

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



FOURTH COMMITTEE, 308th

MEETING

Tuesday, 16 December 1952, at 3 p.m.

Headquarters, New York

CONTENTS

	Page
The Ewe and Togoland unification problem: special report of the Trusteeship Council (A/2289, A/C.4/L.256/Rev.1, A/C.4/L.258, A/C.4/L.260, A/C.4/L.262, A/C.4/L.263) (<i>continued</i>)	413
Question of South West Africa	421

Chairman: Mr. Rodolfo MUNOZ (Argentina).

The Ewe and Togoland unification problem: special report of the Trusteeship Council (A/2289, A/C.4/L.256/Rev.1, A/C.4/L.258, A/C.4/L.260, A/C.4/L.262, A/C.4/L.263) (*continued*)
[Item 32]*

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Olympio, representative of the All-Ewe Conference; Mr. Antor and Mr. Odame, representatives of the Joint Togoland Congress; and Mr. Kpodar, representative of the Parti Togolais du Progrès and of the Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo, took places at the Committee table.

1. Mr PEON DEL VALLE (Mexico) pointed out that the Committee seemed unanimous in its sincere desire to accelerate the development of Togoland in all fields. Owing to the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance, the United Nations had the necessary funds and services to expedite economic development and the organization of a public administration and to ensure social welfare in every country. The Mexican delegation had considered that that programme should be mentioned in the present case and that was why it had submitted its draft resolution (A/C.4/L.262), which was the logical complement of various provisions in the United States draft resolution (A/C.4/L.256/Rev.1). If the United States delegation and the Fourth Committee thought it would facilitate the Committee's work, he was prepared to agree to the incorporation of the operative part of his draft resolution in the United States draft after paragraph 5 of the operative part.

2. Mr. MUCCIO (United States of America) was gratified to note that several suggestions had been made in connexion with his draft resolution. He had taken those suggestions into account in preparing the revised text of the draft (A/C.4/L.256/Rev.1).

3. The preamble of the revised draft was substantially the same as in the original text, except that paragraphs 7 and 8 of the operative part of the original draft had

been added to it, in accordance with the suggestion made by the Venezuelan representative at the 307th meeting. Paragraph 5 of the operative part had been revised to take into account the provisions of subparagraph (a) of the new paragraph proposed in the ten-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.260, para. 1). It did not incorporate the provisions of subparagraph (b) of that paragraph word for word because his delegation had thought it would be better, in the initial stages, to stress the objectives to be sought rather than the procedures which might or might not achieve those results. Obviously, any elections which were held in connexion with the reconstitution of the Joint Council should be on a free and democratic basis. The first objective should be the establishment of a body which would permit the co-operation of all groups for the common benefit of both Territories. That was the intent of paragraph 3 of the operative part of the revised text. The contents of paragraph 9 were implicit in the provision relating to the reconstitution of the Joint Council, but his delegation had thought it advisable to insert the paragraph in order to make it perfectly clear that the Administering Authorities should act through that body.

4. His delegation was unable to support the Guatemalan amendments (A/C.4/L.258), the first of which did not correspond to the position as outlined by the petitioners, the Administering Authorities and the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa, 1952. It implied that there was a degree of unity among the people which did not actually exist at present. The second of those amendments suggested that the Joint Council should be replaced by some arrangement which would hardly prove practicable politically.

5. He agreed to insert the operative part of the Mexican draft resolution after paragraph 5 of the revised United States text.

6. The United States delegation was well aware that his draft resolution would not satisfy everyone on every point, but it thought it offered a practical solu-

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

tion and hoped that it would be approved by a large majority of the Fourth Committee.

7. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) thought that most representatives would agree that the revised United States draft resolution was satisfactory as a whole. He would, however, have preferred a slightly more forceful text. Sub-paragraph (a) of the text proposed by the ten Powers in paragraph 1 of their amendments was no longer necessary as it had been incorporated in paragraph 5 of the operative part of the revised text. With regard to sub-paragraph (b) of the text, proposed by the ten Powers, he said he realized that the United States delegation had made a sincere effort to compromise and appreciated its having done so. But the last part of paragraph 5 was not satisfactory. The essential idea underlying sub-paragraph (b) was the necessity of knowing precisely what the aspirations of the people were. That was why the sponsors of the amendments insisted that the sub-paragraph should be put to the vote. It could either be introduced as a separate paragraph or replace the last part of paragraph 5 of the operative part of the revised United States draft. He suggested that the words "expresses the hope" in paragraph 9 of the operative part of the draft resolution should be replaced by the word "recommends".

8. The ten sponsors of the amendments had made a great effort to accept the United States draft resolution, and he was counting on the goodwill of the United States representative.

