

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTEENTH SESSION
Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE 807th
MEETING**

Tuesday, 18 November 1958,
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Agenda item 13: Report of the Trusteeship Council (continued)	
Question of supplementary hearings of petitioners on the future of the Cameroons under British administration and the Cameroons under French administration (concluded)	337
Supplementary hearings of petitioners on the future of the Cameroons under British administration and the Cameroons under French administration .	338

Chairman: Mr. Frederick H. BOLAND (Ireland).

AGENDA ITEM 13

Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/3822, A/C.4/387, A/C.4/388) (continued)

QUESTION OF SUPPLEMENTARY HEARINGS OF PETITIONERS ON THE FUTURE OF THE CAMEROONS UNDER BRITISH ADMINISTRATION AND THE CAMEROONS UNDER FRENCH ADMINISTRATION (concluded)

1. Mr. Usman SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia), explaining his vote on the Irish proposal adopted at the previous meeting, said that he had voted against it for two reasons.
2. Firstly, he felt that under that proposal the petitioners from the Cameroons were being treated differently from previous petitioners. There was no valid argument against the petitioners' request to be treated in the same way as their predecessors had been. He could not agree with the view held by some delegations that the question of hearing petitioners should be dealt with in a different way at each session. There were practical reasons against such a procedure, for in the future the Committee might well find itself again obliged to suspend a meeting without reaching a satisfactory conclusion.
3. Secondly, although he was aware that the admission of the petitioners was a very important matter for some delegations, those delegations had not, up to the time of voting, made clear why they had opposed it. From a practical point of view, the arrangement which had been agreed upon was not a happy one.
4. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) said that he was grateful to the Belgian representative for having so clearly given at the previous meeting his reason for not supporting the Irish proposal, namely, that the petitioners were professional agitators and agents of foreign Powers. He wished that the other delegations opposing the proposal had been as frank. He could not agree with that description of the petitioners and indeed he found it regrettable that they had been referred to in that way. He did not understand the United Kingdom

representative's remark that the question was whether a difference should be made between delegations and petitioners; it was obvious that such a difference existed. The question to which only the Belgian representative had given a reply was why a distinction should be made between the petitioners in question and others.

5. He would have voted against the proposal had it not been for the fact that the petitioners had made clear that they were not insisting on what in his view were their rights. As it was, he had abstained.

6. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) explained that his delegation had voted in favour of the Irish proposal because it seemed to offer a practical solution to the difficulty. His delegation staunchly upheld the right of petition, but it nevertheless had reservations about the proposal and shared the opinion of many other delegations that such a compromise could not be considered to constitute a precedent. The question should be re-examined in due course in order to prevent the United Nations from becoming a forum in which any person was free to talk on any subject.

7. Mr. SULEIMAN (Sudan) said that he wished his delegation's protest against the words used by the Belgian delegation to be recorded. It disagreed with them entirely.

8. Mr. KIANG (China) said that his delegation had abstained in order to express its disappointment at the fact that the Committee had been led into an absurd position.

9. U ON SEIN (Burma) said that his delegation did not approve of discrimination in any form. In introducing the proposal, the Irish representative had said that it did not discriminate against the petitioners. As his delegation was always ready to accept objective compromises, and as the petitioners themselves had indicated their readiness to agree to the compromise, he had voted in favour of the Irish proposal.

10. Mr. SZALL (Hungary) said that his delegation's abstention had been based on the understanding that the petitioners were prepared to accept the compromise. Nevertheless, his delegation was of the opinion that the petitioners should have the opportunity of making further statements at the Committee table in accordance with established practice. Only in that way could the Committee safeguard the interests of the peoples of those Territories which were fighting to achieve self-determination. His delegation would regard any compromise which interfered with the right of the petitioners to speak freely as discrimination, and its vote should not be interpreted as meaning that it agreed with the compromise proposal.

11. Mr. KELLY (Australia) regretted that he had found himself unable to support the proposal although it had been put forward in a context which made it clear that there could be no question of the participation of the

petitioners in the general debate. The proposal might however be interpreted as giving the petitioners the right to refer to the speeches of representatives in the general debate and it was apparently intended that the petitioners would be able to make further statements at the conclusion of the general debate. In the circumstances it was necessary to affirm the rights of representatives and the dignity and authority of the General Assembly. He accordingly reserved the right of his delegation to speak after the petitioners had made their final statements and before the conclusion of the general debate.

