the problem of the former Italian colonies. We are not convinced by the argument that Eritrea is economically under-developed. If Eritrea is not prepared for independence, the logical procedure would be for the United Nations to prepare it for independence by means of the Trusteeship System provided for in the Charter, and

we should not dare to attempt federation, which is the most advanced form of political structure and therefore the one least suitable for an economically underdeveloped people.

8. Notwithstanding the fact that we favour Eritrean independence, we shall vote against the draft resolutions of the Soviet Union [A/1570] and Poland [A/1564 and Corr.1] because they go far beyond our goal and are rather political, propagandist and demagogic in character. We feel that the wisest proposal was that submitted by the Pakistan delegation; that is why we voted for it in the Committee.

9. Our desire is to promote conditions conducive to freedom in north-east Africa, not to spread chaos. We hope that we are mistaken in this case and that the plan for federation will work out well and will bring prosperity to the people of Eritrea and peace to that part of the world. But we do not wish to assume responsibility for the consequences of the fact that we are closing the road to independence for a country where a great number of the inhabitants have that legitimate aspiration.

10. Mr. VAVRICKA (Czechoslovakia) (*translated from French*): The Czechoslovak delegation's approach to the question of the future of Eritrea and its people is based on the view that all peoples have a right to freedom and independence. To deprive the people of Eritrea of that right is not only a flagrant violation of the Charter but discrimination against a country struggling for its freedom.

11. The question of Eritrean independence is, in reality, only part of a much larger problem. The process of liquidating the colonial system is continuing successfully throughout the world and finds expression in the struggle for national liberation. Oppressed peoples are rebelling against colonial exploitation and insistently demanding freedom and independence, which are the fundamental conditions for economic development and the achievement of a higher standard of living. The Czechoslovak delegation believes that one of the principal duties of the United Nations is to help oppressed peoples to obtain the right to self-determination, as well as freedom and independence.

12. The draft resolution approved by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee is contrary to the spirit and letter of the Charter, and presents a false and unjust solution. It deprives the people of Eritrea of the fundamental and inalienable right freely to decide their own future. It imposes on them a solution which is not in accordance with the national interests of Eritrea and which is opposed by the majority of the population.

13. The General Assembly has no right to deny the people of Eritrea the independence for which so many Eritrean fighters for freedom have risked their lives. The federation with Ethiopia proposed in the draft resolution is a violation of the Charter, which admits of no other solutions than independence or trusteeship in territories which do not yet enjoy self-government. But is it really federation that has been proposed as a solution in the case of Eritrea? Have two sovereign States adopted this form of government freely and without having been subjected to pressure?

14. The federal form of government which would thus be imposed on Eritrea is not based on the free, spon-

taneous and democratic expression of the will of two sovereign States. It is merely a mask for the annexation of little Eritrea by a larger and more populous State.

15. Paragraph 5 of the draft resolution gives a clear indication of the way the interests of the people of Eritrea will be protected. It says this, for instance:

"The citizens of Eritrea shall participate in the executive and judicial branches, and shall be represented in the legislative branch of the federal government in accordance with law and in the proportion that the population of Eritrea bears to the population of the federation."

16. What influence can the representatives of the people of Eritrea — a country of only one million inhabitants — have in legislative bodies where the representatives of Ethiopia will speak for 16 million inhabitants? How will the Eritrean people's right to free development be safeguarded in such a federation and under such conditions?

17. The grant of independence to Eritrea is the only solution of the problem which is in conformity with the letter and spirit of the Charter. That is why my delegation warmly supports the USSR draft resolution [A/1570], which proposes that Eritrea should be granted immediate independence, that the British occupation troops should be withdrawn within three months, and that Ethiopia should be guaranteed access to the sea, a measure required by its economic interests. This draft is in accordance with the national interests of the people of Eritrea, and with the principles of the Charter which guarantee the right of all peoples to self-determination.

18. For substantially the same reasons, my delegation will vote for the Polish draft resolution [A/1564 and Corr.1] if the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union is not adopted.

19. The Czechoslovak delegation will never be a party to intrigues against the freedom of peoples. The Czechoslovak people have experienced occupation by nazi Germany and can well appreciate what it means to lose freedom and national independence. They therefore support the legitimate struggle of any nation for its freedom and independence.

20. The draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee would deprive the people of Eritrea of their freedom. Contrary to the fundamental purposes of the Charter, it would deny the people of Eritrea the right to self-determination and impose on them a federation with Ethiopia which the great majority oppose. Instead of maintaining peace in that part of the world, the resolution would foster civil war and discord. Instead of assisting an oppressed and exploited people to achieve freedom and independence, it would attempt to cover up the annexation of a small State by a larger State.

21. The Czechoslovak delegation categorically refuses to be a party to such a flagrant injustice to the people of Eritrea, an injustice committed for the sake of colonial Powers and other interested States. For the reasons I have stated, my delegation will vote for the USSR draft resolution.

22. Mr. GARCIA BAUER (Guatemala) (*translated from Spanish*): My country took part in the work of

the United Nations Commission for Eritrea, which examined the conditions prevailing in that territory on the spot. After a careful study of conditions in the area, and after visiting the neighbouring countries, including Ethiopia and Egypt, the Commission came to the conclusion that Eritrea was capable of becoming an independent State within a given time.

23. Accordingly, the Guatemalan delegation, together with the Pakistan delegation, submitted a draft resolution, the text of which accompanies the report of the United Nations Commission for Eritrea, providing that Eritrea should become independent at the end of a ten-year period of trusteeship.

24. Various political and economic considerations led us to this conclusion. As we pointed out during the debates in the United Nations Commission for Eritrea, in the Interim Committee,<sup>1</sup> and in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee,<sup>2</sup> we are convinced that the majority of the population of Eritrea favour independence. Moreover we submitted statistics, and our own experience, as well as the results of our investigations into the economic conditions of the territory, prove that Eritrea could become economically independent in a relatively short time.

25. In the circumstances, therefore, the Guatemalan delegation wishes to endorse the idea of independence for Eritrea within a specified time. We cannot, however, support immediate independence for the territory because we are convinced that immediate independence would result in chaos. For that reason, we shall vote against the USSR draft resolution, as we did in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. We shall also vote against the part of the Soviet Union draft relating to the cession of some Eritrean territory to Ethiopia, because we are convinced that access to the sea through the port of Assab would not satisfy the requirements of Ethiopia and that the cession of that part of the territory would be contrary to the wishes of the population concerned.

