

UNITED NATIONS  
TRUSTEESHIP  
COUNCIL

UN LIBRARY

JUN 17 1960

UN/SA



PROVISIONAL

T/PV.1114  
16 June 1960

ENGLISH

Twenty-sixth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ELEVEN HUNDRED AND FOURTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Thursday, 16 June 1960, at 2.30 p.m.

President:

Mr. VITELLI

(Italy)

Examination of annual reports of Administering Authorities  
on the administration of Trust Territories: Ruanda-Urundi [3a] (continued)

Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories  
in East Africa, 1960: Ruanda-Urundi [5a] (continued)

Examination of the possibility of sending a United Nations  
Observers Group to supervise the elections to be held in June 1960  
in Ruanda-Urundi [12] (continued)

Plans of political reform for the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi  
[16] (continued)

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record,  
will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol  
T/SR.1114 and will be subject to representatives' corrections.  
It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

## AGENDA ITEMS 3a, 5a, 12 and 16

EXAMINATION OF ANNUAL REPORTS OF ADMINISTERING AUTHORITIES ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF TRUST TERRITORIES: RUANDA-URUNDI (T/1461, 1495, 1536, 1540, 1543; T/L.985, L.992; T/PET.3/L.10 to L.31; T/COM.3/L.26, 27, 29 to 38) (continued);

REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO TRUST TERRITORIES IN EAST AFRICA, 1960: RUANDA-URUNDI (T/1538) (continued);

EXAMINATION OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SENDING A UNITED NATIONS OBSERVERS GROUP TO SUPERVISE THE ELECTIONS TO BE HELD IN JUNE 1960 IN RUANDA-URUNDI (continued);

PLANS OF POLITICAL REFORM FOR THE TRUST TERRITORY OF RUANDA-URUNDI (GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 1419 (XIV)) (continued)

Request for oral hearing

The PRESIDENT: Before we proceed to the questioning of the Special Representative, I should like to ask the representative of Belgium whether he is now ready to make his observations on the request for an oral hearing contained in document T/1543.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium)(interpretation from French): The Belgian delegation has no comment to make at this time on this request for a hearing nor any objection to the granting of the hearing, if the Council so wishes.

The PRESIDENT: Since there are no observations or objections on the part of the members of the Council, I take it that the request is granted. We shall therefore proceed to notify the petitioner to appear before the Council as soon as possible. In view of the late date, I hope that the petitioner will be able to appear in the course of the next week.

Agenda of the Council

The PRESIDENT: There is a further question which I should like to put to the representative of Belgium. In his statement at the 1112th meeting of the Council on 14 June he stated:

"...the decision was taken to proceed with the communal elections and to hold separate legislative elections. The request to send observers to these first elections has thus been left behind by events."

(T/PV.1112, page 58)

In view of this statement, I should like to ask the representative of Belgium whether item 12 on the Council's agenda, entitled "Examination of the Possibility of Sending a United Nations Observers Group to Supervise the Elections to be Held in June 1960 in Ruanda-Urundi", which was inscribed at the request of the Belgian delegation, still retains its validity.

Mr. CIAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): With regard to my statement at the 1112th meeting concerning the Belgian Government's plan for organizing legislative elections in Ruanda-Urundi under the supervision of the United Nations in June 1961, I believe that I can inform the Council that the Belgian delegation considers that its request to send a group of United Nations observers to supervise the communal elections is no longer a topical matter. It seems to me, therefore, that item 12 on our agenda might be considered now as having no purpose and simply removed from the agenda.

The PRESIDENT: The Council has heard the remarks of the representative of Belgium in relation to item 12.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): It seems a rather unusual procedure to my delegation that the opinion of a delegation -- any delegation -- should be invited as to the validity in any circumstances, old or new or changed, of a certain item inscribed on the Council's agenda. Any member is, of course, free to request the inscription of an item on the agenda, but once the item is

inscribed, it is inscribed by the will of the Council, and it is our view that the views of a particular member -- any member, I would say again -- cease to have any special significance after the Council has adopted its agenda and agreed to the inscription on it of a particular item.

Having said this, I wish to go on to say that the representative of Belgium informed the Council the other day that the communal elections would be held some time in July. Without expressing any categorical opinion at this stage, I should like to say that it is quite possible for the Council, in the light of the observations made by the Visiting Mission, to decide that observers should go for the supervision of the communal elections as well, apart from the elections to the National Councils of Ruanda and Urundi and the elections to the General Council. It is our view, therefore, that not only should this item remain on the agenda, but it should be considered along with the item that is inscribed on our agenda for today, namely examination of annual reports, etc.

That would be the view of my delegation and I hope that no action will be taken, or that it will not be suggested that action be taken, to delete this item from the agenda at this stage. In our turn, at the appropriate time, we propose to express our point of view on this particular matter.

If I may, I should like to comment also on the other matter which the President decided a few minutes ago; that is, that the Council grant a hearing to petitioner Michel Rwagasana. I wish only to say that, while we agree that a telegram should be sent to the effect that the Council grants the hearing, I think that it would be useful if, in the course of this meeting, the text of the telegram that it is proposed to send could be read out to the Council. I think that this would be appropriate and perhaps the right course for us to follow.

The PRESIDENT: May I point out to the representative of India that I was coming to the point which he so rightly made. As a matter of courtesy, of course, I gave the floor first to the representative of Belgium, but, of course, I would have asked other members for their point of view in this particular matter of sending a group of observers.



(The President)

At any rate, the situation now is the following. If I understood correctly, the view of the representative of India is that this particular item should be retained on our agenda. I am not so sure about the procedural aspect of the situation -- whether it is going to be carried over to the agenda of the next session automatically or not. Therefore, I shall have to ask any representatives who are willing to express their opinions on this point to come to the aid of the Chair. It is obviously for the Council to decide. The representative of Belgium has expressed the opinion that the item no longer has any validity in view of developments in Ruanda-Urundi.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I do not quite understand, Mr. President, what you wish to Council to decide now. The Council has decided that the question of sending observers to elections in Ruanda-Urundi should be considered. The item is inscribed on the agenda. You raised a question a little while ago, and I expressed the views of my delegation. It is clear from the Visiting Mission's report that the Visiting Mission's view in the matter was that all elections should be supervised by the United Nations. The Visiting Mission even went to the extent of suggesting that where necessary the elections should be postponed. There seemed to be some general agreement among the parties at a stage during the Visiting Mission's presence in Ruanda-Urundi. As I pointed out, the elections will now take place in stages. The elections to the communal councils are going to be held in July. We do not yet know what exactly the date will be for Ruanda and for Urundi. Therefore, not only is it perfectly possible for the Council to retain the item on its agenda, but it has to do so because it has taken a decision and unless we dispose of the item there is no way of expressing an opinion with regard to its validity or its timeliness. The time is still there. The item is inscribed by the agreement of the Council. It is perfectly possible for the Council, in the course of our discussions during this week or next week, to decide that observers should go even for the communal elections, and if the Council takes that decision the item will be disposed of. If, on the other hand, the Council considers that it is not necessary to send observers, then that part of item 12 which relates to the supervision of communal elections will be disposed of in that manner. I therefore do not see the necessity of engaging in debate on this point at the present stage.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I should like to recall that the request for the inscription of this item on the agenda was introduced by the Belgian delegation. When my delegation put forward that request it did so on the basis of the political plans then envisaged whereby these elections would be the basic elections from which would emerge these councils which afterwards would serve as the electoral body or corps for the legislative elections. Those plans have been abandoned. Furthermore, even during the visit of the Visiting Mission, it appeared that the supervision of the elections beginning on

(Mr. Claeys Bouúaert, Belgium)

27 June and continuing into July in Ruanda, and a little later in Urundi, might give rise to considerable practical difficulties. My delegation does not withdraw its invitation, but as the political elections will take place in 1961, and as, for those elections, the Belgian Administration requests United Nations supervision, we feel that the question of supervision of the earlier elections has been left behind by events. That is our opinion.

The PRESIDENT: Does the representative of India wish to comment on the observations of the Belgian representative?

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I do not wish to comment. There is no necessity for me to do so. I have expressed my delegation's views on the substance of the matter, and it adheres to those views.

The PRESIDENT: The Council has now before it a question which can be summed up more or less as follows. There is an item on our agenda. The Chair, following certain observations made by the Administering Authority, has thought it appropriate to ask the proponent of the item whether or not it still considered the item to be valid. The representative of Belgium has explained why, in his delegation's view, the item has lost its validity, for the moment at least, because it is now a matter of holding communal elections whereas political elections will take place only in 1961. Thus the question was quite proper. The representative of India is of the opinion that this item should be retained. The only solution I can seek is to ask the Council to take a decision on this.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I beg, with due respect, to disagree with your interpretation of this matter, Mr. President. First of all, I do not agree, as I said earlier, that there was any necessity for the Chair to seek the opinion of a member -- no matter which member -- concerning the validity of the item on the agenda. A certain statement was made by the Belgian representative. We have taken note of that statement, and we propose to discuss it when we come to the question stage or the stage of the general debate. The Chair, it seems to me, has precipitated this matter by asking a specific question, by inviting a certain

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

comment from a delegation and by suggesting, in the form of the question itself, that the retention of this item on the agenda seems to be invalid. That is something with which my delegation does not see eye to eye. I think that the only proper course for us is to leave this matter where it stands and allow members of the Council to discuss it when they come to ask questions on this Territory and on what the Visiting Mission has recommended, and not to press a decision beforehand.

The PRESIDENT: Again I would like to point out to the Indian representative that I was coming to precisely the point he has just made. I was about to suggest by way of compromise, if I may so describe it, that we should take the matter up later on.

