

for *New Zealand*, opening the discussion of the sub-committee's proposal reminded the First Committee that the representatives of Cyrenaica desired a united Libya only if it were under the leadership of their Emir. It was his view that in respect of unity the General Assembly should assist and not insist, and, while he believed a united Libya to be the best solution, it seemed to him quite improper to impose upon the people of Libya or on any of the three divisions of Libya a unity which they might not desire. The representative of the *United Kingdom* (Mr McNeil) likewise objected to the sub-committee's text, which in his view would compel the inhabitants of Libya to adhere rigidly to a single, unified form of political structure.

He pointed out that while the Libyan people had many elements in common, there were important differences in political level and administrative patterns. He believed that the people of Libya should be left to choose freely the form of their union, and to that end he proposed amendments to the sub-committee's text. This position was supported by the *United States* and by most countries of the Commonwealth and of Western Europe. The *Soviet Group* denounced these amendments, and an Indian one which superseded them, on the grounds that they were "designed to legalize the partition of Libya into three parts, and would unite Libya in such shape as to maintain the control of the colonial Powers over various sections of Libya." Nor did the Moslem and Latin American countries see any need for amendments: they considered that the sub-committee's text left the inhabitants free to adopt any kind of constitution—unitary, federal, confederal, &c.—provided it was within the framework of a single State of Libya; change would only be needed if it were desired—and the representative of the *United Kingdom* had disclaimed such a desire—to provide for the possibility of three separate independent States. A compromise wording ultimately adopted reads: "That Libya, comprising Cyrenaica, Tripolitania and the Fezzan, shall be constituted an independent and sovereign State."

This was accepted by the *United Kingdom* delegation, but the *New Zealand* delegation still considered that it circumscribed unduly the freedom of choice of the inhabitants, and this, along with the provision for the Advisory Council, was the reason for the delegation's abstention in the vote on the Libyan section of the resolution.

The *New Zealand* delegation considered it a cumbersome arrangement that the *United Nations* Commissioner charged with the task of advising the administering Powers should in turn be advised by an Advisory Council of a political nature. Sir Carl Berendsen expressed his fear that this proposal for "back-seat drivers" would create confusion and distrust, and he asked for its reconsideration. For the *United Kingdom*, Mr McNeil argued that it was administratively untidy to create rival authorities, and that the presence of representatives of foreign Governments would involve some risk of projecting into the territory those