26. In view of these considerations, we shall also vote against the Polish draft resolution, which embodies the same stipulations as the USSR draft resolution. However, we shall support the first paragraph of the Polish draft, which envisages the grant of independence to Eritrea at the end of three years. We feel that such a provision can be carried out.

27. We cannot support the proposal for a so-called federation approved by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. We advanced sufficient reasons, in that Committee, to show that such federation would not be a true federation, and that, in view of the serious inequality between Eritrea and Ethiopia, it would, in practice, be impossible to establish a federation as that term is understood in law.

28. After the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee had approved this plan for so-called federation, we were advised of the position taken on the question by the Eritrean Independence Bloc. The letter addressed by the representative of the Independence Bloc to the President of the General Assembly stated, among other

things, that the Independence Bloc felt it necessary to reiterate that the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's decision to approve the plan for federation was contrary to the wishes of the people, who were confident of their maturity and their right to complete independence.

29. During our travels in Eritrea, we were able to see how important were the parties which form the Independence Bloc, and that experience convinced us that the great majority of the population oppose the idea of federation which the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee approved.

30. Nor can my delegation agree that this plan for so-called federation recommended by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee can be considered a compromise solution, or a well-balanced solution, as it has been called; but it is not up to us to reply to that argument. Time will answer those who make that assertion.

31. In accordance with the views I have just expressed, the delegation of Guatemala will vote against the draft resolution submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee.

32. Mr. CASTRO (El Salvador) (*translated from Spanish*); I wish to make a short statement, on behalf of my delegation, simply to explain the vote it proposes to cast.

33. The delegation of El Salvador has the greatest friendship for the peoples of Eritrea and Ethiopia. Ethiopia is a nation which has suffered the tragedy of a long occupation, and its aspirations deserve our respect. We have the greatest sympathy for the aspirations of Ethiopia, which has taken an active part in the work of the United Nations.

34. The compromise solution submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee takes account of the question of minorities, which is, of course, a matter of the greatest importance in settling this problem. El Salvador appreciates the efforts which have been made to solve the problems of established minorities in Eritrea.

35. As for its position on the draft resolution submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, the delegation of El Salvador wishes to say that the instructions it has received from its government, which are based on the traditional policy of El Salvador, namely, respect for the right of self-determination of peoples, make it impossible for it to vote in favour of that draft, which predetermines the future political structure of Eritrea and provides for a federation between Eritrea and Ethiopia. It is clear that it has been impossible to consult the people of Eritrea in order to find out their wishes; it is true that a commission visited the country, but that is not the way to solve a problem affecting the entire population. To determine whether the people of Eritrea really wanted federation there would have had to be a plebiscite, and a plebiscite was not held. The delegation of El Salvador feels that the opinion of the whole population of Eritrea has not really been sought. Therefore, when a particular political structure is decided for Eritrea, be it federation or confederation, monarchy or republic, we consider that the United Nations is attempting to solve a problem which only the people of Eritrea themselves can properly solve.

<sup>1</sup> See documents A/AC.18/SR.39 to A/AC.18/SR.45 inclusive.

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Ad Hoc Political Committee, 37th to 40th and 48th to 56th meetings inclusive.*

36. For that reason, we very much regret that we cannot support the draft resolution approved by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee.

37. My delegation agrees with the draft resolutions submitted by the Soviet Union and Poland only in so far as they envisage political independence for Eritrea. They go much further, however, and have other aspects which we do not accept and are unable, therefore, to support.

38. Mr. SKOROBOGATY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR also considers it necessary to explain its vote.

39. The discussion in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee of the question of the fate of the former Italian colony of Eritrea has revealed the existence of two different points of view—two different trends—among delegations. Some delegations take the view that Eritrea should be granted independence and its people given an opportunity of deciding their own fate; others oppose the grant of independence to Eritrea and are attempting to thrust upon the Eritrean people a form of government which has nothing in common with that people's wishes and desires.

40. The draft resolutions on the question of Eritrea which have been submitted for the General Assembly's consideration also reflect those two points of view.

41. The draft resolution submitted by fourteen delegations, which was approved by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee and submitted for the General Assembly's consideration, proposes that Eritrea should be federated with Ethiopia; it thereby precludes the grant of independence to Eritrea and imposes on the Eritrean people a particular policy favoured by certain Members of the United Nations. Such a decision on the fate of a country with a population of over a million cannot be regarded as just. Nor is it in conformity with the United Nations Charter which recognizes the right of all peoples to national independence and self-determination.

42. Unless Eritrea is officially granted independence and unless the Eritrean people are allowed to express their will by free and democratic processes, a federation between Eritrea and Ethiopia cannot be regarded as a voluntary association. If the United Nations is prepared to envisage the possibility of such a solution of the question of the fate of Eritrea, it must begin by granting independence to Eritrea and by giving its people an opportunity of choosing between federation with Ethiopia and the creation of an independent, self-governing State. That would be the only democratic and equitable decision for the United Nations to take; it would enable the Eritrean people to express their will freely and independently.

43. In proposing to Eritrea that it should enter into a federation with Ethiopia, the draft resolution—even in that part of the draft which deals with the conditions of such a federation—again disregards the principle of self-determination. The people of Eritrea are being offered federal status, the terms of which have been worked out without their participation. In other words, certain conditions are being imposed upon them regardless of whether those conditions meet their demands and wishes. It is obvious that such an ap-

proach to a solution of the problem is entirely unjust and contrary to the basic principles of democracy and self-determination of peoples by which the United Nations should be guided in solving such problems. If the people of Eritrea wish to enter a federation, they alone have the right to lay down the conditions of such a federation; no one else can or should impose their will upon them.

44. It is thus easy to see that this draft resolution has nothing in common with the interests of the Eritrean people. It serves the purpose only of those who fear that the establishment of an independent Eritrea will be a precedent for other colonial peoples and who are pursuing specific economic, military and strategic ends on the continent of Africa.

45. The people of Eritrea, who have languished for decades under the yoke of colonial oppression, expect a very different decision from the United Nations. They hope for a just decision on their fate. They see that many peoples as small as or even smaller than themselves have national independence and statehood and decide their own fate. The people of Eritrea naturally aspire to do likewise. It is the duty of the United Nations to help them to attain independence, since any decision which is contrary to the interests of that people might create a source of serious danger to peace and security in Africa.

46. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR considers that the only just and equitable solution of the Eritrean problem is to grant Eritrea national independence. It cannot therefore concur in the proposals contained in the draft resolution submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee and will vote against it.

47. A practical solution of the problem is provided in the USSR draft resolution [A/1570], which proposes that Eritrea should be granted independence. That draft resolution proposes that Eritrea should be granted independence immediately. Such a decision would give great satisfaction to the people of Eritrea.

48. That draft resolution also proposes the withdrawal of the British occupation forces within three months of the day on which the decision is adopted by the General Assembly. That condition is essential, since Eritrea cannot be regarded as independent while foreign occupation forces are in the country.

49. The draft resolution of the Soviet Union also offers an equitable solution of the problem of Ethiopia's claims for an outlet to the sea. It proposes that Ethiopia should be ceded that part of the territory of Eritrea which is necessary to secure Ethiopia's access to the sea through the port of Assab.

50. Such a solution of the Eritrean problem would preclude any possibility of internal disturbances in Eritrea, since the people, having acquired their independence, would have every opportunity of deciding their own future as they themselves saw fit. Any justification or pretext for intervention in the domestic affairs of Eritrea by other States would thus be removed and the peace and security of the nations would thereby be strengthened. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR will therefore vote with pleasure for the draft resolution submitted by the USSR.

51. If that draft resolution fails to obtain the necessary majority in the General Assembly, we shall sup-



port the draft resolution of Poland [*A/1564 and Corr.1*] under the terms of which the Eritrean people would attain independence after a transitional period. The Polish draft resolution proposes that Eritrea should be granted independence after three years, during which period Eritrea would be governed by a council of six members, one from Ethiopia, two from the Arab countries, and three from the population of Eritrea, two of whom would represent the indigenous population and one the European. If such a period of preparation for the attainment of independence by Eritrea is considered necessary, the draft resolution of Poland provides the most satisfactory form of administration during that period. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR will therefore also vote for that draft resolution.

52. Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) (*translated from French*): My delegation made a number of reservations when the draft resolution proposing the establishment of a federation between Ethiopia and Eritrea was under consideration in the Committee. It nevertheless voted for the draft because the results of the inquiry conducted on the spot by the United Nations convinced it that the federal solution corresponded to the wishes of the populations concerned, would best promote their interests and welfare and would consequently contribute to the realization of the principle of self-determination of peoples.

53. Today, my delegation will vote for the draft resolution, its conviction strengthened by the significant words spoken this morning [*315th meeting*] on behalf of his government by Mr. Aklilou, in his capacity as Minister for Foreign Affairs and representative of Ethiopia in the General Assembly. My delegation associates itself with others in commending Ethiopia for that statement. It regards that statement not only as a political programme which gives us a complete assurance as to the spirit in which the resolution to be adopted by General Assembly will be carried into effect, but also as an act of faith by a statesman worthy of the name and by a government which has given so many proofs of its devotion to the cause of justice and freedom—in other words, an act of faith in the noblest principles and ideals of the United Nations Charter.

54. In voting for the draft resolution before us, I greet the new federal State on behalf of my government, in the conviction that, as the representative of Ethiopia said in this Assembly, it will follow the tradition of a country which has been illustrious since the earliest times.

55. Mr. Tsune-chi YU (China): My delegation will vote in favour of the fourteen-Power draft resolution which was approved by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee and submitted by that Committee to the Assembly.

56. The attitude of my government regarding the whole question of the final disposal of the former Italian colonies has been constantly and consistently guided by the principles and provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, especially by the spirit of international harmonization, international conciliation, international co-operation and international justice, which find expressions in the four paragraphs of Article 1 of Chapter I of that document. In all the discussions at

this and the last sessions of the General Assembly, my delegation has repeatedly emphasized that independence, self-determination, the welfare of the inhabitants and peace and security should be borne in mind and accorded the fullest consideration by the representatives in the Assembly.

57. It behoves us to confess that the problem of searching for an equitable solution to the problem of Eritrea was difficult. We had to weigh various principles, and their application did not appear, at times, to be very easy, either because of lack of definite information or because of the apparently conflicting results ensuing from the strict and simultaneous application of all those principles.

58. The *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, however, should be congratulated on the logical proposal it has made. Although the draft resolution before us is not based purely and absolutely on the principles of independence and self-determination—chiefly because the necessary facts and figures could not be ascertained and agreed upon by the Chairman and the members of the Commission for Eritrea—the very fundamental principle of harmonization, that is, the principle that the United Nations should serve as a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of the purposes and principles of the United Nations, is eloquently upheld. It is true that the draft resolution is the result of a compromise, as some have mentioned, but it is not one of appeasement; it is the handiwork of those who have striven to uphold the spirit of the Charter rather than a result made possible by intimidation, threats or coercion from any party.

59. Furthermore, my delegation is happy to support the draft resolution because it meets a particular consideration of which we should not lose sight. My delegation maintains—as it has always maintained—that any solution of this knotty problem of Eritrea must be based not only on the observance of the principles which I have just enumerated, but also on their acceptance by the two major parties vitally concerned, namely, democratic Italy and Ethiopia—for which my country has the deepest sympathy and with which we maintain the best of relations. The fact that the draft resolution before the Assembly is acceptable to both these countries is an additional consideration leading my delegation to vote for it.

60. Despite these observations, however, my delegation does not feel that the provisions of the draft resolution are by any means entirely adequate or absolutely perfect. For instance, it would be more satisfactory—and probably a great number of representatives would be happier—if the Eritrean people, through their elected assembly, were given an opportunity to choose their own form of government and their own destiny, after, say, five or ten years. The chances are that the Eritrean people would probably choose to continue the federation with Ethiopia. If, however, they should want to be united with Ethiopia or to be independent, they should be allowed to make that choice. The fact that there is no such provision in the draft resolution is responsible for the regrettable circumstance that some members of the Assembly cannot support it. But the absence of such a provision cannot deter my delegation from voting in favour of the draft resolution.

61. My delegation will vote against the draft resolutions submitted by the Soviet Union and Poland for a reason which seems obvious to my delegation. The sponsors do not aim at true independence for the Eritrean people; their real aim seems to be the creation of chaos in East Africa, as they have amply demonstrated to the world by what they are attempting to do in my country and Korea.