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): I think that this matter has been sufficiently elucidated, if I may say so. I was not here when the discussion first started, but I have a great deal of sympathy with the point of view expressed by the Indian representative which is, I think, not very different from your own, Mr. President. The position seems to me to be quite clear. An item was inscribed at the request of the Belgian delegation at an early stage. The Belgian delegation has now made it clear that in its view that item is unnecessary, but I may say that even if this had not been put down nothing would have prevented members of the Council, during the debate on the Territory, from expressing views very much in this sense if they chose to do so. Therefore, I think we can leave the matter. We know what the view of the Administering Authority is, and every member will be able to approach this discussion at it wishes, so that I do not think that we need have any further discussion or any decision or ruling on the subject. I think we can just leave it as it is.

The PRESIDENT: I think we can consider the discussion of this particular question as concluded for the moment.

We shall now proceed to the questioning in the field of political advancement.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Reisdorff, Special Representative for the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian administration, took a place at the Council table.

Political advancement

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I believe that all members of the Council realize that the most important problem in Ruanda-Urundi relates to the effort at conciliation which must be made in order to ascertain whether it is possible to create those elements which are necessary if the Territory is eventually to become independent. We know that there has been a struggle between the various sectors of the population. It has been called an anti-feudal struggle, a tribal struggle and so forth.

(Mr. Salemanca, Bolivia)

These problems test the political capacity of the Administering Authority. But, before formulating my questions, I might say that, having read the Visiting Mission's report and, especially, having listened to the statement by the representative of the United States, Mr. Sears, and having listened to the opinions of the representative of Belgium and the Special Representative, I believe that I must make a few appropriate remarks.

First I should like to refer to the statement by the representative of Belgium on page 58 of the verbatim record of 14 June 1960, which I shall read out in English, as follows:

"I believe, however, that I must give some supplementary clarification with regard to the remarks in paragraph 27. It is mentioned there that, for the first time, a formal truce was agreed upon between the leaders of the political parties. Evidently, this is the first time that such an agreement was countersigned simultaneously by the Mwami and a considerable number of high-ranking personalities, but it is not the first time that commitments to renounce violence had been solicited and obtained by the Administration and the Mwami." (T/PV.1112, page 58)

The impression produced by this comment regarding paragraph 27 of the Visiting Mission's report is that the conciliatory efforts of the Administering Authority before the Visiting Mission arrived were fragmentary efforts, that is to say, the conciliatory machinery had not really begun to operate. I should like to have a clarification from the representative of Belgium.

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) (interpretation from French): I think that I can give the representative of Bolivia some elements of a reply. The Administering Authority has always, from the beginning of the trouble, gathered the political parties together in order to ensure that they might halt all subversive action, and these parties on numerous occasions gave orders accordingly to their adherents. On the other hand, the Administering Authority, by creating a special committee in Ruanda, gave to it also the mandate of finding peaceful solutions, solutions of appeasement, and this committee indeed is composed of two representatives of the principal parties, and therefore it is



(Mr. Reisdorff,  
Special Representative)

within that committee itself that any action of appeasement could take place, since the various parties were represented in it and thus were able to issue instructions for obtaining appeasement and general agreement to the members of their parties.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I gather from the reply given by the Special Representative that it was only along these formal lines that the conciliatory effort was made and submitted to the population of Ruanda-Urundi by the Administering Authority. We must admit that in the process of conciliation there are many methods. Furthermore, the impression that one gets from the report and, especially, from the opinions voiced at previous meetings by the Special Representative is that there is more than one point of disagreement between the Visiting Mission's report and the Administering Authority's opinions. The impression that one gets -- and this is a preliminary opinion on my part -- is that the Visiting Mission believes that the conciliatory process is not a continuous one, at least that it has been broken off, or perhaps it is simply a formal procedure.

There are two ways of proceeding to conciliation. One is the formal method through representatives in contact with the Administering Authority, and the other is a broader and more complex effort. I should like the Special Representative to tell us exactly and in greater detail how this effort of conciliation is being carried out.

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) (interpretation from French): I think I mentioned in my statement yesterday that on three or four occasions the Resident-General and the Mwami, during the time of the troubles, had made statements and addressed messages to the people of Ruanda to ensure that hostilities would halt between the two factions of the population. On the other hand, the agenda of the provisional council of Ruanda, which is the present governing body of Ruanda, had on several occasions as one of its items the measures of conciliation to be adopted. Lastly, the heads of political parties had agreed with the Resident-General that the members of their parties would cease all subversive activity and would leave it to the Administering

(Mr. Reisdorff,  
Special Representative)

Authority to settle any disputes that might occur between political adversaries. Therefore, if there is any legal terrain in which conciliation could be achieved, it is within the provisional council itself. But, apart from that, the Resident and the Resident-General had numerous contacts with the political leaders and had endeavoured to bring about conciliation through their good offices.

At present the channels for appeasement are among the principal subjects debated in Brussels in regard to Ruanda.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I should like to add that the Special Representative has pointed out quite appropriately that the very creation of the provisional Ruanda-Urundi commission, composed of the representatives of the principal political parties, was essentially a measure designed to set up conditions for discussion which would make it possible to arrive at some form of reconciliation -- a decanting, as it were, of the points on which the opposing factions continued to have differences -- and measures which would make it possible to achieve solutions by peaceful means. The efficiency of this method was recognized by the Visiting Mission, which mentioned it in paragraph 27, that is, that thanks to the intervention of the special provisional council of Ruanda the latter part of its visit could be carried out in peaceful conditions and in conditions ensuring that everyone would have the opportunity of discussing their problems freely with the representatives of the Visiting Mission.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I now come to a question which is somewhat more general but still concerns the problem of conciliation. On page 48 of the initial statement made by Mr. Sears we read the following:

"In order to promote reconciliation the Mission unanimously agreed to recommend the holding of an early pre-election Round Table Conference for Ruanda-Urundi similar to the Round Table Conference on the Congo. Such a conference had already been proposed by political parties in both Ruanda and Urundi.

"The Belgian Government, however, was unable to accept the idea of holding a Round Table Conference at such an early date."

(T/PV.1112, page 48)

The only thing I would like to ask is whether this postponement or delay is really useful in this programme of pacification and reconciliation in Ruanda-Urundi. There is a plain discrepancy between the report of the Visiting Mission and the Administering Authority.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): First of all, I should like to inform the representative of Bolivia that the first answer, addressed on the suggestion of the Visiting Mission, and which in fact was a reply in accordance with which these meetings could be held only in the month of August, had been examined later; that is, this reply was examined later and the decision was taken precisely for the purpose of exploring as rapidly as possible all the possibilities for a reconciliation, so as to hold this gathering in May; and that gathering took place.

Moreover, he had referred to an idea stated by the Visiting Mission, in accordance with which this conference should have approximately the same character as that which was gathered earlier and in which the delegates of the Congolese party and the delegates of the Brussels Government were represented.

I am obliged to mention that the comparison between these two procedures was not possible, for two reasons. First of all, the internal situation in Ruanda-Urundi was in no sense at all comparable -- at this stage, at least -- to the internal situation in the Congo. Secondly, as far as the Congo is

(Claeys Bouuaert, Belgium)

concerned, the Belgian Government had its hands free and could take unilateral decisions, whereas in respect of Ruanda-Urundi, the Belgian Government is bound by the Charter and by the Trusteeship Agreement and thus could not give to this preliminary meeting the same character as that which was imparted to the conference gathering in Brussels, which was attended by the leaders of the Congolese party.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I hope that my colleague and friend will realize that if I am pressing this question about the process of reconciliation it is because I believe that such a process must be a continuous process on all levels, and that is why I am putting these questions in connexion with this point.

I now come to another question. This is a question on which I would like some clarification, and I presume that many members of the Council will find themselves in the same position because the report which we have before us is not sufficient to allow us to understand the whole of the problem of Ruanda-Urundi, and furthermore, there are points of discrepancy between the Visiting Mission and the Administering Authority. Perhaps it would have been appropriate if the Belgian delegation presented to us a paper setting forth these points of fundamental discrepancies; but we do not have such a paper, so we will have to clarify these points ourselves.

There is another important paragraph in Mr. Sears' opening statement. I hope he is not annoyed by my constantly quoting from his statement, but after all he was the Chairman of the Visiting Mission. At the end of page 48 we read:

"The Mission hopes that the national assemblies set up as a result of these elections will draft constitutional agreements establishing democratic institutions. If so it will be a great stride forward in closing the gap between the pro-Administration forces and those supporting the Mwami and immediate independence." (T/PV.1112, page 48)

I am seeking a clarification. Inasmuch as it is suggested here that the Administration is opposed to certain other groups, I would like to know whether this is true.

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) (interpretation from French):

In my view, this is a rather unfortunate expression or one which certainly goes beyond what the position of the Administering Authority is.

The Administration is not opposed to any group of the population and is not opposed to any party. I had pointed out that all the parties are represented in the Provisional Council of Ruanda. The Administration has had bilateral conferences and conversations with all leaders of all parties and has not done this on any exclusive basis and does not consider any party as being its adversary. If it is possible for the judiciary power to have had to react to certain infringements of criminal law, this has never been considered as something against the political code; it was simply infringements of the penal code, and there was no exclusive action at all in respect of any political party nor against any section of the population. There is no party at all that can lay blame against the Administration. This matter has been officially proclaimed on numerous occasions by the authorities, both in Ruanda and in Urundi. The Administration stands above parties. No party can accuse it in any sense. The Administration has not given any exclusive treatment to any party.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I hope that the Belgian delegation will realize that if I put such a question it was because I found it not only in the report but in Mr. Sears' statement. Far be it for me to think that the Administration has to back one or the other sectors of the Territory. With regard to conciliatory efforts, the Administration must adopt a very clear stand and must balance all of the forces in the Territory. I believe the reply given to me is satisfactory because I believe that that indeed must be the position of the Administering Authority in any effort at national reconciliation.