12. He interpreted the proposal to mean that, whenever the petitioners were heard, the general debate would be formally suspended. He had not voted against the proposal because his delegation believed that the General Assembly had the power to accept petitions and examine them in consultation with the Administering Authorities. He felt, however, that petitioners could be heard in circumstances that would not give rise to any confusion between their statements and those of delegations.

13. Mr. EL-RIFAI (Jordan) said that petitioners had the right to appear before the Committee and to give the views of their people or their parties. The Committee had, in fact, invited them to speak and the Belgian representative's statement had therefore been tantamount to an insult to the Committee.

14. Mr. HILALY (Pakistan) said that it was one thing to allow petitioners to sit at the Committee table in order to make statements and quite another to permit them to sit among the delegations. He had been therefore glad to learn that the petitioners had not aspired to participate in the debate but only to be accorded the same treatment as at the previous session. His delegation did not consider the decision taken at the previous session a wise one. Consequently he could not support the same procedure being repeated during the current session. Some speakers had stated that, if the Committee went back on last year's decision, it would amount to discrimination against the present petitioners. There was no question of discrimination against the petitioners concerned and he failed to understand how such an accusation could have been made.

15. He wished to make it clear that, in voting in favour of the proposal, his delegation had expressed its opinion on a simple procedural matter and nothing more.

16. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) said that he did not understand how representatives could say that they failed to observe any discrimination. The representative of the United Kingdom had stated at the previous meeting that it was not a matter of discrimination, but one of differentiation between petitioners and representatives of Member States. What the delegation of Ceylon found unacceptable was not that differentiation, which was patent and axiomatic, but the distinction between one set of petitioners and another. The Belgian representative had referred to those petitioners as professional agitators and agents of foreign Powers; that surely was the best endorsement of the charge of discrimination.

17. The Committee had decided to hear the petitioners. They represented political groups with whose views representatives might or might not be in agree-

ment. They had duly appeared and they could not now be labelled as professional agitators. He appealed to the Belgian representative to ask for the regrettable remark to be withdrawn from the record: it implied a rebuke to the Committee and to every delegation which had voted in favour of hearing the petitioners in the first instance. Such a gesture would augur well for the important deliberations about to begin.

18. Mr. COHEN (Chile) said that he had voted in favour of the proposal for practical reasons, so that the Committee might not lose any further time on matters other than those of substance.

19. Mr. TURKSON (Ghana) felt that the proposal had been misnamed a compromise. The Committee could not do otherwise than vote to allow petitioners to make a statement; consequently, that did not constitute a bargaining point. All that the petitioners had asked was to be allowed to sit at the Committee table as petitioners, and no acceptable reason had been advanced why they should not do so. The decision which had been reached, and against which his delegation had voted, was absurd. He joined in the protests of other delegations against the remarks made by the Belgian representative.

20. Mr. OSMAN (Morocco) protested against the Belgian representative's remarks. The experience of previous years should teach the Committee to be more prudent, for the petitioners of one year might well form part of the Government of a Member State in future years.

21. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) found the Belgian representative's remarks regrettable. In his opinion such remarks were out of order and would not help the Committee to find solutions in the future.

22. Mr. NAJJAR (Lebanon) felt that the Committee's main concern was to ascertain the truth. To that end all sides of a question should be heard, not only in the interests of the Committee but also in those of the Administering Authorities if the latter sincerely wished to correct their mistakes.

23. Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) said that it was impossible for him to withdraw his explanation of vote, which would appear in the record with other such explanations.

24. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) said that the Belgian representative had misunderstood him; all that he had appealed to him to do was to withdraw the unnecessary words "professional agitators and agents of foreign Powers".

25. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) proposed that, since there was no response from the Belgian representative, the discussion should be closed.

It was so decided.

SUPPLEMENTARY HEARINGS OF PETITIONERS ON THE FUTURE OF THE CAMEROONS UNDER BRITISH ADMINISTRATION AND THE CAMEROONS UNDER FRENCH ADMINISTRATION

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Félix Roland Moumié, representative of the Union des populations du Cameroun, Mr. Ndeh Ntumazah, representative of One Kamerun, and Mr. Michel Dookingue and Mr. Jean Ngounga, representatives of the Union nationale

des étudiants camerounais, took places at the Committee table.