62. As the Assembly is about to vote on the draft resolutions before it, I wish to voice my delegation's satisfaction with and appreciation of the conciliatory remarks made by the Foreign Minister of Ethiopia this morning [315th meeting]. I am sure that we should have heard similar words of conciliation and co-operation from the Foreign Minister of democratic Italy, had he been with us today. In the light of such assurances, my delegation—and I am sure all the other delegations to this Assembly—can rest at ease that the government of the new federated State, which has the blessing of the United Nations, will enjoy internal tranquillity and prosperity, that all its inhabitants will enjoy equality, and that the new and greater Ethiopian State will, as a result of its membership of the United Nations, contribute its part towards the building up of peace and security, not only in the eastern part of Africa, but also in the whole world.

63. Mr. GETMANETZ (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (*translated from Russian*)): The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR is one of those which, basing their position on the principles of the United Nations Charter concerning the self-determination of peoples, and taking into account the interests of indigenous populations, have always urged that independence should be granted to the peoples of all the former Italian colonies, namely, Libya, Somaliland and Eritrea.

64. Those peoples' right to national self-determination is a natural and inalienable one. That means that each nation must freely decide its own fate without any interference from other nations in its internal political, economic and cultural life.

65. Only the representatives of the colonial Powers are against the self-determination of the peoples of dependent territories; they are trying by all possible means to perpetuate the present status of those oppressed countries in order to continue their exploitation and plundering.

66. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR believes that the Eritrean people should be guaranteed the exercise of the right to self-determination on the same basis as the people of Libya, who are soon to establish their independent State. This demand is based first of all on the fact that the people of Eritrea indisputably form a nation with all the characteristics of a nation. They constitute a well established and stable society of people based on a common language, culture, economic life and mental outlook, which are reflected in a common culture.

67. During the discussion of the question of Eritrea in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, the representatives of certain countries made statements in support of self-determination and independence for Eritrea, but during the voting on various draft resolutions—those submitted by the USSR, Poland, Pakistan and Iraq—it became evident that they in fact supported and pursued a policy of colonial oppression.

68. By voting in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee for the forced federation of Eritrea with Ethiopia and thereby depriving Eritrea of independence, the representatives of Haiti, Liberia, Burma, the Philippines and various other countries showed that they were the instruments of the colonizers in their struggle against the national liberation movement of oppressed peoples in the colonies.

69. The Soviet representatives and the representatives of the peoples' democracies, in their statements in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, resolutely supported the granting of immediate independence to Eritrea. They also called for the withdrawal of British occupation troops from Eritrea within three months and the cession to Ethiopia of that part of the territory which Ethiopia requires in order to have access to the sea through the port of Assab.

70. The voting in the Committee showed that, as a result of a private understanding between the delegations of the colonial Powers and the delegation of the United States, and of the direct pressure exerted by those delegations on other members of the Committee, they succeeded once again in violating the principles of the Charter and in foisting upon the Committee a draft resolution which did not correspond to the interests of the Eritrean people or satisfy their aspirations to independence.

71. The fourteen-Power draft resolution on the so-called federation between Ethiopia and Eritrea which has now been submitted to the General Assembly, represents only the interests of the colonial Powers and is directed against the Eritrean people. This draft uses the authority of the United Nations to cloak the imperialist designs of the colonial Powers on Eritrea and deludes international public opinion.

72. It is very significant that this extremely long draft resolution does not so much as mention the right of the Eritrean people to self-determination, a right which is proclaimed as one of the basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

73. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR believes that the draft resolution on Eritrea submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee is both unsatisfactory and unacceptable because it does not ensure Eritrea the independence to which that country is certainly entitled.

74. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR—a country where national oppression and its causes have long been abolished and where no national discrimination is possible—urges that independence should be granted to Eritrea immediately and that the national and political oppression of that country by the colonizers, in whatever form it may assume, should be brought to a stop forthwith.

75. Consequently the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR supports the USSR draft resolution [A/1570] on the Eritrean question and will vote for it.

76. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq): Last year, when the sub-committee which studied the future of the former Italian colonies was discussing the future of Eritrea, three solutions were suggested—independence, annexation or partition. My delegation had the honour at that time to state there was a fourth solution—federation

with Ethiopia.<sup>a</sup> My delegation is a believer in the principle of federation, but we had hoped that that federation would come into existence by the decision of the people of Eritrea and the people of Ethiopia themselves, because we are great upholders of the principle of the self-determination of peoples. With that idea in mind, my delegation submitted a draft resolution to the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee proposing the formation of a national assembly which would decide whether Eritrea was to be independent or whether it was to federate with Ethiopia. Unfortunately, the proposal of my delegation was not accepted, and the overwhelming majority of the Committee decided otherwise.

77. As I have said, we do not stand against the idea of federation. We believe that federation is the best solution for the future of Eritrea, but we had hoped that that federation would be based on self-determination, and we had hoped also that the terms of that federation would be explicitly based on the principle of equality between Eritrea and Ethiopia. Here again, unfortunately, we could not obtain any amendment to the draft resolution which we have before us today. We are faced here with a new situation. So far as my delegation is concerned, we are glad to be able to go with the majority now, for reasons which I shall explain.

78. To begin with, my delegation has received assurances from the Ethiopian delegation, assurances which were publicly recorded here today, that there will be equal treatment for all the inhabitants of Eritrea and that the Moslems will have equal participation, as well as the Italians and other people, without discrimination.

79. In addition, my delegation has had a meeting with the leader of the Moslem League, which was opposed to the project of federation. Fortunately, the leader of the Moslem League assured me that he had reached full agreement with the Ethiopian delegation and that the arrangements which are to be made will be fully satisfactory to the opposition in Eritrea. I have also received a telegram from Addis Ababa assuring me that the Arab and Moslem communities there are happy about the federation.

80. In view of all these considerations, my delegation takes pleasure in declaring its change of attitude, along with some other Arab delegations, from one of opposition to one of support. We believe that now that the destiny of Eritrea is being decided and the United Nations is passing judgment, we should offer it our whole-hearted support. We should support it by a strong vote, because that will contribute to the harmony and good relationship between the peoples of Eritrea and Ethiopia.