My next question relates to the process of Africanization of the civil service in Ruanda-Urundi. In reading paragraph 424, and the paragraph that follows, I get the impression that there is only a plan but no real intent to incorporate in the civil service men who would begin to have the necessary

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

responsibility for public administration in Ruanda-Urundi. In accordance with the plans of the Administration at what time will the establishment of efficient and effective civil service personnel take place in the Territory?

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) (interpretation from French): The Visiting Mission itself had dealt with this question at greater length. In paragraph 424, and subsequent ones, additional information is supplied by the Administering Authority on this subject.

I believe I should indicate that a rather substantial portion of the officials of the Administration are Africans. At present, there are 297 agents of the fourth category and two officials or agents of the third category.



(Mr. Reisdorff,  
Special Representative)

The third category and the fourth category were, up to a few years ago, occupied solely by European officials because they called for rather extensive studies, in other words, complete secondary schooling and additional administrative schooling.

I believe this will indicate to the representative of Bolivia that the increase in the number of African officials in the administrative service is being carried out in a regular way and that we can look forward to the complete Africanization, in a few years, of the whole of the administration. Furthermore, exceptional measures are being employed to provide the most deserving and competent elements with periods of rapid training so as to enable these candidates to reach higher posts in the Administration. At present there are several inhabitants of Ruanda and of Urundi who are undergoing this training at the Central Administration at Usumbura.

In the same field, I should like to inform the representative of Bolivia that the number of young men taking university training is increasing every year. Last year the number stood at 156; it is now 165. These 165 university students from Ruanda and Urundi are now registered in various schools, either in Europe or in Africa, and in a few years we shall have future officials graduating from these schools.

The same thing applies to military schools. Six students are at present registered in the Military School of Brussels and ten in the Military School of Luluabourg. Thus, as regards the army likewise, relief will be shortly forthcoming in the form of officials from Ruanda and Urundi.

I should also like to point out the recent establishment of a school for administration at Astrida. The Astrida College comprises a school which will make it possible for young men, after an additional year following their secondary schooling, to enter the fourth category. Finally, the first graduates have come out of the Athénée d'Usumbura and are now taking university courses, and some of them will go into the Administration.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): What I really wanted to know was not the details, but how many years it would take. The Special Representative has told us that it would take a few years; he cannot give us the exact number -- three, four or more, perhaps. My impression was that the process was not going along easily, and I would like to know what the difficulty is. In paragraph 425 of the report of the Visiting Mission, we read as follows: (continued in English)

"In his statement of 3 March 1960, the Resident-General said that the human problem of the Africanization of the administration could be resolved without difficulty if everyone approached it from the right angle psychologically, and with good will."

(continued in Spanish)

In other words, I thought that there was some difficulty. The Special Representative, however, informs us that there are no difficulties.

I now come to another question which may, in one way or another, affect the future of Ruanda-Urundi. In his opening statement, the representative of Belgium stated as follows -- and I quote in English since I have no copy here in Spanish:

"Paragraphs 507, 508 and 509 of the Visiting Mission's report state how we have begun to study these matters and set forth the provisional measures which have been envisaged until such time as Ruanda-Urundi is independent and can decide, as a sovereign State, what connexion it wishes to have with the independent State of the Congo in the matter of economic union."

(T/PV.1112, page 63)

(continued in Spanish)

At the same time, elsewhere in his initial statement he told us that a Commission had been set up to study this problem. Article 8 of the Trusteeship Agreement contemplates the eventual possibility that the Territory of Ruanda-Urundi might indeed become a part of a greater unit, an administrative union with the Congo. I should like to know whether this commission includes representatives of Ruanda-Urundi. If, in a more or less distant future, there are in Ruanda-Urundi two completely divided factions and if theseparation should be widened -- and this is a quite likely development in a small and overpopulated country -- as a result of strong internal stresses, one could conceive of the possibility of conciliation

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

of these internal differences as lying within the organization of a larger confederation. I should like to know if the recently created Commission has contemplated that possibility and whether the Administering Authority has any clear-cut ideas on the matter.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The Commission is at present at work in Brussels. In answer to the first part of the question, I can state to the representative of Bolivia that the Commission is composed of two representatives from Ruanda, two representatives from Urundi and three Belgian technicians of whom one was selected by the General Council of Ruanda-Urundi, the other two being officials.

As for the subject matter of this study, it is rather extensive. For the time being, the Commission is occupied essentially with the various aspects of monetary union and trade policy. It is not only the mixed Brussels Commission that is dealing with the question, but also the constituted bodies of Ruanda-Urundi and, in particular, the General Council of Ruanda-Urundi where, as is well known, representatives of both countries are gathered.

The General Council of Ruanda-Urundi recently issued a communiqué on this subject. Though it is somewhat lengthy, I should like to read it:

(Mr. Claeys Boulaert, Belgium)

"The Congo and Ruanda-Urundi up to now have had an administrative, monetary and customs union which has resulted in a complete interpenetration of the economy. European experience in particular shows that if it is relatively easy to separate nations, it is extremely difficult to unite them. The experience of the formation of the Common Market is typical in this respect, because it provides for a transitional period of twelve to fifteen years. This experience suggests that if in the future the Congo and Ruanda-Urundi wish to form a stable union among themselves, this union will give rise to extremely difficult problems if we begin by separating their territories which today are united. Also it would appear desirable in the very interests of these territories not to prejudge the future by cutting, as of today, the bonds which they might wish to re-establish two or three years hence, which then would be very difficult to set up.

"The General Council, considering the foregoing, expresses the wish that the economic, customs and taxation union which exists at the present should be extended, first by legislative provisions for a maximum period of four months, and then by one or several conventions concluded for an undefined period, so long as each party can put an end to it by prior notice of six months and provided that the texts include the following provisions:

"(a) Co-operative organs shall be created in each of the two countries. The Congo, on the one hand, and Ruanda-Urundi, on the other, would be represented on a parity basis.

"(b) Ruanda-Urundi might use all its budgetary resources, particularly in relation to taxation and charges, which would imply a revision of the system of sharing the revenues.

"(c) Ruanda-Urundi might in particular organize its own supplies, this including the system of import licences, tariffs, the means of transport and transit rights between Kigoma and Dar es Salaam, so as to take better account of the economic realities in Ruanda-Urundi."

This view of the General Council was expressed by thirty-four votes to three, with five abstentions. It is to be noted that among those opposing there were only European members. I could give more detailed information regarding monetary problems, but that would go beyond the scope of the question that has been put.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): It was very good of the Belgian representative to give me that very interesting reply. I presume that it will be possible in the future, once Ruanda-Urundi has become reconciled, that the political leaders will have enough vision to see that their future would be better if they were to enter into a larger confederation, rather than remain as a small country with difficult problems.

I have two more questions to put, and I must admit that my next question, which I address to the Belgian Government, is a rather difficult question. I understand that there is a very clear co-relation between the efforts at conciliation in the Territory and the organization of the Territory into two separate entities with a common government. All these factors must be measured by the Administering Authority, and I should like to put the following question. Could the representative of Belgium estimate approximately the time which will be required for a solution of these problems in order to bring about the independence of Ruanda-Urundi or its union with the Congo, if the latter is to be the solution?

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I believe that I answered that question to the extent possible in the latter part of my general statement, in which I indicated that the conversations which have been started and which will be continued between the Administering Authority and the representatives of the Trust Territory provide that at the present stage the talks should be conducted in three parts. The two last parts would concern particularly the prospects for the future development of local institutions and their ultimate effect upon other Territories, either between themselves or in relation to neighbouring territories. I should like to read out what I said in this connexion:

"... a conference will be held", -- at the end of this year -- "to which the leaders of all the political tendencies in the two States will be invited, so as to study with the Administering Authority the next steps in the political evolution." (T/PV.1112, page 68-70)

Among the points which will be discussed will be the distribution of functions between the Governments of the two countries and the Governments of

Ruanda-Urundi. This is for the phase of the unification and of the union which we have always considered as necessary between Ruanda and Urundi. After the elections of 1961, as soon as the two countries have a government responsible to their Legislative Assemblies, the Belgian Government intends to organize, with the representatives of these two governments, a general conference "to discuss the type of independence which they desire and to examine the procedures leading to the termination of Trusteeship." (Ibid.)

This regime of independence should, within the framework envisaged for these discussions, result in co-operation with the future neighbouring States on a monetary, economic and customs level.

Therefore, the reply with regard to timing is that the points on which union might be achieved with the neighbouring countries will be examined by the Belgian Government, because it will still be the Administering Authority, and the delegates of the two Governments of Ruanda-Urundi at a general conference which will take place in 1961.



Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I realise that it was difficult to obtain a specific reply because the action programme is divided up into various stages. I presume that the situation may change from one moment to the next. It may be accelerated or slowed down.

The PRESIDENT: Before calling on the next speaker, I should like to read out the text of the telegram which is to be sent out to Mr. Rwagasana:  
(continued in French)

"The Trusteeship Council has granted your request for hearing.  
American authorities notified. Request you take first available aircraft to appear as soon as possible before Council."  
(continued in English)

Since no member wishes to comment on this text, it will be sent out as soon as possible, since time is of the essence.

It was so decided.

U Tin MAUNG (Burma): On behalf of my delegation, I should like to extend a very cordial and warm welcome to the Special Representative, Mr. Reisdorff, who appeared at this Council for the first time at its twenty-fourth session. At that session of the Council we had the benefit of the vast experience and knowledge of Mr. Reisdorff, which contributed to the deliberations of the Council. I express the hope that we shall have the same co-operation and assistance from him.