26. Mr. NTUMAZAH (One Kamerun) said that the question of the two Cameroons called for thorough examination. The terms of the Trusteeship Agreements and of the Charter were explicit and he urged delegations to give them full attention. He wished to clarify his party's position; he would not go into details of the abnormal state of affairs in the Territories, which the responsible parties had not denied. He hoped that his views would assist in achieving a just solution.
27. Careful examination showed that both the Trusteeship Agreements and the Charter had been violated. Independence had been promised to the Cameroons under French administration on 1 January 1960 while the fate of the Cameroons under British administration had been associated with that of the independence of Nigeria. No doubt the Committee would ultimately discover that the promised independence was an illusion. The Cameroons under British administration had been divided into two zones on the principle of "divide and rule": the Southern Cameroons had gone its own way while the Northern Cameroons had fended for itself within Northern Nigeria. It had been said that that division had been carried out in accordance with the wishes of the people; he would be glad to know when and in what manner the people of the Northern Cameroons had been consulted. The Northern Cameroons had been kept separate from the Southern and no road linked the two zones; that had been done in an endeavour to make the two zones forget that they had formed one country in the period between 1884 and 1919. Although it had been alleged that the Northern Cameroons had chosen to remain part of Northern Nigeria, he doubted whether the people of that zone were politically qualified to speak for themselves. The Committee had been told that there was an autonomous Government in the Southern Cameroons, but it had not been suggested that there was such a Government in the Northern Cameroons. That zone had been prepared for annexation by Nigeria and the Administering Authority had accordingly suppressed the growth of political consciousness in it. It had been said that certain decisions had been taken by the Governor-General of Nigeria on the advice of Nigerian ministers; that was a statement which the Committee could not accept without inquiring whether the Northern Cameroons had been consulted. The Northern Cameroons had no say in its Government and would continue to be administered as part of Northern Nigeria when the latter became self-governing. That meant that the Trusteeship Agreement would continue to be violated.
28. In view of the fact that Northern Nigeria was to achieve self-government in 1959, the United Nations and the Administering Authority should arrange for a separate administration for the northern zone of the Cameroons under British administration. When that had been done, the inhabitants could be consulted. As he had said in his statement at the 775th meeting, the whole complex question could be solved only by a simultaneous consultation of the people of the Cameroons. The Trusteeship Agreement allowed the Cameroons under British administration to be administered as an integral part of Nigeria as an administrative convenience only. If the Administering Authority really had no special interest in integrating the Territory with Nigeria, why did it oppose unification? The inhabitants respected boundaries imposed on them by foreign Powers but did not accept them. The day would come when Africa, which had been divided by the colonialist Powers for their own ends, would be one. Nigeria was a great African nation and would contribute to the rebuilding of that continent but the United Kingdom Government seemed to wish to force the Cameroons upon it and to lay the foundations of hatred between the Cameroons under British administration and Nigeria, for its own economic interest.
29. Elections were to be held in the Southern Cameroons in January 1959 and the United Kingdom would do everything possible to ensure the success of the integrationists, who would succeed if the elections were not supervised by an impartial body. It was a difficult question, which could not be left in the hands of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa, 1958, for that body had remained in the Cameroons under British administration for two weeks only and had had no time to meet each political group, while the presence of the army in certain areas of the Cameroons under French administration would prevent its meeting those inhabitants whom the army was pursuing. Little time was left before 1960 and it was important that the United Nations should arrange at the current session for the question of the Cameroons to be given careful study by an impartial body under the mandate of the General Assembly.
30. He appealed to the United Kingdom Government to grant him a passport. Owing to the fact that he was opposed to integration, he was subject to unlawful arrest and his passport was impounded each time he returned home. Others who supported the stand for reunification were also deprived of freedom of speech or movement.
31. He hoped that he would be allowed to intervene again later in the debate.
- Mr. Rodzinski (Poland), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.
32. Mr. DOOKINGUE (Union nationale des étudiants camerounais) said that he had asked to be allowed to speak again because he had felt that when the general debate on the Cameroons was about to be opened his organization's point of view should be clarified.
33. At the 774th meeting of the Committee the French representative had read out a statement of the French Government which referred to the accession of the Cameroons to complete independence after consultation of the Cameroons population. ^{1/}A memorandum by the French Government circulated to the Committee (A/C.4/388) expressed the opinion that Cameroonian public opinion favoured the attainment of independence and that the Cameroonians had acquired the necessary abilities.
34. He would therefore raise the question what kind of consultation was envisaged. There appeared to be a discrepancy between the memorandum by the French Government and the French representative's statement. The statement referred to a consultation of the Cameroons population, under United Nations supervision and under conditions of which the principle might be decided by the General Assembly and the specific forms of application determined by the Trusteeship

^{1/} See A/C.4/SR.774, para. 38; see also A/C.4/381.