81. I wish to take this opportunity to express my appreciation of the statement we heard this morning from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ethiopia. We hope that those words will be put into deeds. My delegation desires to express its best wishes for the future prosperity, progress and harmony between the peoples of Ethiopia and Eritrea.

82. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): We have concluded the explanations of vote. We shall

now proceed to the vote on the various draft resolutions.

83. In the first place, I shall put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee [A/1561]. A roll-call vote has been requested.

84. Mr. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) (*translated from French*): I asked the Secretariat that a separate vote should be taken on the following parts of the draft resolution:

The first recital (for at the time the treaty was being drawn up in Paris, the Yugoslav delegation voiced its opposition to the provision of the treaty mentioned in this recital);

Paragraph 6 (d) of the operative part (we ask that a separate vote should be taken on each of the two parts, for in the second we find a throw-back to the colonial period);

Paragraph 7 (a) of the operative part (we ask that a separate vote should be taken on each of the two sentences of this sub-paragraph because here too, in the second sentence, we find a throw-back to the colonial period).

85. We shall vote in favour of the remainder of the draft resolution, which we consider to be a constructive document. The right of peoples to self-determination does not necessarily mean that they should be separated. The Yugoslav delegation has come to the conclusion that the people of Eritrea are in favour of union with the Ethiopian people.

86. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The Yugoslav representative has asked for a separate vote on certain parts; he has not requested a separate vote on each paragraph. Furthermore, a roll-call vote has been requested. Would the representative who asked for that roll-call vote agree that it should be taken only on the draft resolution as a whole, or does he ask for a roll-call vote on each paragraph?

87. Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) (*translated from French*): A vote by roll-call on the draft resolution as a whole would satisfy me.

88. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I put to the vote the first recital of the draft resolution submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee [A/1561].

*The first recital was adopted by 48 votes to 2, with 7 abstentions.*

89. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I put to the vote the remainder of the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 5 of the operative part.

*The remainder of the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 5 of the operative part were adopted by 39 votes to 7, with 6 abstentions.*

90. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I put to the vote paragraph 6, up to and including sub-paragraph (c).

*Paragraph 6, up to and including sub-paragraph (c) was adopted by 44 votes to 7, with 7 abstentions.*

91. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The vote on paragraph 6 (d) will be taken in two parts. In the first place, I put to the vote the first sentence, which ends with the words "federal laws".

<sup>a</sup> *Ibid.*, Fourth Session, First Committee, Annex, document A/C.1/522. See also document A/C.1/SC.17/L.16.

*The first sentence of paragraph 6 (d) was adopted by 42 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions.*

92. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I put to the vote the remainder of paragraph 6 (d).

*The remainder of paragraph 6 (d) was adopted by 44 votes to 7, with 5 abstentions.*

93. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I put to the vote the beginning of paragraph 7, and the first sentence of sub-paragraph (a).

*The beginning of paragraph 7 and the first sentence of sub-paragraph (a) were adopted by 45 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.*

94. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I put to the vote the remainder of paragraph 7 (a).

*The remainder of paragraph 7 (a) was adopted by 42 votes to 6, with 8 abstentions.*

95. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): Separate votes have not been requested on the remainder of the draft resolution. I therefore put to the vote the remainder of the draft resolution, beginning with paragraph 7 (b).

*The remainder of the draft resolution was adopted by 43 votes to 7, with 5 abstentions.*

96. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): We shall now vote by roll-call on the draft resolution as a whole [A/1561].

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*China, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile.

*Against:* Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Pakistan, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

*Abstaining:* Israel, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Uruguay.

*The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 46 votes to 10, with 4 abstentions.*

97. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I must now ask the Assembly to vote on the second draft resolution submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee in its additional report [A/1561/Add.1].

98. Before putting this text to the vote, I would ask the Rapporteur of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee for an explanation. Is it intentionally provided that if members of the proposed committee fail to agree on the nomination of one candidate, they should nominate three candidates? Is three a maximum figure? Did the authors of the draft resolution mean that the committee could nominate either two or three candidates?

99. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines), Rapporteur of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee: I think it was the intention of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee that, in the event that there was no agreement among the members of the nominating committee, the greatest practicable latitude should be left in the matter of choosing a commissioner for Eritrea. For that reason, the number was fixed at three.

100. However, if it is the intention of the General Assembly that this choice should be limited to either two or three, then I believe that it should be explicitly so stated in the draft resolution. It might therefore be suggested that a small drafting change should be introduced so that the draft resolution would read "two or three candidates for the post of United Nations Commissioner for Eritrea".

101. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I thank the Rapporteur for his explanation. I think the committee should be left free to nominate two or three candidates. The committee may not be able to find three persons whom it considers fully qualified.

102. I therefore support the last suggestion made by the Rapporteur, and I propose, accordingly, that the amendment he has just submitted should be adopted.

*The amendment was adopted.*

103. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): We shall now vote on the draft resolution, with the amendment which has just been adopted.

*The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 45 votes to 5, with 6 abstentions.*

104. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): We shall now vote on the draft resolution of the Soviet Union [A/1570]. A vote by division has been requested. I therefore invite the Assembly to vote on each of the three paragraphs of the draft resolution in turn.

*The first paragraph was rejected by 32 votes to 13, with 8 abstentions.*

*The second paragraph was rejected by 34 votes to 9, with 10 abstentions.*

*The third paragraph was rejected by 38 votes to 5, with 14 abstentions.*

105. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): As all three paragraphs have been rejected separately, it is unnecessary to vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

106. I now ask the Assembly to vote on the Polish draft resolution [A/1564 and Corr.1].

107. Mr. GARCIA BAUER (Guatemala) (*translated from Spanish*): I request that paragraph 1 should be voted upon separately and by roll-call.

108. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): A roll-call vote is in order. The Assembly will therefore proceed to vote on paragraph 1.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Brazil, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Pakistan, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.



*Against:* Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia.

*Abstaining:* Colombia, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Sweden, Syria, Uruguay, Yemen, Afghanistan, Argentina.

*Paragraph 1 was rejected by 36 votes to 10, with 14 abstentions.*

109. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I shall now put to the vote, in turn, paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Poland.