Before my delegation asks a number of questions in the political field, I should like to refer to certain passages in the opening statement of the representative of Belgium which he made on Tuesday.

The representative of the Administering Authority, in referring to the two separate political sections in the report of the Visiting Mission dealing with the problems of Ruanda and the problems of Urundi, said that even though Belgium might well have unified the Trust Territory by imposing adequate measures even against the wishes of the people concerned, the Administering Authority could not overlook the obligation imposed on it by Article 76b of the Charter.

(U Tin Maung, Burma)

I think the representative of Belgium was talking about compulsory measures which he said the United Nations had urged his Government to impose on the Territory, but in retrospect I cannot recall any recommendation of either the Trusteeship Council or the General Assembly which called for the imposition by the Administering Authority of ready-made formulas or the imposition of adequate measures even against the wishes of the people concerned. If we remember correctly, even as recent as the twenty-fourth session of the Trusteeship Council, the Council made a recommendation which did not urge the Administering Authority to impose ready-made formulas on the Trust Territory against the wishes of the people concerned. I should like to refer to the relevant passage in that resolution which was adopted by the Trusteeship Council at its twenty-fourth session, in which the Council recommended the "strengthening of the relationships between Ruanda and Urundi by encouraging the establishment and development, on a democratic basis, of common political, economic, social and educational institutions. It also reiterates the views previously expressed in favour of full and complete freedom for the establishment and functioning of political parties." (Official Records: Fourteenth Session, Supplement No. 4 (A/4100) p.44)

The Visiting Mission, in paragraphs 61 and 62 of its report, gives reasons very clearly and simply why it proposes to present the problems of the two countries in separate sections. The report of the Visiting Mission does not say that the problems in Ruanda and Urundi have to be dealt with in two separate sections because the Administration had failed to unify the Territory. All that the Visiting Mission says is that it has to acknowledge the existence of certain elements of particularism in each State. The Mission in paragraph 61 states: "The disturbances of November 1959 in Ruanda drew attention to the differences between Ruanda and Urundi and led the Administering Authority to follow in Ruanda policies which it did not feel obliged to apply in Urundi."

In the light of this important observation made by the Mission, could the representative of the Administering Authority categorically deny that after the November 1959 disturbances in Ruanda the compulsory measures taken by the Administration to cope with the tense situation in Ruanda were never applied to Urundi?

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): With respect to the preliminary comments made by the representative of Burma, I must say that they correspond rather well with the point of view which I expressed in my opening statement. I am happy that he has expressed my own ideas in other terms. The representative of Burma has said that the Visiting Mission indicates that different measure had been taken in Ruanda from those taken in Urundi. That is correct. This is not a change in our policy. These particular measures were made necessary in Ruanda because of the civil war which was occurring there; they were not necessary in Urundi because there was no violence in that area, although political tension was running high. The disparity in certain measures simply concerned preventive police measures. They did not concern legislation or our over-all policy.

U Tin MAUNG (Burma): Of course we know that the situation in the two States were quite different and that there were no disturbances in Urundi. But then nobody could deny the fact that there was also a tense situation in Urundi. We shall return to that point in the course of the discussion on conditions in the Territory.

The representative of Belgium, while expressing his thanks to the Visiting Mission for its sincere efforts to achieve agreement between the leaders of the four political parties to restore calm in Ruanda, took exception to the claim which the Visiting Mission made that through the Mission's initiative a formal agreement was achieved for the first time between the leaders of the political parties, the Mwami and the Administration. The representative of the Administering Authority said that although for the first time the agreement was countersigned simultaneously by the Mwami, the Resident-General, the Special Representative, members of the Special Council and the Chairman of the Visiting Mission, it was not the first time that statements denouncing violence had been solicited and obtained on the part of the Administration and the Mwami.

In the light of this observation by the representative of Belgium, I should like to know whether the Special Representative or the representative of Belgium could give the Council any instance of such an achievement before the visit of the Mission in the Territory.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium)(interpretation from French): Before the Special Representative is called upon for the specific details requested by the representative of Burma, I must say, if I have understood him correctly, that he has attributed to my statement some argument regarding the assertions of the Visiting Mission and a denial by me of the correctness of what the Visiting Mission said. I merely wished to give a supplementary piece of information; that was all. By reading the Visiting Mission's report, one might have thought that never before had an attempt at conciliation been made. That is not quite right. From the very beginning of the disturbances in November, numerous and continuing efforts were made to achieve pacification. On 14 or 15 November a joint statement by the Resident General and the Mwami was drafted and circulated by aircraft throughout the whole of the disturbed areas. Meetings were held constantly by the political leaders and members of the Administration in order to have violence renounced. These meetings gave rise to promises to renounce violence, which promises were not always kept.

I must also point out that in this matter which was brought up by the Visiting Mission, this was a specific agreement for a specific purpose, inviting the political leaders to influence their party members to renounce violence so as to permit an orderly procedure of communication and exchange of views with the Visiting Mission.

The efforts of the Administering Authority to achieve reconciliation were more complex and were broader because we were not attempting to arrive at some pacification for a short period of time; we were simply trying to bring fundamentally opposed parties together. There were wide divergencies of opinion there and we had to get them to agree to democratic procedures instead of procedures involving violence.

U Tin MAUNG (Burma): I think that the representative of Belgium has clarified the point. I simply wanted to know whether any attempt had been made by the Administering Authority to reconcile the political parties which opposed one another and whether any agreement had already been arrived at to restore the country to normal conditions.

In paragraphs 26 and 27 of the Visiting Mission's report reference is made to certain incidents, particularly at Gitarama and Biumba. I do not think that I need to repeat the description of the incidents, but there was considerable tension after they had taken place, even when the Visiting Mission was in the Territory. I should like to know whether the Special Representative could tell us what measures were taken immediately after those incidents were reported to the Administering Authority; whether some action was taken to restore calm and normal conditions, or whether those responsible for those outbreaks were punished.

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) (interpretation from French): Before answering the question of the representative of Burma, I should like to thank him for the very kind words which he spoke on my behalf and to assure him of my full co-operation.

In reply to his question, I would say that these incidents which occurred when the Visiting Mission was passing through the Territory represented the culmination of tension there. In effect, the political parties wished to deploy their forces when the Visiting Mission was there in order to impress the Mission with their numbers, and to impress the population as well. After the Mission had left, the situation calmed down. The Mission asked that minimum measures be taken to restore public order so that free manifestation of opinion would not be prevented. There was an agreement between the Mission and the Administration to the effect that order would be maintained but that, on the other hand, all petitioners who wished to do so could approach the Mission.

The incidents at Gitarama took place on that one day only. Afterwards, the people involved returned to their homes. There was an investigation by the police and those who had committed offences under common law were brought to trial. In those regions at present, ordinary police surveillance is being maintained. No special conditions have been established. The incidents did not continue the following day. I think that that is the sort of reply which the representative of Burma expected.



U Tin MAUNG (Burma): In his opening statement the representative of Belgium said:

"Another measure ... had been determined by the Government after consultation with the Visiting Mission, namely, to hold in Brussels, before the communal elections, a conference of political leaders of Ruanda first, and then of Urundi, in order to find the bases for national reconciliation ..." (T/PV.1112, page 58)

This was strongly recommended by the Visiting Mission in paragraphs 471 to 473 of its report. The representative of Belgium continued:

"... This would only concern Ruanda, and then they would proceed to a general survey of tasks for the future regarding modification of the electoral legislation, the preparation of a general conference which would bring together the representatives of the two States, and the rate of political reforms." (Ibid.)

He then went on to say that this conference in Ruanda had encountered serious difficulties, due to the objections of several representatives of the parties who leveled criticisms against such a conference as being premature and prejudicial to the outcome of the communal elections, as well as denying the elected representatives the right to voice their opinions and thus negotiate for compromise solutions.



(U Tin Maung, Burma)

These are my questions. First, I should like to know what political parties objected on the ground that such a meeting could not normally and usefully be convened except after the communal elections had been held. Second, on what political basis, either legal or constitutional, was the Special Provisional Council -- which we all know is composed of two representatives of each of the four political parties -- given the mandate by the people of Ruanda to attend the conference of political leaders in Brussels?

Mr. CLAUDE BOUJAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): In the second part of this question the representative of Burma has put his finger on the precise problem. Upon what basis were these persons considered to represent the population? That was the objection advanced by certain parties, and especially by the HUTU parties. These latter -- and indeed all the parties -- said, "If we have considerable substantive differences concerning the very heart of our problem, the only way to get out of them is to consult the people". The Administration convinced all the parties that, even without taking substantive decisions on their difficulties, it would be a good idea for them to have a conference so that they could at least reach agreement on peaceful methods which would permit them to set forth the aspirations of the majority of the people and to formulate methods on the basis of which they might proceed peacefully and constitutionally to an examination of the problem. The preliminary meeting thus would have as its objective the examination of methods or a line of conduct for the parties rather than taking a final decision on their difficulties. This gave rise to the joint communique of the four parties involved in the Special Provisional Council which I read out in my opening statement. In that communique the representatives of all the parties say that, under the present circumstances, they represent the various currents of opinion in Ruanda-Urundi. They agree to envisage procedure which would allow them to examine the future of the country within the framework of consent to or agreement upon the appropriate methods. They wanted to go to Brussels having set aside their fundamental differences. They wanted to go there simply to be able to reach an agreement, in the interests of the welfare of the country, on methods of consulting the population in order to determine its aspirations.

U Tin MAUNG (Burma): I have before me the communique which was adopted by the Special Provisional Council and to which the representative of Belgium referred me just now. In that communique there are four points. The first is of some interest to my delegation. The Special Provisional Council

"Notes that the State is divided upon important questions, principally the essential question of the person of Kigeri V, Mwami of Ruanda."