Council, account being taken of the report of the Visiting Mission. According to the memorandum, the Government of the French Republic proposed that the Trusteeship Council should be requested by the General Assembly to adopt, having in mind the report of the Visiting Mission, all appropriate steps to enable the General Assembly, during its fourteenth session, to make a decision concerning the termination of the Trusteeship System simultaneously with the attainment of independence by the Cameroons on 1 January 1960. Nothing was said there about a consultation. In the light of those texts he wondered what was expected of the Visiting Mission. If the Mission was expected to establish that the country was not ready for independence he wondered why the Administering Authority had stated the contrary and why there should be a popular consultation concerning the attainment of independence on 1 January 1960. Furthermore, the French representative had said in his statement at the 774th meeting that the Cameroonian Legislative Assembly, which was demanding independence, was the representative body of the Cameroonian people. If a popular consultation were to be held on a subject on which the Legislative Assembly had expressed its wishes, that would appear to show that the Assembly was not a representative body. Was the Visiting Mission expected to say whether the Cameroonians wished or did not wish for the unification of the country and whether they wished to be associated with France? The petitioners held that a referendum on the first point should be organized in both Trust Territories, while the second question should be settled between the Government of an independent Cameroons and the Government of France. If, however, that aspect of the problem were to be emphasized he would observe that the organization he represented entertained serious doubts about the association referred to in the French Constitution.

35. Finally, he would ask whether the Visiting Mission was expected to produce suggestions with regard to the termination of the trusteeship. If the Cameroons possessed a representative Government which exercised full powers it could not remain under trusteeship. Yet the Trusteeship Council, in its resolution 1924 (S-IX), had requested the Visiting Mission to set forth its views on the procedure for organizing the consultation which would enable the people of the Cameroons under French administration to express, at the appropriate time, their wishes concerning their future, and concerning the termination of trusteeship upon the attainment of full national independence in 1960. He wished to know how that was to be done and what questions would be put to the people. According to the memorandum of the French Government (A/C.4/388), the termination of trusteeship would take place in the manner prescribed by the Charter of the United Nations and the Trusteeship Agreement. He was not clear what that meant and whether the requirements of Article 76 of the Charter would be fulfilled. They were not being fulfilled at the present time in the Cameroons under French administration: the proof was that certain political organizations which had the support of the majority of the population were banned and there was no freedom of political opinion in the country. Measures such as the outlawing of the Union des populations du Cameroun (UPC), the Jeunesse démocratique camerounaise (JDC) and the Union des femmes camerounaises (UDEFEF) were obstacles to the restoration of a calm political atmosphere in the Cameroons.

Those organizations were operating clandestinely and the Administering Authority was opposing them by force. If the Visiting Mission were to conclude that calm had not been restored in the country, he wondered whether the General Assembly would wait until its fourteenth session to take cognizance of the Mission's report and only after that consider measures for the restoration of order before independence was proclaimed. The Union nationale des étudiants camerounais could not think that it was necessary to await the report of the Mission before taking action. Delay would further aggravate a situation which was already serious and increase the difficulties of finding a solution.

36. First of all, it was essential that calm should be restored, that there should be an end to oppression and political persecution and that the armed forces should be withdrawn; there should be an unconditional general amnesty accompanied by the abrogation of the decrees dissolving the UPC, the JDC and UDEFEF.

37. Before the attainment of independence the Cameroons must possess representative organs as a result of free elections supervised by a United Nations commission which might be appointed by the General Assembly at its present session. It was inconceivable that the Visiting Mission should recommend the postponement of those essential steps.

38. With regard to the Cameroons under British administration, he would like to know what it was expected to achieve by the elections to be held in the Southern Cameroons in January 1959. He considered that it would be preferable to hold a referendum immediately rather than an election first and a referendum later. Furthermore the referendum should cover the Northern as well as the Southern Cameroons. In that connexion, he observed that it was strange that when the Cameroons had been divided into a northern and a southern section it had not been considered necessary to revise the Trusteeship Agreement. The Administering Authority had been entrusted with the administration of a single Territory and when the Trusteeship Agreement was terminated it was bound to return the Territory in the same form.