*Paragraph 2 was rejected by 37 votes to 5, with 13 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 3 was rejected by 34 votes to 8, with 11 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 4 was rejected by 35 votes to 5, with 11 abstentions.*

110. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): Since all the paragraphs of the Polish draft resolution have been rejected separately, there is no need to vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

#### **Postponement of the consideration of the question of the admission of new Members to the United Nations**

111. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The next item on the agenda is the admission of new Members to the United Nations, and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice. A draft resolution on this item has just been submitted by the delegation of El Salvador [A/1585]. Since delegations have perhaps not had sufficient time to study the text, we shall postpone the discussion of the question until Monday, if there are no objections.

*It was so decided.*

#### **Report of the Trusteeship Council: report of the Fourth Committee (A/1546)**

[Agenda item 13]

Mr. Anker (Norway), Rapporteur, presented the report of the Fourth Committee and the accompanying draft resolutions [A/1546].

112. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I intend to put to the vote separately each of the eleven draft resolutions contained in the Fourth Committee's report.

113. Mr. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) (*translated from French*): As regards draft resolution I, we have asked that each of the paragraphs should be voted on separately.

114. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): We shall vote successively on paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of draft resolution I.

*Paragraph 1 was adopted by 44 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 2 was adopted by 41 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 3 was adopted by 45 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.*

115. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I now put draft resolution I as a whole to the vote.

*Draft resolution I as a whole was adopted by 45 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.*

116. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): We shall now vote on draft resolution II.

117. Mr. ICHASO (Cuba) (*translated from Spanish*): I request a vote by roll-call.

118. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The representative of Cuba certainly has the right to request a roll-call vote, but I would draw his attention to the fact that we still have ten draft resolutions before us. If we have to vote by roll-call on each of them, we shall still be here in January.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*China, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile.

*Against:* Guatemala.

*Abstaining:* Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France.

*Draft resolution II was adopted by 53 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions:*

119. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I shall now put to the vote draft resolution III.

120. Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba): (*translated from Spanish*): I am afraid that the procedure my delegation is going to request will delay the Assembly a little. However, since a two-thirds majority is required for the adoption of proposals on matters affecting trusteeship, my delegation especially requests a roll-call vote on draft resolutions III, IV, V, VI and X. I prefer to make this request now, for all the draft resolutions I have mentioned, so as not to interrupt the voting each time.

121. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): We shall therefore vote by roll-call on draft resolutions III, IV, V, VI and X. The United States representative has the floor to explain his vote.

122. Mr. COOPER (United States of America): The United States delegation requests that a separate vote should be taken on the third recital of draft resolution III.

123. The United States delegation is obliged to vote against this recital because it attempts to define the relationship between the Trusteeship Council and the General Assembly. The Trusteeship Council prescribes its own rules. It has the competence to take decisions, and its members are representatives of governments and act under instructions from their governments. It is our position that it would be unwise to attempt in the preamble of a resolution of this type to define this relationship, and we shall therefore vote against the recital and request that a separate vote should be taken on it.

124. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): In accordance with the wish expressed by the representative of the United States, the third recital of draft resolution III will be put to the vote separately. The representative of Cuba has the floor to explain his vote.

125. Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) (*translated from Spanish*): I should like briefly to explain my vote, since a separate vote has been requested on the third recital. I also request that the vote should be taken by roll-call.

126. The delegation of Cuba will vote in favour of that recital because, although we understand that the Trusteeship Council is free to adopt its own rules of procedure, it is nevertheless obliged by Article 85, paragraph 2, of the Charter to assist the General Assembly in discharging the functions enumerated in Chapter XII of the Charter.

127. The third recital of the draft resolution simply states that the Council, in adopting its rules of procedure under Article 90 of the Charter, must consider "the inclusion of all provisions required to assist the General Assembly in carrying out its functions with regard to the Trusteeship System as provided in the Charter". The Cuban delegation considers, therefore, that this is a faithful interpretation of the relationship which exists, and must exist, between Article 90 and Article 85, paragraph 2. It is necessary to stress this relationship because of certain minor difficulties which have arisen in connexion with the relationship between the Council and the General Assembly.

128. My delegation will therefore vote in favour of this recital, since we consider it essential that the Assembly should make its views clear in the matter.

129. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): Would the representative of Cuba be satisfied if his statement appeared in the verbatim record? It would then be known that the Cuban delegation had voted in favour of this paragraph, and it would perhaps be unnecessary to press for a roll-call vote.

130. Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) (*translated from Spanish*): I insist on a vote by roll-call.

131. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I put to the vote the third recital of draft resolution III. A roll-call vote has been requested.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Turkey, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Yemen,

Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, El Salvador, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria.

*Against:* Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Burma, Denmark, France, Iceland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Thailand.

*Abstaining:* Turkey, Venezuela, Argentina, Canada, Chile, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Greece, Iran, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru.

*The result of the vote was 25 in favour, 16 against and 14 abstentions.*

132. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): Under rule 84 of the rules of procedure, decisions on questions relating to the operation of the Trusteeship System must be made by a two-thirds majority.

*The third recital of draft resolution III was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.*

133. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I put to the vote draft resolution III as a whole, excluding the third recital, which has not been adopted. A roll-call vote has been requested.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Thailand, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria.

*Abstaining:* Canada, Dominican Republic.

*Draft resolution III, excluding the third recital, was adopted by 53 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

134. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I put draft resolution IV to the vote. A roll-call vote has been requested.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Israel, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salva-

dor, Ethiopia, Greece, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq.

*Abstaining:* Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Paraguay, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Dominican Republic, France.

*Draft resolution IV was adopted by 41 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.*

135. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): We now come to draft resolution V.

136. Mr. COOK (United Kingdom): I wish to request a separate vote on the fifth recital of draft resolution V. My delegation would vote against this recital because we cannot accept the suggestion that there is such a thing as an anonymous petition. There may, of course, be anonymous communications and, in the Fourth Committee, my delegation voted in favour of an amendment which would have introduced this concept.

137. However, having regard for the present wording of this recital, and bearing in mind that there is no reference to anonymous petitions or even to anonymous communications in the operative part of this draft resolution, my delegation feels that this recital is out of place in the present draft resolution. If it is deleted, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution, although it must also point out that, in its view, the words referring to the right of petition as one of the fundamental human rights are also out of place in view of the discussions which have been going on in the Third Committee on the proposed covenant of human rights.

138. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I now put the fifth recital of draft resolution V to the vote.

*The fifth recital of draft resolution V was rejected by 24 votes to 17, with 7 abstentions.*

139. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I now put to the vote draft resolution V as a whole, excluding the fifth recital, which has just been rejected. The Cuban delegation has requested a roll-call vote.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Iran, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia.