9. Mr. CALERO RODRIGUES (Brazil) explained that, in associating himself with the sponsors of the ten-Power amendments, he had explained his attitude on the problems under discussion. The Ewe and Togoland unification problem could not be set aside, for no one could allege that it had been raised by persons whose only motive was ambition. On the contrary, the petitioners had shown great political maturity. The fact that their plan was to some extent flexible was evidence of their sincerity and honesty. The United States representative seemed to reproach the General Assembly with having made a mistake in its resolution 555 (VI) since it was wrong to expect a solution from the Joint Council and at the same time to send a visiting mission to study the problem and make specific recommendations.

10. The conclusions and recommendations contained in the Visiting Mission's special report (T/1034) did not provide the guidance the General Assembly had expected for the solution of the problem. On the other hand, the report itself clearly described the reasons why the Joint Council, for its part, had failed to contribute to the finding of a solution. But despite its lack of success, he still thought that the problem should be tackled afresh in the same way. The Joint Council provided an opportunity for freely discussing every aspect of the problem. The fundamental decisions should, however, be taken by the people and by the Administering Authorities concerned. In that respect the revised United States draft resolution rightly emphasized that every element of the population should participate in the search for a solution.

11. He assured the petitioners that his delegation and most of the members of the Fourth Committee thought

it their duty to ensure that account was taken of the aspirations of the people of Togoland. That was one of the supervisory functions of the United Nations under the Trusteeship System. The Organization would keep itself constantly informed of developments in the situation in the two Territories and it might well be that the General Assembly would decide to send out a special mission. For the present it would be well if the leaders of the various parties and groups joined in an attempt to find an approach acceptable to the large majority of the people concerned.

12. The revised United States draft resolution was constructive and represented a significant contribution to the Committee's work. Paragraph 3 of the operative part of the original text had not been clear and the purpose of the new text proposed by the ten Powers in paragraph 1 of their amendments had been to correct that defect. The difficulties which had prevented the Joint Council from operating effectively were well known to the Committee. Some factions had thought that the Council's terms of reference were too limited and that its members had not been selected according to democratic processes. Consequently it was obvious that the Council could not be made to work if no account was taken of the objections which had been raised. They were reasonable and it should be possible to reconcile them with the views of the Administering Authorities and of other groups.

13. The Administering Authorities thought the terms of reference of the Joint Council had been broad enough to enable it freely to discuss all aspects of the question. It would be better, however, to specify that fact clearly. That was the purpose of sub-paragraph (a) of the new text proposed by the ten Powers and he was gratified to note that the substance of that sub-paragraph had been incorporated in the revised United States text.

14. Sub-paragraph (b) of the same text provided for the reconstitution of the Joint Council by means of direct elections on the basis of universal adult suffrage exercised by secret ballot. His delegation, together with eight other Member States, had made a similar proposal (A/C.4/L.168, para. 7 (b)) at the sixth session of the General Assembly but had not insisted on its adoption in order to take account of the considerations raised by the Administering Authorities.¹ The procedure adopted, however, had not produced results. It would therefore be better now to use the approach suggested in sub-paragraph (b), which was in no way subversive or dangerous, particularly as the objections raised against that procedure were not convincing. Moreover, the sub-paragraph was not contrary to the intent of the United States draft; its only purpose was to elucidate a very important point. He sincerely hoped that the United States representative and the Fourth Committee would be able to accept it.

15. Mr. HUNEIDI (Syria) wished to make it clear that, on the question of principle, his delegation was categorically in favour of the unification of Togoland. The United States revised draft resolution was not entirely satisfactory. The Syrian delegation proposed the addition to it of a paragraph requesting the Trustee-

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Fourth Committee, 234th meeting.*

ship Council to submit to the next regular session of the General Assembly a special report on the implementation of the resolution by the Administering Authorities concerned and the action taken by the Council thereon (A/C.4/L.263). He thought that amendment was in complete conformity with the spirit of the Fourth Committee's work.

16. Mr. PIGNON (France) said he had no objections to make concerning the Mexican draft resolution, the purpose and scope of which he fully appreciated.

17. He had listened with keen interest to the Guatemalan representative's statement, which contained important points on which he had often reflected in the past. He could not, however, support the Guatemalan amendments. It was the desire of the French Government to co-operate with the United Kingdom Government in seeking every possible solution of the disturbing problem under consideration. His Government thought that every possibility had been studied, but it was ready to make a new effort in co-operation with the United Kingdom Government and to report objectively on the work of the two Governments, as they had done in the past.