39. In conclusion, he emphasized that what his organization desired was, firstly, a return to normal political life in the Territory; secondly, the dispatch of a United Nations commission to the Cameroons in the first part of 1959 with special terms of reference laid down by the present session of the General Assembly and with a sufficiently large membership which should not include representatives of the colonial Powers. Its task would be to restore normal political life and to organize in both parts of the Territory a referendum on the problem of unification, the question to be put to the voters being: "Are you for or against reunification and immediate independence?". Subsequently an election should be organized throughout the unified Cameroons for a constituent assembly, to be succeeded by a Government to which the Administering Authorities would transfer all powers; it would be for that Government to request the termination of the trusteeship after the independence of the Cameroons had been proclaimed.

40. Mr. MOUMIE (Union des populations du Cameroun) said that an analysis of the situation in the Cameroons showed that a solution would depend upon three

main factors: firstly, the restoration of normal political life; secondly, a referendum on the question of unification; thirdly, the organization of elections for a Parliament and a representative Government to be set up before the attainment of independence.

41. It was clear that the Cameroons could not return to normal political life until calm was restored by the ending of repressive measures. There must be a cessation of hostilities, the troops must be withdrawn, the concentration camps closed, an unconditional political amnesty declared, judicial proceedings for political offences stopped, the political exiles allowed to return, there must be freedom of speech and opinion throughout the country and the dissolved political parties must be reinstated.

42. It had been asserted that calm now prevailed in the Cameroons under French administration. The Committee had been informed of a number of facts which were evidence to the contrary. He himself had recently received information that repressive measures were continuing. Furthermore, he had received a letter dated 7 November which stated that people had been prevented by force from approaching the Visiting Mission, that many people had been arrested and that the prisons were filled to overflowing.

43. He would repeat what he had said before, that the UPC and its work were so closely connected with the struggle against colonial domination that it could not be ignored. The UPC had striven for reconciliation in the Cameroons and only when it had been enabled to put its intentions into effect would the Administering Authority be in a position to give evidence of a conciliatory spirit.

44. A committee of amnesty and national reconciliation had recently been set up in the Cameroons, under the leadership of well-known Cameroonians. That committee, which had wide support among Cameroonians, called for the restoration of normal political life.

45. He was glad to see that it was not only the petitioners who were asking the Committee to take into consideration the desire of the whole Cameroonian people for reunification. Nevertheless those who advocated that course did not always see fit to say how reunification could be brought about. It was apparently deemed sufficient to demand reunification at the same time as the attainment of independence. It seemed to be taken for granted that the liberated country would remain under the present Government. It was said that the Cameroons would have to enter into some kind of association with France, but since a unified Cameroons would be a meeting-ground for French and British cultural influences, the country's future development would be jeopardized if it were to enter into a close association with one of those two countries. In his view the Cameroons should be associated culturally with both France and the United Kingdom, without prejudice to any economic relationship it might form with other Powers.

46. In his opinion, after the referendum a general election should be organized to elect a truly representative assembly. In order that such an election should be truly democratic it should be supervised not by a commissioner but by a commission appointed by the United Nations.

47. At the 705th meeting of the Committee, held during the twelfth session, the United Kingdom representa-

tive had said in connexion with Togoland under French administration that it was clear that elections based on universal suffrage and in the presence of outside observers would set up an assembly whose representative character could not be questioned.

48. Many petitions had been sent to the United Nations denying the representative character of the Government headed by Mr. Ahidjo, and there had also been a number of petitions expressing support for the outlawed parties.

49. He thanked the Committee for giving him the opportunity to speak again. The time the Committee devoted to the Cameroonian problem would be a proof to the people of the Trust Territory and to world opinion of the interest it took in the question.

50. Mr. RAO (India) said that in his statement at the 775th meeting Mr. Ntumazah had stated that a number of Cameroonians had been arrested in the Cameroons under British administration and handed over to the French authorities and that they had been executed. He would like to know if Mr. Ntumazah could give the Committee the names of the persons concerned.

51. Mr. NTUMAZAH (One Kamerun) said that the names were as follows: Fotso Joseph, Kamto Donart, Kandem Justise, Fougang Mathias, Simon Pierre, Augustine Ngoumela, Clement Tontap, Benjamin Toupi, John Janda, Numbis Janvier.

52. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) said that Mr. Ntumazah had stated that the Administering Authority for the Cameroons under British administration had endeavoured to stifle political consciousness in the northern part of the Territory and that, for example, two men had been deported in 1954 because they had advocated unification. He would like to know the names of the two men and whether there had been other similar cases.

53. Secondly, he wished to know where Mr. Ntumazah had obtained the information that the Visiting Mission had spent only two weeks in the Cameroons under British administration and whether the Secretariat could confirm that allegation.

54. Mr. NTUMAZAH (One Kamerun) said that he had referred to two Lamidos who had been deported from the Northern Region because they had advocated unification. In his country it was customary to refer to traditional rulers by their titles only and he was therefore unable to give their names. As he had said, that action had put fear into the minds of the people and so far nobody else had spoken openly in favour of unification.

55. In 1953 the leaders of the Northern Cameroons had signed a joint declaration with those of the Southern Cameroons to the effect that they wished to secede from the Federation of Nigeria. Later, however, the northern leaders had recanted and there could be no doubt that pressure had been brought to bear on them.

56. With regard to the second question, he had been informed by telegram from people in the Territory that the Visiting Mission had arrived in the Cameroons under British administration on 29 October and had proceeded to the Cameroons under French administration on 14 November.

57. Mr. LOIZIDES (Greece) recalled that at the 775th meeting Mr. Ntumazah had expressed the view that

before a referendum was held freedom of speech and assembly should be restored, the ban on certain political parties lifted and exiled political leaders allowed to return to the Cameroons. In reply to that statement, the United Kingdom representative had said that the restrictions referred to did not apply to the Cameroons under British administration. He asked the petitioner whether that was the case.

58. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that the Greek representative had not understood him correctly; what he had actually said was that he was speaking only for the Cameroons under British administration.

59. Mr. NTUMAZAH (One Kamerun) said that in his earlier statement he had referred to the Union des populations du Cameroun, the Jeunesse démocratique camerounaise and the Union des femmes camerounaises, all of which had been banned by the United Kingdom authorities in 1957 and their leaders deported. Freedom of speech and assembly was curbed by the device of requiring those who wished to make speeches to obtain the permission not only of the police but also of the owners of the property where such speeches were to be made; if the police then threatened the landlord, as sometimes happened, it became impossible to hold a meeting even if a police permit had been obtained. Another tactic was to intimidate the people by frequent arrests of their leaders. Members of his party, for instance, were constantly being arrested; he himself had been arrested in July 1957, detained for a week and then released without trial. Yet another tactic was to charge the critics of the Administering Authority with crimes which they had not committed.

60. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela) asked if the petitioners could state whether the executions and deportations to which Mr. Ntumazah had referred had been mentioned in any organ of the Press.

Mr. Boland (Ireland) resumed the Chair.

61. Mr. NTUMAZAH (One Kamerun) said that no newspapers were circulated in the Cameroons under British administration except those published in Nigeria and the United Kingdom. Naturally newspapers which were opposed to the movement for unification and independence did not report such news. Mr. Bebey-Eyedi had operated a small printing press in the Cameroons under French administration for the purpose of disseminating news about nationalist activities but had been arrested and detained at Eséka for a long time.

62. Mr. NAJJAR (Lebanon) recalled that Mr. Ahidjo had said in his statement at the 794th meeting that he had not always been in accord with the French authorities. He asked Mr. Moumié if his party had ever tried to associate itself with Mr. Ahidjo in solving Cameroonian problems.

63. Mr. MOUMIE (Union des populations du Cameroun) said that in his statement at the 775th meeting he had described his party's attempts to reach agreement not only with the Administering Authority but also with the Government. Mr. Dookingue and Mr. Ngounga had quoted from the letters exchanged at the time. Mr. Ahidjo had sent the assistant director of his Cabinet to discuss the matter with the students. He did not know why the discussions had been discontinued.

64. Mr. NAJJAR (Lebanon) asked why in that case Mr. Ahidjo had described the petitioners as agitators and as groups acting contrary to the interests of their country.

65. Mr. MOUMIE (Union des populations du Cameroun) said that he thought the best answer to that question was to be found in the statement he had made at the 792nd meeting on behalf of Mrs. Marthe Ouandie, in which he had quoted from a broadcast by a British naval officer saying that terrorists were those who were on the opposite side from the person who described them as such.