*Abstaining:* Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Australia, Belgium, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic.

*Draft resolution V, excluding the fifth recital, was adopted by 47 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.*

140. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I put draft resolution VI to the vote. A roll-call vote has been requested.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Australia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina.

*Against:* Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Bolivia, Chile, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Greece, Iceland, Israel, Netherlands, Peru, Turkey, Venezuela.

*Draft resolution VI was adopted by 33 votes to 11, with 12 abstentions.*

*Draft resolution VII was adopted by 47 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.*

*Draft resolution VIII was adopted by 54 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

*Draft resolution IX was adopted by 51 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

141. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I put draft resolution X to the vote. A roll-call has been requested.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Yemen, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

*Abstaining:* Belgium, Union of South Africa.

*Draft resolution X was adopted by 55 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

*Draft resolution XI was adopted by 48 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.*

**Former Italian colonies: (c) draft trusteeship agreement for the Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration: reports of the Fourth Committee (A/1550) and the Fifth Committee (A/1573)**

[Agenda item 21]

142. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The General Assembly has before it the Fourth Committee's report on the draft trusteeship agreement for the Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration [A/1550]. The Fourth Committee has not submitted a draft resolution in its report. The General Assembly, however, must take a decision by voting on a draft resolution.

143. I have inquired as to what was done in previous years, and I propose that the Assembly should adopt a draft resolution similar to the one which was adopted before. It reads as follows:

*"The General Assembly*

*"Approves the draft trusteeship agreement for the Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration, as contained in document A/1294."*

144. I put this draft resolution to the vote.

145. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I wish to explain my vote.

146. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I shall call upon you after the vote. I am not required to allow speakers to explain their votes before the vote is taken, unless they wish to raise a point of order with regard to the vote.

147. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I simply wish to explain my vote.

148. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I shall call upon you after the vote. Moreover, there are other speakers already on my list.

*The draft resolution, as read out by the President, was adopted by 44 votes to 6.*

149. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The representative of Poland has the floor to explain his vote.

150. Mr. DROHOJOWSKI (Poland): If I correctly recall, the President was asked whether a representative should explain his vote before or after the voting, and the President said that he did not intend to break the tradition which had been established that representatives could explain their votes before the voting. Today, however, that tradition has been broken, and I am very sorry that that has happened.

151. During the deliberations of the Fourth Committee,<sup>4</sup> the Polish delegation undertook an article by article analysis of the proposed trusteeship agreement for Somaliland and the appended declaration on constitutional principles. This analysis and the subsequent discussion in the Fourth Committee led us to certain conclusions.

152. In the first place, neither the trusteeship agreement nor the declaration of constitutional principles safeguards the proper influence of the Somalis in the administration of the country, in its educational system and in its social institutions. The documents in question do not give the Somalis the right to elect their own representatives in the Territorial Council, which is to be composed only of nominees of the administering Power. The judicial system is to be based on Italian law with Italian judges. Schools will be run in accordance with the wishes of the Administering Authority and not in the interests of the Somali people.

153. Secondly, the country is being left open for a colonial exploitation of all its natural resources and to such an economic domination of the Administering Authority that the achievement of full political independence by the Somali nation will be jeopardized.

154. Thirdly, important recommendations of last year's resolution of the General Assembly [*resolution 289 A (IV)*] have been disregarded, as have the binding suggestions of the Indian annexure, to which many delegations attached such great importance last year.

155. Fourthly, the statement of the Chairman of the United Nations Advisory Council on Somaliland during the discussion in the Fourth Committee convinced us that this is not a body which will properly defend the rights of the Somali people.

156. The Polish delegation, at the last session of the General Assembly, pleaded that the granting of independence to the Somali people and to Somaliland should not be unduly delayed. We pleaded for the establishment of a trusteeship over Somaliland, with the United Nations as the Administering Authority. We pleaded for a solution which neither in letter nor in spirit would be similar to the sad experiences of the tradition of colonial exploitation, which every Member of the United Nations should fight with all the means at its disposal.

157. The majority chose to go in another direction. We were forced, therefore, to vote against the Trusteeship Agreement as proposed in the documents before us in the Fourth Committee, and we had to vote against it also in the plenary meeting.

158. We cannot fail to add that this Agreement, which reminds us of the bygone times of colonial empires, does not serve the legitimate interests and aspirations of the Somalis. Instead, it serves the interests of those who are establishing military bases all over Africa. In not serving the Somalis it does not serve the cause of peace and the peaceful international co-operation of all the peoples of the world.

159. I wish to reiterate my great regret that the President did not allow my delegation to speak before the vote.

160. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I should not have replied if the Polish representative had not repeated his objection to my procedure after explaining his vote. As everyone knows, the President has discretion to allow members to explain their votes either before or after the voting. This morning, some representatives asked me to allow them to explain their votes before the voting began. I gladly acceded to their request. It will be understood, however, that once the voting has begun I cannot interrupt it to allow a mem-

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, Fifth Session, Fourth Committee, 173rd to 180th and 186th meetings.



ber to explain his vote. The members of the General Assembly will agree that I acted in accordance with the rules of procedure and in order to ensure the orderly conduct of our debates.

161. Mr. BIHELLER (Czechoslovakia): In the course of the debate in the Fourth Committee, the Czechoslovak delegation clearly expressed its fundamental opposition to the idea that Somaliland should be placed under the trusteeship of a single Power, and objected in particular to the idea that that Power should be Italy, the former colonial master of that territory.

162. The decision of the General Assembly which initiated such a course was contrary to the peace treaty with Italy and contrary to the spirit of the Charter and the aims of the Trusteeship System. We know that in this case also the United States Government imposed its will upon the majority. Ignoring and setting aside the interests and wishes of the Somali people, the United States Government is all out to have Somaliland transformed into a military base and a source of raw material and man-power for its aggressive plans against the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies, as well as against the national liberation movements of Asia and Africa.

163. The Trusteeship Agreement for Somaliland, based upon a fundamentally wrong decision, contains provisions which will enable the Administering Authority to take political and economical roots in that country and to fortify its colonial possessions there at the expense of the Somali people. The Czechoslovak delegation discussed this item in detail in the Fourth Committee. It will therefore be sufficient to mention in brief the most important shortcomings of that Agreement.