I just wish to seek further clarification from the representatives of the Administering Authority. What is the basic difference of opinion between the parties concerned with regard to the person of Kigeri V, Mwami of Ruanda?

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative): The Visiting Mission itself analysed the various positions of the indigenous inhabitants of Ruanda vis-à-vis the person and the functions of Kigeri V. It pointed out that in the popular movement there was a sector of public opinion that wanted a republican system. It pointed out also that most or at least a certain number of those representing this trend would go along with a regime of constitutional monarchy. In the UMAR movement, which is a legitimist movement adhering unrestrictedly to the person of the Mwami, we find also various shades of opinion, because while certain of them wish to maintain the powers of a traditional Mwami, with all that that involves in the way of feudalism, others are more inclined towards the concept of a constitutional Mwami. The country is thus divided on this question. Some want to maintain the powers of a traditional Mwami, while other shades of opinion diverge all the way to the republican concept of central power.

U Tin MAUNG (Burma): In the light of that reply I would like to know whether this very question of the person Kigeri V will be taken up at the conference to which the Special Provisional Council has sent a delegation. Will it be discussed, even informally, at that meeting?

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative): The question was on the agenda of the conference, but we do not yet know what conclusions were reached.

U Tin MAUNG (Burma): That reply gives rise to another question in connexion with the monarchy. The representative of Belgium, in his opening statement, said that because one political party boycotted the meeting by refusing to send representatives three other persons went as substitutes to take their places. I do not know by whom these three persons were chosen, but they had to go to Brussels and one of them, I believe, was Mr. François Ruzibiza, the brother of the Mwami and his special delegate to the Provisional Council. I simply would like to know in what capacity this gentleman, Mr. Ruzibiza, the brother of the Mwami, went to Brussels to attend the conference.

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) (interpretation from French):

Mr. Ruzibiza is the customary representative of the Mwami on the special council of Ruanda, and it was in that capacity that he went to Brussels. On the other hand, the UNAR party, which had agreed to participate at this conference, after interventions from abroad, changed its mind and did not attend the conference at Brussels. Three parties, rather than four, were represented.

U TIN MAUNG (Burma): I wonder whether the Special Representative is yet in a position to tell the Council with regard to the discussions which are taking place and the results of that conference. If he can enlighten us, we will be very grateful to him.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): We have not yet received the full report of the conclusions of the conference which has just come to an end at Brussels. As the Special Representative has said and as, I believe, I have also intimated, the objective of that conference was to achieve some easing of the tension there by getting an agreement as to methods, without for the moment touching upon the actual substance of the problems, concerning which there is a great conflict of opinion.

I believe that, with regard to the problem of methods, the parties present at Brussels were unanimously in agreement. According to the partial information which I have received, I would say that during the conference, however, there were certain discussions as to the actual substance of the dissension, opposing the Mwami, on the one hand, and another section of the population, as well as other currents of opinion.

I may have to give certain explanations here concerning certain African peculiarities. Two matters which gave rise to quite agitated discussion were the maintenance of the Kalinga as the symbol of monarchy, or its abandonment, and the institution of the Biru, or priests that hold the secrets of the dynasty. The parties present at Brussels said that some easing of tensions might be achieved if the Mwami would renounce officially the Kalinga, this being in their eyes, because of certain traditions, not a symbol of union between the people of Ruanda but a symbol of domination of the Bantu masses by the Tutsi invaders. The Biru, on the other hand, because of their secret nature

(Mr. Claeys Bouffaert, Belgium)

and the deep influence which they have as holders of the secrets of the dynasty, were considered to be exercising an influence, even against the very idea of constitutionality, which the Mwami had openly upheld.

U TIN NAUNG (Burma): My delegation is very grateful for whatever little information the representative of the Administering Authority can give us, because we are naturally interested in the proceedings of the conference, and we all hope that its outcome will be the reconciliation which we in this Council all aim at. We shall be extremely grateful to the representatives of the Administering Authority if they can inform us, even at some time before this session of the Council is over at the end of this month, of the results of that conference.

The next question I should like to ask of the Special Representative or the representative of Belgium is in connexion with the problem of national reconciliation. I think this is a question which has been covered in certain aspects by the representative of Bolivia, who preceded me.

The problem of national reconciliation is of major importance in the solution of the immediate problems facing Ruanda, particularly the relations between the Tutsi and the Hutu. My delegation regrets to note that the Administering Authority does not see eye to eye with the Visiting Mission in regard to this very important question, which we must all agree should be settled very soon. The Administering Authority's approach to the problem in Ruanda is based strictly on juridical grounds and for that very reason is extremely weak, in the view of my delegation, and cannot be considered as a practical approach which will commend itself to all the political parties, which are as anxious as the Administering Authority to solve the problem and to reconsider and reconcile their differences and sink their party and personal prejudices in the larger interests of their own country.

As the Visiting Mission quite correctly states, it is politically highly desirable to accept as soon as possible amnesty measures with regard to the events of November 1959. The Mission quite rightly points out that without amnesty measures national reconciliation will be difficult.

The recent lessons of acceleration on the part of certain administrations in other parts of Africa in taking necessary measures, particularly amnesty measures, in their own Trust Territories should, I think, not be lost sight of by

the Belgian Administration. I am afraid that the Administering Authority, from what we have heard from the representative of Belgium, took a dim view of things. It rather took the rigid position that if the amnesty or the return of exiled leaders were interpreted as a victory for UNAR this might provoke new and even more violent incidents. Neither in the report of the Visiting Mission nor in the annual report, nor in the statements so far made by the Administering Authority, could my delegation find any evidence showing that the amnesty or the return of exiled leaders would be or could be interpreted as a victory for one particular political party, UNAR, and that the presence of exiled leaders in their own country would provoke even new and more violent incidents. On the contrary, if the exiled leaders are forbidden to return to their own country -- and we hope not -- the situation will be more tense and even worse.

I should like to know on what factual grounds the Administering Authority could base its belief that such an unlikely eventuality could and would happen, since UNAR is, as admitted by the Administering Authority itself, not an outlawed organization, and since some of its leaders are still co-operating in Ruanda very closely with the Administering Authority, and even usefully and openly carrying on their activities. Why should UNAR's top-ranking leaders, who are unfortunately exiled, be debarred from participating in the conversations at Brussels, which we all hope will lead not only to national conciliation but also to the restoration of normal relations, which we all sincerely hope will be cemented between the Belgian Administration and the indigenous national leaders whose co-operation and support the Belgian trusteeship administration will have to court in its endeavours to discharge smoothly the obligations it owes to the international community, particularly at the penultimate stages of the Territory's development towards self-government?



(U Tin Maung, Burma)

As we all know, Ruanda-Urundi is approaching, very closely and surely, we all hope, its cherished goal of independence. Now, if Belgium wishes to win the friendship of the entire people of Ruanda, which is not the friendship of one race, one section, one community, one class and one clan, but the friendship of the entire population of Ruanda, and since the very political edifice which Belgium wishes to see erected soundly and solidly in Ruanda in the not-too-distant future cannot be given any semblance of a foundation without the co-operation, support and agreement of all the leaders of all political parties, who are the natural architects of Ruanda statehood, would the representative of Belgium kindly recommend to his Government not to take too rigid a stand on this important question of national reconciliation but instead adopt emergency measures without further delay. As we all know, time is of the essence, and the sooner the Administering Authority seriously gives consideration to this recommendation of the Visiting Mission -- which, I am sure, will be endorsed very heartily by all the members of this Council -- the better it will be for Belgium, for Ruanda and for us, the United Nations.

I hope the Special Representative or the representative of Belgium will be able to tell us whether any recommendation will be made to his Government with regard to a reconsideration of this question.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I must say, first of all, that my delegation fully shares the views advanced by the representative of Burma when he says that the Administering Authority does not wish to seek the support of one single sector of the population alone. This is not our objective. On the contrary, we are attempting to obtain a reconciliation; and this reconciliation, as I have explained, can only be achieved by adherence to certain moral principles and certain methods which will allow for an examination of the problem, so that we can find a solution to the problem.

In following up his statement, the representative of Burma expressed doubts as to the logic of obliging certain leaders of certain parties to remain outside the Territory.

(Mr. Claeys Bouwaert, Belgium)

Now, in this connexion I must say the following. If there are three or four leaders of a movement who thought that they had to put a frontier between themselves and the justice of their country -- well, it is true that at least twelve leaders of other parties were assassinated in cold blood. And that also has to be taken into account.

With regard to the substance, I have nothing more to say other than what I have said in my initial statement.

The question as to whether an amnesty would favour or promote reconciliation cannot be decided, in the last analysis, except by the persons concerned. If this measure -- to which we are not opposed -- is to be of any benefit, we must have the assurance that the amnesty will, in effect, be a measure of pacification, a measure which will allow examination of the problems under constitutional methods and peaceful methods. The Administration is not opposed, in principle, to an amnesty; but it seems that under the present circumstances it would entail a great many risks if we would see these domestic quarrels arise again rather than seeing them pacified.

U Tin MAUNG (Burma): My delegation does not intend to take issue with the representative of Belgium. However, we have stated our point of view very clearly, and, in the course of the debate, when we will have a further opportunity to discuss the problems, we may refer to the statements which have just been made by the representative of Belgium.

I would like to go on to the next series of questions.

As one of the functions of the Visiting Mission was to study on the spot the conditions and causes of the disturbances of 1959, I would like to pose a number of questions which refer historically to 1956, 1957, 1958 and 1959.

In paragraph 110 of the Visiting Mission's report a reference is made to certain criticisms in the Press directed, between the years 1952 and 1956, against the indigenous authorities, the political institutions, the Tutsi and the operation of the courts. These critical articles appeared, in particular, in the Ruandese-language publication Kinyamateka, published in the bishopric of Kabgayi.