66. Mr. NAJJAR (Lebanon) asked what was the petitioners' understanding of the amnesty which Mr. Ahidjo had said he was prepared to grant.

67. Mr. MOUMIE (Union des populations du Cameroun) recalled that in replying to questions put to him by certain delegations Mr. Ahidjo had said he was prepared to grant an amnesty on condition that those who were to benefit from it obeyed the law. Under the French tradition, as the inhabitants of the Cameroons knew it, that meant submitting to political pressure.

68. The CHAIRMAN said that he now had the information requested about the length of time the Visiting Mission had spent in the Cameroons under British administration. The Mission had arrived at Lagos on 27 October, had proceeded to Victoria on 29 October and had left for the Cameroons under French administration on 14 November. Thus the petitioner's statement was correct.

69. Mr. EILAN (Israel) noted that according to the summary record Mr. Ntumazah had said at the 780th meeting that there were practically no political organizations left in the Cameroons under French administration but only parliamentary groups, such as the Catholic Group led by Mr. Mbida and the Group of Eight led by Mr. Soppo Priso. According to his recollection, however, Mr. Ntumazah had said that Mr. Soppo Priso enjoyed no popular support. He asked whether his recollection was correct.

70. Mr. NTUMAZAH (One Kamerun) replied that the Administering Authority itself had admitted at the General Assembly's twelfth session that Mr. Soppo Priso's Group did not enjoy the overwhelming support of the people. When appearing before the Fourth Committee during the twelfth session together with other members of his Group Mr. Soppo Priso had pointed out (714th meeting) that the 1956 elections had been held in abnormal conditions and that the Assembly which had resulted from those elections had not been truly representative. Later, however, Mr. Soppo Priso and the minority group led by him had joined Mr. Ahidjo's Government. If true political organizations had existed in the Territory new elections would have been held when the Prime Minister had lost the confidence of the people.

71. Mr. EILAN (Israel) said that what he had asked was whether he had been correct in understanding Mr. Ntumazah to have said that Mr. Soppo Priso enjoyed no popular support.

72. Mr. NTUMAZAH (One Kamerun) replied that Mr. Soppo Priso had a very small following.

73. Mr. SULEIMAN (Sudan) asked whether there was any law prohibiting the publication of newspapers in the Cameroons under British administration.

74. Mr. NTUMAZAH (One Kamerun) replied that there was no such law but that the inhabitants had not the financial means to publish newspapers.

75. Mr. SULEIMAN (Sudan) asked if Mr. Ntumazah thought that the United Kingdom authorities were categorically opposed to unification and, if so, what steps they had taken to prevent it.

76. Mr. NTUMAZAH (One Kamerun) said that paragraph 63 of the report on the Nigeria Constitutional Conference held in London in May and June 1957^{2/} had made it clear that in the view of the Secretary of State for the Colonies the safest course for the Cameroons under British administration would be integration with Nigeria. That stand was surprising inasmuch as the United Kingdom representative at the nineteenth session of the Trusteeship Council had admitted that the people of the Cameroons under British administration favoured unification.

77. Mr. SULEIMAN (Sudan) asked how many times Mr. Ntumazah had been deprived of his passport and whether he was now carrying a valid United Kingdom passport.

78. Mr. NTUMAZAH (One Kamerun) replied that whenever he was granted a United Kingdom passport it was stamped with instruction that it should be surrendered at Lagos, so that before each journey he had to apply afresh for a passport. That confirmed his statement that freedom of movement was restricted in the Territory, at least as far as those who opposed the Administering Authority were concerned. He had had considerable difficulty in obtaining a passport to attend the present session of the General Assembly and had not received it until 18 October.

79. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said that he had noted that the common denominator of all the petitioners' statements was the desire for unification. Visiting missions had likewise found that the people in both Territories aspired to unification. He asked whether the petitioners were in a position to estimate what percentage of the electorate in the Cameroons under French administration, the Southern Cameroons under British administration and the Northern Cameroons under British administration respectively would vote for unification if a referendum on that question were held.

80. Mr. MOUMIE (Union des populations du Cameroun) said that only the United Nations itself could provide the answer to that question.