18. The Guatemalan proposal was based on an excessive simplification of the problem, although the aims sought were assuredly praiseworthy. The proposal would commit the Administering Authorities to a course that would certainly lead nowhere. Undoubtedly better solutions might have been adopted concerning Togoland immediately after the First World War, but it was difficult, if not impossible, thirty years later, in the name of simplicity and logic to consider solutions which would profoundly disrupt the life of the indigenous inhabitants. What he had just said applied in part to some of the suggestions made by the Venezuelan representative. The French delegation had noted that representative's proposals with interest and the French Government would take them into account in re-examining the question. He pointed out in that connexion that paragraph 9 of the United States revised draft resolution contained the essentials of the Venezuelan suggestions.

19. He fully approved the second amendment proposed by the ten Powers. Although the idea expressed was obvious, there was of course no harm in recalling it.

20. On the other hand, he was compelled to adopt a more reserved attitude towards the text in paragraph 1 of the ten-Power amendments. Concerning the terms of reference of the Joint Council, he wished to point out that the Administering Authorities had done everything to grant the Council as much freedom as possible; it was fully responsible for its own agenda, but it had seemed unnecessary to make it discuss forthwith the most delicate and controversial questions. It had appeared preferable first to create an atmosphere of understanding and to dispel prejudices. Nevertheless, the question of unification was of course implicitly before the Joint Council. Although sub-paragraph (a) of the new paragraph proposed by the ten Powers had been incorporated in the United States revised draft resolution, he would not insist on a separate vote upon it, but asked to have his reservations mentioned in the summary record.

21. He also wished to make some express reservations concerning sub-paragraph (b) of that paragraph. The observations he had already made still held. The possibility of a dispute between the Joint Council and the existing bodies was obvious. It would be neither wise nor timely to impose a solution without consulting the peoples concerned. Any hasty action would be dangerous, and the question of the Joint Council should be taken up again thoroughly, in consultation with the two Administering Authorities and all sections of the population. He was convinced that most of the members of the Fourth Committee had an incorrect idea of the present state of the administration of the African Trust Territories. From now onwards the Administering Authorities were far from either wishing, or being able, to impose their will. By accepting sub-paragraph (b), he would be committing his Government, and, in the circumstances, he could not do that.

22. In his opinion, the United States revised draft resolution was the only text that allowed sufficient latitude for seeking a solution, which would be greatly facilitated if all the parties concerned answered the appeal contained in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. He considered the Syrian amendment unnecessary, as the Trusteeship Council would automatically report to the General Assembly on the matter.

23. Mr. SHEIKIN (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) recalled that the United Nations had been trying for five years to settle the question and had not succeeded in doing so satisfactorily, on account of the Administering Authorities' opposition. The people were demanding the settlement of the question in accordance with their aspirations, and that was in complete conformity with Article 76 and Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter. As far back as 1947 the Trusteeship Council had officially recognized the Ewes' desire for unification.² In 1949 the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa had reported that the demands for unification constituted a political question which should be solved without delay in the interest of peace and stability in that part of the African continent.³ In spite of those conclusions, the Administering Authorities had not yet set up any body to promote the advancement of those Territories towards self-government. Togoland under British administration was administratively attached to the Gold Coast and the Byelorussian delegation was convinced that the Ewes were right when they stated that Togoland under British administration had ceased, in practice, to be a Trust Territory. As for Togoland under French administration, it was being slowly incorporated into the so-called French Union.

24. Freedom of the Press and freedom of association were not respected and the Administering Authorities committed arbitrary acts incompatible with their obligations under the Charter. At the sixth session of the General Assembly, their representatives had resorted to slander in order to dispel the impression created by the statements of the Ewe representatives, which had been unfavourable to them. The General Assembly had nevertheless adopted resolution 555 (VI), in which it

² See Trusteeship Council resolution 14 (II).

³ See *Official Records of the Trusteeship Council, Seventh Session, Supplement No. 2*, Special report on the Ewe problem, para. 106.

had noted with concern the atmosphere of tension which appeared to exist in the Territories as a result of the delay in arriving at an adequate solution and had urged the two Administering Authorities and the peoples involved to exert every effort to achieve a prompt settlement. That settlement had not been brought any nearer by the conclusions reached by the Visiting Mission sent to the Territories in accordance with the Assembly resolution. In endorsing those conclusions, in its resolution 643 (XI), the Trusteeship Council had once again shown itself incapable of properly defending the interests of the indigenous population.

25. The United States revised draft resolution was unsatisfactory, as the measures it proposed were just as unlikely to solve the problem. The ten-Power amendments were an improvement on the draft resolution, and the Byelorussian delegation would therefore vote for them. Its view was that the General Assembly should take a decision at its seventh session concerning the future of the Ewes and Togoland which would be based on the Charter and would take into account the aspirations of the peoples concerned.

26. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala), taking into account the ten-Power amendments and the revised text of the United States draft resolution, wished to modify the text of his delegation's amendments (A/C.4/L.258).