(U Tin Maung, Burma)

I would like to put the following questions to the Special Representative:

What is the circulation of this publication, Kinyamateka?

Is this publication in circulation in Urundi, also?

Did the Administration take serious note of these articles and make a detailed study of these criticisms and reply to them?

Did any discussion take place in the General Council of Ruanda-Urundi based on these critical articles which appeared in the publication Kinyamateka?

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) (interpretation from French):

Kinyamateka is a bi-monthly publication with a circulation of 14,500 copies.

The articles involved consist principally of letters from readers. Kinyamateka had opened in its columns a "Letters to the Editor" section in which Africans could complain of extortions and injustices or set forth their personal grievances. About that time and in a general way there occurred a reaction against the abuses of traditional authority, resulting in letters of instruction from the Bam to the sub-chiefs, cautioning them against their abuses of power. The publication Kinyamateka, published in the Ruanda language in the diocese of Kabgayi, took up a certain number of these articles, insisting on the necessity of greater social justice and on the measures to be taken to put an end to certain abuses. I have not before me the records of the meetings of the General Council for those years, but the question did arise there and a reaction was noted. If I recall correctly, in the course of the last five years 250 sub-chiefs were deprived of their powers because of abuses that they had committed. It is, therefore, a question of the first manifestation of popular reaction against a state of affairs which formerly was tolerated. U Tin Maung, who has studied these problems in Ruanda-Urundi, knows that the old Ruandan society was a society of castes, where every man had a superior, where each one attached himself personally to a protector. Naturally, in this traditional society there was no such thing as consultation or decisions taken in common. Each one depended on someone else for his security and owed him work and money. It was against this feudal system that, immediately after the war, reaction occurred, that articles were published in the press and statements were made in various bodies and various publications during the years to which the representative of Burma has just referred.

U Tin MAUNG (Burma): My delegation is very grateful to the Special Representative for his reply and the information he has furnished to us. We are quite satisfied to know that the question of these critical articles which appeared in that publication was discussed in the General Council and that a certain reaction occurred.

(U Tin Maung, Burma)

In paragraph 111 of the Visiting Mission's report reference is made to the problem of the Tutsi and the Hutu:

"The first time that the problem of the Tutsi and the Hutu received some publicity was when Mr. Maus, a European settler, member of the Council of Vice-Government-General of Ruanda-Urundi, proposed in April 1956, on the occasion of the debate on the question of reorganizing that Council as the General Council of Ruanda-Urundi, that a special list of four members, indigenous and Europeans, should be drawn up to provide separate representation for the Hutu. That proposal met with opposition from Mwami Mutara, who said that there was no ground for distinguishing between the terms 'Tutsi' and 'Hutu'." (T/1538, paragraph 111)

Mr. Maus' proposal was rejected by an overwhelming majority of votes, the only affirmative vote, actually, being his own. Mr. Maus must have got very angry and irritated, and submitted his resignation to the Council in a letter in which he took Mwami Mutara to task -- rightly or wrongly we do not know -- for being anti-democratic in spirit and in favour of a single party, that of the Tutsi, who, he said, would continue to dominate the other two indigenous groups, the Hutu and the Twa. He said that Mwami Mutara was quite well aware that separate representation for the Hutu would be the first crack -- those are his own words -- in the edifice of Tutsi domination and that in order to avoid such an eventuality he had proposed separate representation for the Hutu in the way he did. Mr. Maus was emphatically of the opinion that

"the conflict of interests between the Tutsi and Hutu communities which is the most pressing social problem and the most poignant human drama in the Territory, will therefore continue to be officially ignored by our institutions and left without any constitutional means of defence."

(Ibid.)

I would like now to pose a series of short questions:

First, after the receipt of the resignation of Mr. Maus, what did the Administration do in order to reply to this letter of resignation?

Second, did the Administration indicate at all to him that the Administration did not agree with the point of view advanced by Mr. Maus?;

And third, who was appointed to the seat vacated by Mr. Maus?

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) (interpretation from French):

I would be unable to say whether Mr. Maus has received a reply satisfactory to him since I have not with me the file on his case with the reply that was sent to him. I am sure, however, that a reply was sent to him. On the other hand, contact between the Administration and Mr. Maus has never been severed, since Mr. Maus has occupied a place on various committees and has continued to collaborate with the Administration. There has therefore been no severing of relations between Mr. Maus and the Administering Authority.

The Administration certainly has not told Mr. Maus that it did not agree with the substance of the matter. The Administration did not agree with the procedure used. It is a fact that the Administering Authority of Ruanda-Urundi has built the development and progress of the Territory on what existed there, and what existed there in Ruanda was an extremely strong and centralized organization. The Administration has subsequently endeavoured to improve this organization and to induce the political leaders to exercise their power no longer in their own private interest but in the interest of the community. The Administration has achieved a certain number of reforms which have led it to hope and to foresee that the evolution of the Territory will take place smoothly to its eventual autonomy and independence and the achievement of a democratic regime.



(Mr. Reisdorff, Special Representative)

Therefore, the position adopted by Mr. Maus did not upset the Administration's view, but it was the procedure used which at these times cannot be supported by the Administration, which had hoped to come to a peaceful settlement of the problem and not by following Mr. Maus in precipitating immediate tension with the Tutsi element in the country.

The person who has replaced Mr. Maus is his first deputy. There are two deputies provided for each seat, and it was therefore normal that in the absence of Mr. Maus, or in the case of resignation, the first deputy should replace him. So far as I know, there have been no further nominations.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): With regard to the procedure, I should like to add that the Administration did not have to make up its mind or take a stand on the views of Mr. Maus. Mr. Maus acted as general adviser and he was free to express any views he deemed fit. He did so. As a matter of fact, he was contradicted by the Council as a whole, since the motion he presented received only his own vote in favour. From the procedural point of view, the situation was clear, and the motion introduced by Mr. Maus did not call for any stand to be taken by the Administration.

U TIN MAUNG (Burma): We know very well that the General Council of Ruanda-Urundi is not a legislative body; it is purely an advisory body, so whatever views Mr. Maus may have given to the Administration should be left as they were. But we are not going to discuss now the procedure of the General Council. As we all know, the very concept of the General Council and the very limited powers it exercises is not satisfactory to this Council.

For my next question, I should like to refer to the statement of views approved in 1957 by the High Council of Ruanda, a statement on which the 1957 Visiting Mission commented at some length in paragraphs 42 to 46 of its report. It will be recalled also that the statement of views was reproduced verbatim in an annex to the report of the 1957 Visiting Mission. At the twenty-first session of the Trusteeship Council, my delegation and others asked the Special Representative whether the Administration gave any opportunity to the members of

(U Tin Maung, Burma)

the High Council of Ruanda-Urundi to discuss that statement of views at its regular session. If I remember correctly, the representative of Belgium stated quite categorically that that statement of views was not an official document of the High Council of Ruanda-Urundi. Strong exception was taken to this statement of the Belgian representative by the High Council of Ruanda-Urundi, which naturally strongly objected to that interpretation. It was said that it could even have turned members of the High Council against the Administration. I should like to put the following questions.

Could the Special Representative or the Belgian representative explain to me why a document which was formally approved by the High Council of Ruanda-Urundi cannot be classified as an official document of the High Council? Secondly, was there any note of dissent in the High Council when its members were discussing that statement of views?

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): This leads me to speak somewhat of procedure. First of all, I should like to state, in connexion with the question of the representative of Burma in which he mentioned the procedure of the General Council, that the reference which he made to the consultative nature of that body minimizes the influence of the views of the General Council by alleging that, regardless of these wishes, the Administration does not adhere to them. That is not so. Constitutionally, when a wish is expressed by the General Council, the Administration is bound to give a reply and explain the kind of action it will take, and it will either agree to that wish and take the necessary measures, or explain why it is impossible to implement the wish which has been expressed. Therefore, it is impossible that any wish expressed would not be acted upon, and in this particular instance the views of Mr. Maus were effectively acted upon by the General Council.

With regard to the statement about the High Council of Ruanda, the position is as follows. The representative of Belgium has said that this did not constitute an official measure of the Council of the country which, by reasons of procedure, did not have that character. It was a polemic, as it were, between a fraction of the population who drew up a manifesto and a declaration -- the

(Mr. Claeys Bouúaert, Belgium)

manifesto of the Bahutu -- which was countersigned by the overwhelming majority -- I think it received the votes of all the members -- of the High Council, but it did not have the character of a formal motion because it was not countersigned by the Mwami. In any event, by virtue of its character, the text in question was not in the form of a wish, it was simply the expression of an opinion on a broader subject.

U TIN MAUNG (Burma): I am grateful to the representative of Belgium. Of course, we know that this statement of views was only an expression of opinion, but it is very important that this statement should have been thoroughly discussed. Had the people been able to reconcile their differences of opinion and also their own interests, in the view of my delegation, the disturbances of November 1959 would not have occurred. However, I do not want to debate that point, I should like to go on to my next question.

As the Trusteeship Council is aware, another important document entitled the Manifesto of the Bahutu also appeared in Ruanda at about the same time. That was a note on the social aspects of the indigenous racial problem in Ruanda and for the first time, as the Visiting Mission pointed out, it gave specific form to the political creed of the Hutu leaders. One passage in that document stands out clearly as the core of the indigenous racial problem. This is the passage:

"No solution of the Tutsi-Belgian relations can be durable until the fundamental difficulties between the Tutsi and the Hutu are settled."

(T/1538, page 41)

This document also warns against:

"... a method which, while tending to eliminate black and white colonialism, would leave a worse Hamitic colonialism over the Hutu."

(Ibid.)

The manifesto also recommends measures for the "integrated and collective advancement of the Hutu". (Ibid.)