81. Mr. NTUMAZAH (One Kamerun) observed that the desire of all Cameroonians for unification and independence, which had been contested by the French Administering Authority in the past, had now been recognized by it. The United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of the Cameroons under British Administration and the Cameroons under French Administration, 1955, had noted in its report in document T/1226 that all the political organizations in the southern part of the Cameroons under British administration were for unification but had reported that it had not found the same feeling in the Northern Cameroons. For that reason it was important to take into consideration the lack of political maturity of the population in the Northern Cameroons and the fact that that

section had already in effect been integrated with Nigeria. The people had not been educated and had no political parties of their own, for all the parties functioning in the Northern Cameroons were Nigerian parties. Furthermore, the deportations carried out by the Administering Authority had inspired fear among the people.

82. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) noted that the petitioners regarded the plans currently envisaged by the Administering Authorities for the Cameroons under British and French administration as a new form of colonialism. The "divide and rule" principle was, however, nothing new, for it had been a conspicuous feature of colonialism in the past. He would like to know what difference there was between that principle as applied in the past and as the petitioners maintained it was to be applied in the present instance.

83. Mr. NTUMAZAH (One Kamerun) replied that colonialism need not be exclusively political but could also be economic. He recalled that in 1944 it had been asked in the United Kingdom Parliament why there had been no investment in the Cameroons under British mandate, to which a speaker from the Government Bench had replied that the United Kingdom Government was not prepared to invest in countries whose future had not been decided. The implication was clearly that money could be invested only when a territory had indicated that it could remain permanently dependent on an imperial power. Under the integration scheme Nigeria would be the new colonial master of what was now the Cameroons under British administration and the United Kingdom would continue to reap the economic benefits of that association.

84. Another point he wished to make was that if the Trust Territory were integrated with Nigeria the Cameroonians would lose the separate nationality which they had hitherto possessed. It was not one of the aims of the Trusteeship System that the people of Trust Territories should be obliged to change their nationality. Hence the Cameroonians were justified in regarding integration as a new form of colonialism intended to benefit either the United Kingdom or its new agent, the Federation of Nigeria.

85. Mr. MOUMIE (Union des populations du Cameroun) quoted statements made by various Frenchmen who had occupied the post of Minister for Overseas France to show that the freedom offered to the Cameroons under French administration was also a new form of colonialism. On 10 August 1954 Mr. Buron had said that it was impossible to fix a target date for the termination of trusteeship because the French Republic was indivisible and metropolitan and overseas France were one. After the events of May 1955 Mr. Mitterrand had said in an article appearing in a publication issued by Mr. Mendès-France that if the peoples of Africa wanted independence there was another way of keeping them within the framework of colonialism, namely, through the Franco-African community. That, he had written, was a matter of economic necessity. In a book he had written on the Cameroons Mr. Aujoulat had expressed views coinciding with those of Mr. Buron and Mr. Mitterrand.

86. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) noted that the petitioners had expressed the view that the division of the Cameroonians was immoral. He asked them to explain that statement.

^{2/} Report by the Nigeria Constitutional Conference, Cmnd. 207 (London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office).

87. Mr. NTUMAZAH (One Kamerun) replied that the division was immoral because it had been imposed without any consideration being given to tribal or ethnic links and had even divided families, so that in some cases it was difficult for relatives to visit each other. If a section of the Cameroons were now to be integrated with another country the immorality would be compounded. Such division was a violation of article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which guaranteed the right of freedom of movement within the borders of States.

88. Mr. MOUMIE (Union des populations du Cameroun) observed that when a people struggled for its independence one of its aims was to preserve its customs and culture. To force members of the same family to live in isolation from each other was certainly contrary to custom.

89. Mr. EILAN (Israel) said that while his delegation was not opposed to unification of the Cameroons he was disturbed by a remark made by one of the petitioners which seemed to imply that an independent Nigeria would be regarded as an imperialistic agent. He asked if he had interpreted the remark correctly.

90. Mr. NTUMAZAH (One Kamerun) replied that it should be for an independent Nigeria and an independent Cameroons to decide their future relationship by negotiation with each other. He had not meant that an independent Nigeria would be a new colonial Government but that the integration scheme had been put forward by the United Kingdom rather than Nigeria. No Nigerian had shown interest in annexing the Trust Territory, whereas the United Kingdom Government was trying to convince everyone concerned that integration would be beneficial to both sides.

91. Mr. EILAN (Israel) said that he was glad to note that the petitioner did not regard the future independent state of Nigeria as an "imperialist agent".

92. Mr. RAO (India) requested that the statements made by the petitioners should be circulated in the usual way.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.