27. First, his delegation wished to replace the words "all sections" in paragraph 1 of its amendments by the words "the majority". When the Guatemalan delegation had drafted the original text of its amendment, it had been aware that some tribes in the northern part of Togoland under British administration appeared to prefer to be attached to the Northern Territories of the Gold Coast; but it had thought that the General Assembly could not consider attachment of one part of a Trust Territory to a colony. He was surprised that the fact that unification of Togoland would have the effect of separating the Ewes of unified Togoland from those in the Gold Coast by an international frontier had been invoked as an argument against unification. That international frontier already constituted a legal and political fact.

28. Secondly, he proposed that the text in paragraph 2 of his amendments should form a new paragraph to be inserted between paragraphs 5 and 6 of the United States revised draft resolution. Although the Joint Council was not in a position to solve the problem of unification alone, it could certainly contribute to the solution.

29. Mr. ELIAV (Israel) noted that, in spite of the considerable documentation collected by the United Nations since it had been asked to consider the Togoland unification problem, the Committee still lacked some basic information for formulating final conclusions. It only knew that the problem was a real one. It was not even certain that all the peoples of both Territories demanded unification, for it seemed that some sections of the population of northern and western Togoland seemed to prefer to be attached to other territories. It was desirable, therefore, in the interests of those demanding unification, that the political groups which were making the demands should give a clear assurance that those sections of the population which did not desire unification would have the possibility of free self-determination.

30. The Israel delegation paid a tribute to the devotion of the members of the Visiting Mission, whose report was a very important contribution to the solution of the problem, although it did not contain final conclusions. It seemed that, in future, reports of that kind ought to contain more information on the historical, ethnological, economic and geographical aspects of the problem and on the means of communication and include ethnographical and topographical maps of Togoland. The information available to the Committee was too strictly limited to political questions.

31. The Israel delegation had been greatly impressed by the high degree of political consciousness of the population of the two Territories. It regretted, however, that the form of unification should be the subject of such serious differences of opinion. It was surprising that there was no harmony between the Togoland unification movement and the national movement in the Gold Coast, which was rapidly approaching the stage of self-government.

32. In the circumstances it seemed that the Committee must reach the same conclusion as the Mission, namely, that no specific form of unification had won sufficient support to justify a change in the present system of administration. The only practical measure would be to improve the co-operation and co-ordination between the two Territories, and the United States revised draft resolution seemed a step in the right direction. Perhaps it might be improved by making the terms of reference of the Joint Council more specific, as proposed in the ten-Power amendments. In that connexion he recalled the Trusteeship Council resolution 345 (IX) and paragraph 428 of the Visiting Mission's report. His delegation was in favour of the principle of direct election of the members of the Joint Council by universal suffrage. Account must be taken, however, of the degree of political advancement of certain sections of the population.

33. The Israel delegation fully supported paragraph 6 of the United States revised draft resolution and hoped that the Administering Authorities would take into consideration the Visiting Mission's recommendations concerning frontier problems (T/1034, paras. 437 to 446). Perhaps it would be wise to go even further and invite the Administering Authorities to co-ordinate their policy in each Territory as far as possible, in accordance with the Venezuelan representative's suggestions. In that connexion he recalled the recommendations of the 1949 Visiting Mission.

34. He assured the representatives of the Togolandese that all the members of the Committee had the warmest sympathy for their rightful aspirations; however, they must give proof of their political maturity and their desire for unification might be demonstrated further by setting up joint voluntary institutions of an economic, cultural and social nature.

35. Mr. SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia) felt that one indisputable fact emerged from the contradictory statements of the petitioners and the Administering Authorities as well as the Visiting Missions' reports: the overwhelming majority of the people of the two Territories wanted to be united. He briefly sketched the background of the problem, pointing out that it had become acute at the time when France had introduced the new constitutional concept of the French Union and the

United Kingdom had instituted constitutional reforms which clearly seemed to be leading to the absorption of Togoland under British Administration by the Gold Coast Colony. The people of Togoland, of whom the Ewes formed an important part, had at that moment feared that they would lose for good their national identity.

36. According to the last Visiting Mission's report, opinions in the two Territories regarding the solution of the unification problem were contradictory and irreconcilable. Indonesia regretted that the Visiting Mission had been unable, in the time at its disposal, to find out which form of unification enjoyed the widest support throughout the two Territories, or to explore the possibility of bringing about general agreement on modifications to the organization and functioning of the Joint Council. Since the Visiting Mission had been unable to carry out the task expressly entrusted to it under General Assembly resolution 555 (VI), operative paragraph 8, the Trusteeship Council and the Fourth Committee found themselves in a difficult position. None the less, it was the duty of the Fourth Committee to decide how a settlement of the problem could be brought nearer, in conformity with the wishes and interests of the people.