164. There is no provision in the Agreement which stipulates the right of the United Nations, through its competent organs, including the Advisory Council, decisively to influence the formulation of administration policies in Somaliland. The Agreement concedes to the Advisory Council only the right to give aid and advice which the Administering Authority may or may not take into account. It does not give the Advisory Council the right to prevent, if necessary, the taking of measures by the Administering Authority which might hinder the attainment of the objectives of the trusteeship.

165. Secondly, although this trusteeship is explicitly limited to a period of ten years, the Agreement does not contain any provisions whatsoever which would oblige the Administering Authority progressively to establish appropriate, democratically elected representative bodies of the Somali people. The Territorial Council mentioned in the Agreement is no substitute for a democratically elected representative body of the Somalis; it has only an advisory status. Its members are to be selected by the Administering Authority, and there can be no doubt that those will be only persons prepared to agree to all and any measures of the Administration, including those contrary to the interests of the Somali people and to the objectives of the trusteeship.

166. Thirdly, the Agreement does not contain provisions which would effectively safeguard the economic interests of the Somali people. On the contrary, it enables the Administering Authority to permit the lease of as much as 1,000 acres of land to non-indigenous

persons or companies for an unlimited period, necessitating only the consent of two-thirds of the members of the Territorial Council. Such consent will be easily received, considering the hand-picked composition of that body. Equally ineffective as a safeguard of Somali interests is a provision permitting — and in fact authorizing — the Administering Authority to lease for an unlimited period, to non-indigenous persons or companies, the exploitation of the natural resources in the Territory. It is obvious that the long-term lease which is permitted by the Agreement will give the present and prospective colonial exploiters sufficient latitude to enable them ruthlessly and profitably to exploit the soil, the natural resources and the man-power in the Territory for a long time to come, even after the attainment of independence.

167. Fourthly, the Agreement authorizes the Administering Authority to set up a police force and armed forces, supposedly for the maintenance of peace in and defence of the Territory. Both these provisions give the Administering Authority the right firmly to establish Italian colonial rule in the Territory, and to violate the peace treaty with Italy by extending and using the forces under its command far beyond the limits set up therein. The Agreement gives the Italian administration the right to set up military bases in Somaliland and thus drag that Territory and its people into the network of United States strategic schemes. This is all the more objectionable as these plans are directed not only against the independent, peace-loving and freedom-loving countries, but also against the liberation struggles of the peoples in the colonies. The purposes of this provision are clearly to engage and entangle the Somali people in war preparations which are not of their making and which are contrary to their interests, thus chaining them to the American war chariot without giving them the right and possibility to decide on this matter freely and in accordance with their interests.

168. These are the main reasons why the Czechoslovak delegation objected to the draft resolution approving the Trusteeship Agreement and voted against it.

169. Mr. TAJIBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I should like to give a brief explanation of the USSR delegation's vote. I very much regret that I was not given an opportunity of doing so before the vote was taken, as my delegation requested.

170. The Government of the Soviet Union considers that the Somali people should be granted independence at the earliest possible date and should themselves decide their own fate. They are fully entitled and able to do so.

171. That is why, as long ago as at the last session of the General Assembly, the USSR opposed the idea that former Italian Somaliland should be placed under Italian administration for a period of ten years, and proposed instead that it should be placed under a provisional trusteeship administered directly by the United Nations Trusteeship Council and that it should be given full independence five years later.<sup>5</sup>

172. But the Anglo-American bloc, desirous of using Italian Somaliland as a strategic military base, suc-

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, Plenary Meetings, Annex, document A/1082.

ceeded — thanks to the subservient majority at its command — in getting the General Assembly to adopt resolution 289 A (IV), which provided that Italian Somaliland was to be placed under Italian administration for a period of ten years.

173. And now the same majority is foisting on us a Trusteeship Agreement for Somaliland under Italian administration; the Agreement was drafted by the United Nations Trusteeship Council and approved by the same majority in the Fourth Committee — and now in the General Assembly.

174. The agreement which the General Assembly has just approved is not in conformity with the aims of the International Trusteeship System. It provides for the retention of the colonial system in Somaliland rather than for the development of the Territory towards self-government and independence. The Agreement in effect excludes the indigenous population from any part in the administration of the country.

175. All power in the Territory is in fact transferred to the Administrator who, under the pretext of "exceptional circumstances" — to be defined by the Administering Authority — is free to administer the country quite arbitrarily. The grant of democratic rights and freedoms — one of the fundamental objectives which the United Nations Charter is designed to secure — is subject, under articles 19 and 20 of the Agreement, to the observance by the local population of the so-called requirements of public order. This proviso can always be used as a pretext for violating the democratic rights and freedoms of the population of Somaliland.

176. The Agreement gives the imperialist Powers complete freedom for economic expansion in Somaliland and for the rapacious exploitation of its natural wealth; it also places the whole economy of the Territory under foreign control. At the same time, the Agreement makes no provision for the protection of the economic interests of the indigenous population of Somaliland.

177. Under the pretext of maintaining peace and order in Italian Somaliland, the Agreement permits the Administering Authority to establish military installa-

tions, to maintain so-called police forces — which may in fact be Italian armed forces — and to take other military measures with a view to converting Somaliland into an Anglo-American military and strategic base. This is a glaring violation of the United Nations Charter.

178. The Agreement thus, in fact, preserves the former colonial system in Italian Somaliland. This is borne out by the fact that the Italian Government has retained intact the previous administrative system, which dates back to the fascist dictatorship of Mussolini. It has reappointed to various administrative posts in Italian Somaliland many one-time fascist administrators who served in the former Italian colonies in Africa, including Italian Somaliland itself. Moreover, many laws enacted by the former fascist government are still operative in Somaliland.

179. It follows from what I have said that, far from corresponding to the interests of the Somali people, this Agreement contributes to their further enslavement and also defers their attainment of freedom and independence.

180. The USSR delegation therefore voted against the approval of the draft trusteeship agreement for Somaliland under Italian administration, submitted to the General Assembly by the Trusteeship Council.

#### **Place of meeting of the sixth session of the General Assembly**

181. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): As you know, the delegations of Bolivia, Colombia and Peru have submitted a draft resolution [A/1593] asking that, for technical reasons, the sixth session of the General Assembly should be held in Europe.

182. If there are no objections, this draft resolution will be referred to the Fifth Committee for consideration.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 6 p.m.*