(U Tin Maung, Burma)

The two documents, the statement of views and the Manifesto of the Bahutu, contained the germ of all the ideological elements which inspired the disturbances of November 1959 and led to the Visiting Mission being received in Ruanda in March 1960 by mutually contradictory slogans: "Immediate independence. Get rid of the Belgians for us", and "Down with Tutsi feudalism. Long live Belgian trusteeship". As I stated earlier, it was rather unfortunate that these two very important documents were not thoroughly discussed on the floor of the General Council of Ruanda-Urundi at the July 1957 session. The Governor of Ruanda-Urundi, according to the records, brushed aside the request of three members of the General Council that the Government should study the Manifesto of the Bahutu thoroughly and that its views should be communicated at the next session of the General Council. The Governor pointed out that the question was delicate and difficult to tackle with equanimity.

In view of the fact that the political views of the two races, the Tutsi and the Hutu, have not been thoroughly studied and discussed at the opening session of the General Council of Ruanda-Urundi, does not the Administering Authority think that had it taken the advice of the three members of the General Council, the conflicting points of view could have been reconciled and the unhappy incidents which occurred in November 1959 would have been avoided?

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) (interpretation from French):

It is not correct that this problem has not been discussed. The Hutu-Tutsi problem first of all was discussed in the High Council of the country, which resulted in a study by a commission. It was at the Ruanda level that this problem had to be studied. The stand taken at the end of the work of the commission which was designed to study the Hutu-Tutsi problem did not satisfy the Bahutu. Indeed the conclusions of the commission led a substantial portion of the Bahutu to conclude that the problem had been evaded. But the problem was taken over by the Governor of Ruanda-Urundi in December 1958, and the Governor affirmed that there was a Hutu-Tutsi conflict. He proposed methods and reforms to put an end to the abuses and to elevate the Hutu class. This was only the continuation of a policy that had been practised for a long time by the Administration. He made public something that

(Mr. Reisdorff, Special Representative)

the Administration had carried out ever since it assumed responsibility for Ruanda. I think, therefore, that the reproach levelled at the Administration of not having examined this problem is not founded, as I see it. It was certainly in the forefront of the attention of all of the officials and all the civil servants of Ruanda ever since they have been governing the country. It is certainly also contained in the solemn declaration of the highest administrative authority of the country.

U TIN MAUNG (Burma): My delegation knows full well that a special commission was appointed by the Mwami of Ruanda to study the problem and also that certain recommendations were made. But I think there is no denying the fact that the High Council laid the blame squarely at the door of the Administration and the religious missions for their being discriminatory treatment particularly in the education of children of the Hutu families; also in the field of political reforms which the Hutu expected would be introduced in order that social justice would be advanced in many fields. The High Council also stated, and it is a matter of record, that the Administration had not hitherto carried out the High Council's wishes in that respect.

The Tutsi-Hutu conflict was not a racial problem but purely a social question, according to the late Mwami, and in his closing speech he stressed that Tutsi, Hutu and Twa were all Ruandese. This attitude of the Mwami was strongly supported by the traditionalists, who considered that the High Council and the Mwami had thus shown understanding, breadth of view and realism. But the Hutu leaders interpreted that attitude as dismissing the case. In other words, the Hutu leaders believed that the Mwami was not only denying the existence of the problem but was accusing those who continued to raise it of being "dividers of people, enemies of their country and disturbers of public order". This attitude of the Mwami must have disappointed many Hutu leaders who accused the Mwami, rightly or wrongly, of being reactionary.

Seen from the Visiting Mission's report, particularly paragraph 124, whatever monarchist sympathy some of the Hutu leaders might have entertained was unfortunately alienated by the attitude of the late king. My delegation, however,

(U Tin Maung, Burma)

is of the opinion that the Mwami had the best of intentions to consolidate the unity of his subjects under a single dynasty, and all that he attempted to impress on his subjects was that the Belgian Administration should, without any loss of time, discharge its responsibilities for maintaining the unity of the State by introducing the much needed political reforms.

In the light of my observations, I would like to ask the following question: After the recommendations of the Hutu-Tutsi commission were made known, did the Governor of Ruanda-Urundi ever have any informal discussion of this very important problem with the Mwami, and, if so, what were the views of the Governor and what were his observations on the recommendations made by that commission?



(Mr. Reisdorff,  
Special Representative)

I wish to affirm here once more -- and I think that I can base myself upon my personal experience of twenty-one years in the administration of Ruanda-Urundi -- that it was not the statement made by Mwami Mutara, anymore than the stand taken by the Hutu party, which led the Government to realise the Hutu problem and to adopt measures. If there is any inequality in Ruanda, it is a land inequality which is based on the rule of a dominating class over a dominated class, and the Administration has always been perfectly aware of this problem and has been firm in its decision to find a solution for a state of affairs which was not satisfactory from the social point of view.

I had the opportunity, in my statement, to show that as early as 1930, when the Administration did not have the possibilities which it now has and when the situation in Africa was not the same as it is now, the Administration had received as a directive on the part of the Governor of Ruanda-Urundi the putting an end to the abuses of the dominating class against the dominated class. But such reform could not be achieved through revolution, which would have been sterile and misunderstood and would not have been followed by any sector of the population. It was an evolution which was necessary; it was the very basis of society itself which had to be transformed.

The Administration has undertaken to do this by stages, by bringing an end to the absolutism of the dominating class, preventing conflicts being settled between superiors and inferiors and forcing the population to submit their conflicts to the courts, improving the framework of the indigenous notables who, in the first place, received suitable training, which was then given to their children -- and complaints have been made to us in this respect -- who had been sent to school, so that the sons were better educated than their parents. Then the Administration, by choosing directors on the basis of merit, approached the problems at the foundation, which problems involved livestock and land. As a matter of fact, if there is inequality and a Hutu-Tutsi problem, it is not because there are two different races, but because there is one race which dominates and one which is dominated, one race which has wealth, because the wealthy representatives of the population are all chosen from one social category, while the poor, the Bahutu, have practically no representatives at all. Therefore, it was necessary to change the regime of the distribution of wealth based on livestock.

(Mr. Reisdorff,  
Special Representative)

One knows that the livestock contract has been modified and that now each individual is able to be the owner of his herds. But it was not sufficient to share out the livestock. It was also necessary to parcel out the land because servitude based on livestock became land servitude. It was after the events to which the representative of Burma has referred that the land reform began to take shape. Land commissions had been set up. They permitted the liberation of the land from all feudal mortgages, liberation of farming rights and of the right to grazing land. But the conditions of the repurchase of these rights were very difficult. The governing class did not wish to lose its rights without substantial compensation for those rights which it exercised. Those rights belonged to that class and they were prepared to relinquish them only in exchange for fair compensation. But the principle was admitted and, if a swift change had not taken place in the attitude of the owner class, it is probable that there would not have been any social troubles in Ruanda, as we hope there will not be in Urundi.

U Tin MAUNG (Burma): Leaving aside for the time being the problem of the Tutsi-Hutu, I should like to proceed to another question. In paragraph 125 of the Visiting Mission's report reference is made to strained relations between the Mwami Mutara and the Belgian Administration. After the former's return to his country from a lengthy visit to Belgium in 1958. According to the rumours current in Ruanda-Urundi, the Mwami had been very displeased with the way in which he had been treated in Belgium in 1958, which was alleged to be quite different from the cordial response which he had been given on previous visits. The Visiting Mission mentions a press report to the effect that, on his return, the Mwami was said to have made this remark: "There will not be a single European in Ruanda at the end of a year." This is a very serious statement if it was made by the Mwami.

I should like to know in how many newspapers published and circulated in Ruanda-Urundi there was a reference to this alleged remark. Secondly, did the Belgian Government immediately bring to the attention of the Mwami a reference to his alleged remark in the press? If so, what the Mwami say about the statement which the newspapers attributed to him?

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) (interpretation from French):

I do not think that we should attach too much importance to what, on the part of the Mwami, was no more than a personal point of view. It is quite possible that at that time the Mwami was particularly sensitive; he felt that his relations, especially with his counselor and the Resident of Ruanda, were rather strained. However, I do not think that his relations with the Resident-General was strained. It was just a question, I think, of personal suspicion on his part; he was feeling a bit ruffled.

The Mwami of Ruanda certainly had a number of problems and difficulties facing him, such as the Hutu-Tutsi problem and the opposition of certain chiefs, particularly, in that connexion, the opposition to the Mwami became manifest.

His statement that "There will not be a single European in Ruanda at the end of a year" did not create any great stir in public opinion. I do not think that this was a position of principle on his part; it was just an expression of personal pique. I could not give a precise opinion on this statement, but I am sure that the Mwami would not, either officially or directly, maintain such a statement, which really did not reflect his attitude.

The position of the Mwami after his return from Belgium was quite difficult, but it never led to a rupture which might have given rise to such a statement. Indeed, a little before his death, he approached the Administration and made a number of statements in order to put an end to a campaign of denigration and opposition to the work of the Administration. Therefore, I feel that we should not see anything more in this statement of his than a passing show of ill-temper.

U Tin MAUNG (Burma): Since the Special Representative has minimized the statement ascribed to the Mwami my delegation has no desire to pursue the matter further.

I should like to turn to my next question. As we all know, two important statements were made by the Governor of Ruanda-Urundi with regard to the question of Hutu-Tutsi relations. In the statement he made at the opening meeting of the General Council in December 1958 the Governor admitted the existence of this problem, which was the question of wide-spread pauperism among far too large masses of the population, so that they were politically, socially and economically oppressed by a certain number of representatives of their local authorities. But the Governor said that he did not mean that there was an oppressive Tutsi class which was exploiting the defenceless Hutu masses. He also referred to the existence of a peasant class which, though not belonging actually to the ethnic group of the Tutsi, was forced to seek protection under the wings of the Tutsi class.