37. The Committee should first endeavour to dispel the distrust between the Administering Authorities and the political parties, and also the distrust among the political parties themselves. Indonesia considered that the people of Togoland should themselves reach a decision, as the United States representative had said at the 307th meeting. It was possible for the political parties to collaborate with the Joint Council for Togoland Affairs, provided that the Council's membership and terms of reference were regarded as satisfactory by all concerned. With regard to the Joint Council's terms of reference, the United Kingdom and France would apparently not object to express provision being made for the Council to consider all political, economic, social and cultural matters relating to the two Territories, including their unification.

38. The Indonesian delegation considered that, for a joint body the members of which represented Territories and not political parties, parity of representation was to be preferred to proportional representation of the respective populations of the two Territories. Moreover, a system of parity of representation would make it possible to dispense with the two-thirds majority rule, which had apparently caused difficulty in the functioning of the Joint Council and created some confusion among the people. He appealed to the Administering Authorities to reconsider their position on that matter.

39. With regard to direct election to the Joint Council on the basis of universal adult suffrage, his delegation had joined with others at the sixth session of the Assembly to formulate such a proposal, but had withdrawn it in a spirit of conciliation in favour of the text proposed by the Administering Authorities (A/C.4/L.182/Rev.1, para. 2). It was clear from paragraphs 278 and 320 of the Visiting Mission's report that the full consultation between the Administering Authorities and political parties envisaged by General Assembly resolution 555 (VI) had not taken place. The Indonesian delegation therefore unreservedly associated itself with sub-paragraph (b) of the text proposed in

paragraph 1 of the ten-Power amendments. There was no reason why, in constituting such an important body as the Joint Council, the method of direct election on the basis of universal adult suffrage, which was used for elections to local bodies in the two Territories, should not be applied. In that connexion, he called to mind what had been said in paragraph 179 of the Visiting Mission's report.

40. The Indonesian delegation found the revised text of the United States draft resolution acceptable. It nevertheless pressed for adoption of sub-paragraph (b) of the text proposed in paragraph 1 of the ten-Power amendments, and would vote for the two Guatemalan amendments as redrafted verbally by the Guatemalan representative, and for the Mexican and Syrian amendments.

41. Mr. McINNIS (Canada) said that he would vote for the United States draft resolution, which he found impartial, reasonable, and moderate and which took account of the fact that the various petitioners and the Administering Authorities had frequently expressed conflicting opinions. Although Canada was in favour of election to the Joint Council in principle on the basis of universal suffrage, he would vote against sub-paragraph (b) of the text proposed in paragraph 1 of the ten-Power amendments because the General Assembly could not recommend that method to the Administering Authorities when they found the measure inadvisable. Canada would also vote against the two Guatemalan amendments, the first of which, even as orally amended, seemed debatable, and the second premature, to say the least.

42. Mr. MUCCIO (United States of America) accepted the oral proposal of the representative of Iraq, to the effect that, in operative paragraph 9 of the United States draft resolution the words "expresses the hope" should be replaced by "recommends". He considered that operative paragraph 8 of the United States draft took full account of the need to determine the population's view, referred to by the representative of Iraq. He still believed that the General Assembly should not go into the detailed procedure for the election of representatives to the Joint Council. Hence, he was unable to accept sub-paragraph (b) of the text proposed in the ten-Power amendments. He proposed, however, by way of compromise, to add at the end of paragraph 5 of his draft resolution the following clause: "and that any elections which might be carried out to select members of this body should be conducted on a free and democratic basis."

43. The United States accepted the Syrian amendment (A/C.4/L.263), but suggested that the Syrian representative should substitute the words "full report" for the words "special report".

44. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) thanked the United States representative for his conciliatory spirit but pointed out that the text just proposed by him would leave it doubtful whether elections to the Joint Council would take place. Iraq would rather maintain the text of sub-paragraph (b) as it appeared in paragraph 1 of the ten-Power amendments.

45. Mr. HUNEIDI (Syria) agreed to the replacement of the words "special report" by the words "full report" in his amendment.

46. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) would like to be sure that the change in wording would not prevent the Ewe and Togoland unification problem from appearing as a separate item in the agenda of the next Assembly session.

47. After an exchange of views in which Mr. HUNEIDI (Syria), Mr. MUCCIO (United States of America), Mr. ELIAV (Israel), Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq), Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium), and the CHAIRMAN took part, Mr. MUCCIO (United States of America) withdrew his suggestion and agreed to incorporate the original text of the Syrian amendment, as contained in document A/C.3/L.263, in his draft resolution.

48. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the revised United States draft resolution (A/C.4/L.256/Rev.1) and the amendments that had been accepted by the United States delegation as well as the amendments that had not been embodied in the draft resolution.

49. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that he would abstain from voting on the preamble to the draft resolution because he did not know what the result of the vote on the operative part would be. He could see no reason for voting for the preamble if he was going to be obliged to vote against the draft resolution as a whole.

The first paragraph of the preamble of the United States draft resolution (A/C.4/L.256/Rev.1) was adopted by 48 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The second paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 43 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

The third paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 43 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

The fourth paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 48 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The fifth paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 43 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

The sixth paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 43 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

The seventh paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 43 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

The text proposed in paragraph 1 of the Guatemalan amendments (A/C.4/L.258), as amended, was adopted by 33 votes to 2, with 13 abstentions, and became the eighth paragraph of the preamble.

The eighth paragraph of the preamble of the United States draft resolution (A/C.4/L.256/Rev.1) was adopted by 48 votes to none, with 1 abstention, and became the ninth paragraph of the draft resolution.

Paragraph 1 of the operative part of the United States draft resolution (A/C.4/L.256/Rev.1) was adopted by 48 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 2 of the operative part was adopted by 44 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Paragraph 3 of the operative part was adopted by 44 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Paragraph 4 of the operative part was adopted by 44 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

50. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote sub-paragraph (b) of the text contained in paragraph 1 of the ten-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.260), which would replace the final phrase of paragraph 5 of the operative part of the United States draft resolution, as amended earlier in the meeting by its author.

51. Mr. MUCCIO (United States of America) requested a roll-call vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria.

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

Abstaining: Uruguay, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Greece, Israel, Norway, Peru, Thailand.

Sub-paragraph (b) was adopted by 29 votes to 10, with 10 abstentions.

Paragraph 5 of the operative part, as amended, was adopted by 32 votes to 8, with 6 abstentions.

52. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 2 of the Guatemalan amendments (A/C.4/L.258) as amended by its author, which would become a new paragraph 6 of the operative part of the draft resolution.

53. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) requested a roll-call vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Egypt, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen, Afghanistan, Burma.

Against: France, Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Dominican Republic, Ecuador.

Abstaining: Greece, Israel, Norway, Peru, Poland, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Denmark.

That paragraph was adopted by 18 votes to 13, with 18 abstentions.

54. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the operative part of the Mexican draft resolution (A/C.4/L.262), which would become a new paragraph to be placed before paragraph 6 of the operative part of the United States draft resolution.

That paragraph was adopted by 42 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

Paragraph 6 of the operative part of the United States draft resolution (A/C.4/L.256/Rev.1) was adopted by 49 votes to none.

Paragraph 7 of the operative part was adopted by 49 votes to none.

Paragraph 8 of the operative part was adopted by 43 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

Paragraph 9 of the operative part, as amended orally by Iraq, was adopted by 48 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 10 of the operative part was adopted by 43 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

Paragraph 11 of the operative part was adopted by 47 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The Syrian amendment (A/C.4/L.263) calling for the addition of a new paragraph at the end of the operative part of the United States draft resolution was adopted by 38 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions.

55. Mr. NAUDY (France) explained that his delegation would gladly have voted in favour of the United States draft resolution in its original or revised form. However, after the addition of sub-paragraph (b) of the text proposed in paragraph 1 of the ten-Power amendments and of the text in paragraph 2 of the Guatemalan amendments, his delegation would be obliged to vote against the amended text of the draft resolution.

56. His delegation's vote would be based on the reasons it had given on several occasions when speaking on the question of the structure of the Joint Council, or when analysing paragraph 2 of the Guatemalan amendments.

57. Accordingly his delegation repeated the reservations it had already expressed on the two proposals adopted.

58. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that he had not voted against paragraph 2 of the Guatemalan amendments because it had obviously been submitted for the best of motives. He had abstained, because the unification movement had gained such proportions amongst the people in both parts of Togoland that no step could now be taken in any other direction unless the population was first consulted. At a time when the population was demanding the unification of the two Territories, independence in five years and, in the interval, United Nations trusteeship, the Assembly could not recommend the negotiation of a new trusteeship agreement to place the two Territories under a single Administering Authority. Such a possibility could certainly be considered later, but only in the circumstances to which he had referred at the 307th meeting.

59. If the population was to be allowed to express itself freely, democratic elections must be organized by secret ballot, with universal suffrage. The Yugo-

slav delegation, together with nine others, had submitted an amendment (A/C.4/L.260, para. 1) to that effect. It was to be hoped that the Administering Authorities, which were well known for their democratic traditions, would meet the wishes of the General Assembly and of the populations of the Territories concerned. Once the people had had the opportunity freely to express their views on the question of the unification of the two Territories, the Assembly could consider granting them immediate independence or placing them under a different form of trusteeship.