The Governor stated that the Belgian administration had, therefore, endeavoured to hunt down the abuses whenever it could find them, but not to attack the Tutsi as a whole. In the light of this observation and of the statement made by the Governor, a question arises. Has the Governor impressed on the people of Ruanda-Urundi, and particularly the Hutu, the importance of replacing the sub-chiefs and chiefs who have abused their powers by Tutsi chiefs, and replacing judges and monitors by Hutu everywhere? Do not the Hutu realize that the problem was not racial but simply a misuse of local authority?

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative)(interpretation from French):

I do not know whether my reply will completely cover the question put by the representative of Burma, but I would like to say that the designation of chiefs and sub-chiefs was never carried out according to racial or even social criteria. Rather, I should say that in principle, when the Belgian Administration took over, there existed a traditional way of holding power. This system was then improved, and the Administration attempted to have indigenous officials put in charge. The Administration found itself in a position to give public positions to those who

(Mr. Reisdorff,  
Special Representative)

deserved them most -- those who were prepared, who had administrative ability, and who had knowledge and education -- and here the Hutu were handicapped by comparison with the Tutsi. Therefore, when posts became vacant because of transfers, deaths and so on, it was not possible to give them systematically to Hutu. Rather, they were given to those who were most qualified. The Mwami designated them upon nomination by the Administration, and among the candidates there were young persons who had completed their studies in the administrative group at Astrida -- persons who had shown that they were qualified and had had some preliminary training. Candidates for sub-chiefs' posts were persons who had sufficient education and training. Thus we did not attempt to hand out political posts, but, rather, to have designations by the Mwami, because the Mwami had the authority. He nominated the persons for the posts, and the Administration recognized and authorized the nominations. Therefore, it would not have been possible deliberately and systematically to substitute Hutu candidates for former Tutsi posts. Rather, as I say, the posts were given to the most highly qualified persons.

U Tin MAUNG (Burma): The Governor also emphasized the danger of introducing the notion of discrimination by misuse of the terms "Hutu" and "Tutsi", and stressed the need to improve the position of the Hutu, to reform the political structure and to continue the fight against poverty. But in his speech before the Visiting Mission on 3 March 1960 he said that he had gradually modified the convictions which he had entertained in December 1958. He spoke in these terms:

"The Tutsi-Hutu problem certainly had an economic basis but, as I had tried to emphasize, it also had a political-social basis, and the Administration would have to take it into account."

This is the question I would like to ask on the basis of that last statement of the Governor of Ruanda-Urundi. I should like to know whether, in view of the problem of Hutu-Tutsi relations assuming such urgency, the Administering Authority was convinced that no political reforms could be introduced in Ruanda-Urundi without the agreement, co-operation and support of all the races of Ruanda-Urundi without exception.



Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative)(interpretation from French):

The Administration and the Governor, its highest representative, have always been convinced that radical reforms should be based on the agreement of all sectors of the population, whether it was a question of land reform, of cattle reform or of the status of individuals. No decision was ever taken without first starting with broad consultation in the sub-chiefdoms and chiefdoms and in the Territorial Council. Thus in the land question, the example which I have already mentioned, the Land Commission had available documents drawn up in all the chiefdoms after consultation with all the sub-chiefdoms in such a way as to specify what the land regulations, the local usages and the local customary law were in each region. A unilateral measure would have been unpopular and would have been objected to by one section or another of the population.



(Mr. Reisdorff,  
Special Representative)

These Councils were set up in 1943. This was done by the Administrators, who gave them the shape that they felt most fitting. Then in 1952 they received a legal form and shape, and since then their importance has continued to grow. They were gradually going to replace the authorities; they represented the opinion of all levels of the population, not only in the field of administration but in the field of the judiciary, justice being exercised there by customary courts with Hutu advisers, so that the customary laws of the Hutu would be known to the judge when the judge himself was not a Hutu.

U Tin MAUNG (Burma): Not only the Governor but other members of the General Council have always maintained, and I think quite rightly so, that there is more than one aspect to the problem of the Hutu-Tutsi relations. I think that five members or alternates of the General Council prepared a very long report, which was finalized at the end of 1958. Copies of this report were sent to the King of Belgium, to the Minister of the Belgian Congo and Ruanda-Urundi, to the Governor-General of the Belgian Congo and to the Governor of Ruanda-Urundi. The Working Group and also the Visiting Mission have had a chance to study this report.

The first aspect of the problem referred to injustices committed by the customary authorities, who were in fact all Tutsi. Under the influence of the Administration, of the religious missions, and of certain Europeans, the authors of that long report said, "the situation of the weak still remains pitifully tragic", and they referred to the tragic plight of the peasant who did not profit from certain steps taken by the Administration designed to alleviate his position, because of the "malignity" of the customary authorities.

Another aspect of the problem was the fact that the Hutu were backward as a result of the Tutsi monopoly in the political, cultural and economic and the gap between Tutsi wealth and Hutu poverty, and that the Tutsi domination of the Hutu common people had been increased under the influence of the Belgian administration. The report suggested a number of solutions, such as the abolition of chiefdoms, with the maintenance of sub-chiefdoms, the supervision and

inspection of indigenous authorities and of judges, the separation of administrative and judicial powers, the education of the mass of the people in its rights, the introduction of the principle of numerical parity -- and this is very important -- between the Tutsi and the Hutu in the distribution of social and public positions, fundamental reforms and so forth. I think that Mr. Maus also had a hand in the formulation of these ideas. In very clear terms, he and his colleagues gave this stern warning to the Administration: "To avoid

"To avoid revolution, a revolution must be carried out. The Administration must not be placed in this dilemma: either to support the oppressors in the name of public order or to support the revolt in the name of justice."

This neatly puts it in a very few words. In the view of my delegation, had this warning been considered seriously by the Administration, and had the Administration been vigorous in its efforts and endeavours to introduce the numerous reforms demanded by the people, the November 1959 incidents would not have occurred, with such tragic results.

Now I should like to put a few questions to the Special Representative or the representative of the Administering Authority. What were the respective reactions of the King of Belgium, the Ministry of the Belgian Congo and Ruanda-Urundi, the Governor-General of the Congo and the Governor of Ruanda-Urundi to the report submitted by five members or alternates of the General Council?

Secondly, did the Governor of Ruanda-Urundi at least hold informal discussions with the authors of the report on the implications of the demands made by the people?

Thirdly, did the Belgian administration, in the face of the numerous reforms demanded by the people, give any indication as to when and how the Administering Authority intended introduce reforms in order to allay the fears of the majority race?

Fourthly, and lastly, when the contents of this report were made known to the members of the General Council, how did the Tutsi members of the General Council react to the numerous reforms demanded therein?

Mr. CIAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I can reply partially at least. I would say this with regard to the reaction of His Majesty the King and the reaction of his Ministers. As my colleague is aware, we have a constitutional parliamentary monarchy, and the reaction of the Crown is evidenced through the Ministers. The reaction of the Belgian Government to the various petitions and communications mentioned by the representative of Burma was in substance as follows.

To get out of this dilemma, must we decrease the autonomy of Ruanda-Urundi and proceed to reforms directly by setting up a system of direct administration or, on the other hand, must we attempt to reorganize local institutions so as to allow these local institutions to serve as means of leading the parties concerned to find a solution to their own problems? It was the second method which was adopted.

Along these lines, a parliamentary Working Group was sent there. It studied all the documents and all the views of the population, especially as regards the solution to be given to the social and ethnic problems existing in Ruanda-Urundi. It reached the conclusion that there should be a great political plan which would eventually result, with the increasing participation of the majority of the population, in the establishment of local legislative organs which would establish the legal, administrative and constitutional norms that would govern the affairs of the country and would solve the difficulties of the country upon the basis of the freely expressed wishes of the population as a whole.

(Mr. Claeys Boumaert, Belgium)

That is the substance of the reply given by the Belgian Government to the various communications reflecting an unsatisfactory social, ethnic condition. Now, this was a general reply; it did not reply specifically to the four questions put. Perhaps the Special Representative could add something.

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative): I have very little to add to the statement which has just been made by the representative of Belgium.

In the framework of the General Council of Ruanda-Urundi, the proposal of Mr. Morse and the Hutu problems were well known, and the General Council, which had been approached as to the way it intended to introduce some improvement in this situation, asked that a working group be sent rather than the General Council itself embarking upon a discussion of texts. That was done because the General Council realized the complexity of the problems in Ruanda, and then asked that a working group be sent, which seemed to be the best solution to meet the proposals made by Mr. Morse's group as well as other proposals and other appeals and other debatable points which at that time obtained in the country.

U Tin MAUNG (Burma): I thank the Special Representative and also the representative of the Administering Authority for their very kind co-operation and enlightening statements.

Mr. President, I have no more questions for this afternoon, but my delegation reserves the right to put a few more questions in the political field during subsequent meetings of the Council. We ought to cover this very excellent report, I must say, which has been presented to us by members of the Visiting Mission. It is an excellent document and there is a lot of information in the report that we can make use of if we want to objectively consider the problems which are now facing us in the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi.

Mr. KIANG (China): Mr. President, at the moment you are facing this side, and I do not know whether you are aware that the time is as late as 5.30. I am sure that a break would be most welcome by our good friend, Mr. Reisdorff.

The PRESIDENT: Of course, I am in the hands of the Council. I think that without much harm we could adjourn at this time, but I must hasten to add that we would have to have two meetings tomorrow. I hope there will be a number of members prepared to ask questions.

Before we adjourn, I would like to make a short announcement to the effect that there will be a meeting of the Drafting Committee on Tanganyika at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, in Conference Room No. 6.

The meeting is now adjourned.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.