60. The Yugoslav delegation would accept the decisions taken on the subject by the Administering Authorities after the necessary consultations and in accordance with the aspirations of the people and with the Charter provisions concerning the Trusteeship System.

61. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the revised United States draft resolution, even in its amended form, was still inadequate because it did not meet the wishes of the petitioners, who were demanding the unification and independence of Togoland. The USSR delegation could, nevertheless, vote in favour of the amended draft resolution as a whole because it contained recommendations designed to meet the wishes of the populations concerned regarding the composition of the Joint Council, its terms of reference and the method of electing its members. The draft resolution recommended that the Council's terms of reference should enable it to examine all the political, economic, social and educational matters affecting the two Trust Territories, including the question of their unification, and to make recommendations on those questions. It also recommended that the Council should be reconstituted by means of direct elections on the basis of universal adult suffrage exercised by secret ballot. Those recommendations met the requests of the petitioners who had represented the Comité de l'Unité Togolaise and the All-Ewe Conference.

62. His delegation had abstained from voting on paragraph 2 of the Guatemalan amendments because it provided for the unification of the two Territories by placing them under a single Administering Authority. Such a measure would not in any way satisfy the aspirations of the peoples concerned who, through their petitioners and through the 2,500-odd petitions submitted to the Visiting Mission, had demanded independence.

63. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) said he had hoped to be able to vote in favour of the revised United States draft resolution. However, in view of the insertion of two amendments which his delegation could not accept, it would be obliged to vote against the draft resolution as a whole.

64. The United Kingdom delegation could not commit its Government to any given method of organizing the Joint Council. The current procedure seemed satisfactory although there was obviously no reason why the Administering Authority should not again consult the political parties.

65. Paragraph 2 of the Guatemalan amendments providing for a revision of the Trusteeship Agreements concerning the two Territories was entirely unjustified.

66. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) said that the question of the Ewes and of Togoland unification had not yet been fully clarified; it would undoubtedly be submitted to the Assembly for some time to come. It was essential, therefore, that Member States should do everything in their power to help to find a concrete solution to the problem.

67. His delegation had voted against paragraph 2 of the Guatemalan amendments because it recommended the revision of Trusteeship Agreements which had already been concluded between the United Nations, on the one hand, and the United Kingdom and France, on the other, and were thus in the nature of treaties. The question of the revision of Trusteeship Agreements had never yet arisen in the General Assembly and his delegation wished to reserve its position on the subject. He hoped that the obstacle of the Guatemalan amendment would be removed in the plenary meeting.

68. His delegation would abstain from voting on the amended draft resolution as a whole because it contained the second Guatemalan amendment; but if that amendment was rejected in the plenary meeting, he would vote in favour of the draft as a whole.

69. Mr. KONDAPI (India) wished to explain why his delegation had voted for the various amendments to the revised United States draft resolution and would vote in favour of the amended text as a whole. It considered that the draft resolution constituted an honest approach to the Ewe and Togoland unification question. He thanked the United States delegation for having accepted sub-paragraph (a) of the text contained in paragraph 1 of the ten-Power amendments, as well as paragraph 2 of those amendments; he regretted however that the United States delegation had been unable to accept sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 1 of those amendments, regarding the reconstitution of the Joint Council.

70. He recalled that, as a result of the 1949 Visiting Mission's report and of the Trusteeship Council's recommendations (resolution 250 (VII)), the Administering Authorities had decided to extend the membership and the terms of reference of the Anglo-French Standing Consultative Commission for Togoland Affairs. However, the chief groups supporting unification had refused to participate fully in the work of the Enlarged Consultative Commission and the Administering Authorities had subsequently decided to set up a joint organ composed of representatives of both Territories.

71. During the sixth session of the Assembly, his delegation had emphasized in the Fourth Committee (240th meeting) the need to create independent legislative organs in the two Territories. It was in that same spirit that it had just voted in favour of the amendment proposing the reconstitution of the Joint Council through direct elections, although, in its opinion, the Committee should not confine its actions to so limited a field.

72. His delegation had voted in favour of paragraph 1 of the Guatemalan amendments because it drew attention to an undeniable factual situation. It had voted for paragraph 2 of the Guatemalan amendments because it constituted a first step towards the establishment of direct United Nations trusteeship over

both parts of Togoland, which his delegation considered to be the ideal solution.

73. The Indian delegation had also voted for the Mexican amendment which was in the nature of an addition. India had consistently supported proposals for the economic development of under-developed areas.

74. Lastly, the Indian delegation had voted for the Syrian amendment because the General Assembly should be enabled to measure the progress made on the matter in the next few months.

75. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) emphasized that paragraph 2 of his amendments was in no way contrary to the aspirations of the peoples of the two Territories. It called for the revision of the existing Trusteeship Agreements in order to bring about the unification of the Territory, but without prejudice to the people's right to independence. It should be borne in mind that one of the fundamental objectives of the Trusteeship System was to promote the gradual advancement of the peoples of the Trust Territories towards independence. Moreover, the petitioners demanding unification of the Territory had asked that it should accede to independence only after five years, thus recognizing that in the meantime it should remain under trusteeship.

76. The Guatemalan amendment did not call for a unilateral revision of the Trusteeship Agreements; it recommended that the two parties directly concerned should explore the possibilities of revising the Trusteeship Agreements and report to the Trusteeship Council on the outcome of those negotiations. The Trusteeship Council and the General Assembly would then have to come to a decision.

77. Mr. PEACHEY (Australia) said that his delegation would have been glad to vote for the revised United States draft resolution, but that it would be compelled to vote against the draft in its amended form mainly because one of the amendments called for the revision of two Trusteeship Agreements. The Australian delegation considered that a very serious step, which should only be taken after a very thorough study of the question. Not enough importance had been given to the fact that the Trusteeship Agreements were treaties concluded with the approval of the United Nations.

78. Mr. CALERO RODRIGUES (Brazil) said that his delegation had voted for paragraph 1 of the Guatemalan amendments, because it merely stated facts set forth by the Visiting Mission in paragraph 401 of its report.

79. Paragraph 2 of the Guatemalan amendments would have helped solve the problem only if the Administering Authorities had shown a disposition to accept the idea that the whole of the Territory should be put under a single authority. That was not, however, the case, and the appeal in the Guatemalan amendment therefore had no chance of success. As the General Assembly's resolutions were not binding and the amendment was merely a request, the Brazilian delegation had abstained in the vote on it.

80. It would vote for the draft resolution as a whole as amended.

81. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that since certain amendments had been incorporated in the revised United States draft resolution, the Belgian delegation could not accept the resolution as a whole. In its amended form, the draft was a direct interference in the administration of the Trust Territories. It contained statements without any foundation, such as the assertion that the vast majority of the people favoured independence. It also contained blatant contradictions, for it recommended the re-establishment of the Joint Council at the same time as it called for revision of the Trusteeship Agreements without prior consultation of the Joint Council. Similarly, it urged the Administering Authorities to bring about a more rapid evolution of the northern parts of both Territories and at the same time recommended the immediate organization of elections by universal suffrage. Those who knew how far the peoples concerned had advanced considered such recommendations absolutely unrealistic.

82. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) was very sorry that he would have to vote against the United States draft resolution in its amended form. His delegation would have voted for it if the Committee had not made two amendments which were utterly unacceptable because they lacked flexibility, were premature and took no account of the opinion of the population.

83. Moreover, the two Administering Authorities could not enter into negotiations with a view to revising the Trusteeship Agreements in accordance with the wishes and aspirations of the population of the Territories because they did not actually know their true wishes and aspirations.

84. Mr. MUCCIO (United States of America) said that his delegation would be forced to vote against the United States draft resolution as a whole because sub-paragraph (b) of the text contained in paragraph 1 of the ten-Power amendments and also paragraph 2 of the Guatemalan amendments had been embodied in it. The United States delegation did not believe that adoption of those two amendments would contribute to a solution of the problem.

85. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the revised United States draft resolution as a whole (A/C.4/L.256/Rev.1), as amended.

86. Mr. EGUIZABAL (El Salvador) asked for a vote by roll-call.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Iraq, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Iraq, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran.

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

Abstaining: Israel, Norway, Peru, Thailand, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 30 votes to 11, with 9 abstentions.

87. Mr. PEACHEY (Australia) said he wished to make a statement, in his capacity as Chairman of the Visiting Mission, in reply to certain remarks concerning the Visiting Mission made in the course of the debate on the Ewe and Togoland unification problem.

88. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) thought that if the Australian representative were allowed to make a statement in his capacity as Chairman of the Visiting Mission after closure of the debate on the Ewe and Togoland unification question, the same privilege should be afforded the members of the Committee who might wish to reply to the remarks of the Chairman of the Visiting Mission.

89. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) pointed out that the Visiting Mission had been subjected to severe and unfair criticism during the debate. There should therefore be no objection to allowing a member of the Mission to reply to that criticism.

90. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) also thought that the Chairman of the Visiting Mission should have full opportunity to reply to the attacks made on the Mission during the debate on the Ewe and Togoland unification question. It was proper for the reply to the charges to be made by the Chairman of the Visiting Mission, speaking in that capacity. That was a matter of principle which might arise in connexion with other visiting missions. The delegation of the Dominican Republic was therefore prepared, if necessary, to suggest that the Australian representative should be authorized to make his statement in his capacity as Chairman of the Visiting Mission.

91. After an exchange of views between Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq), Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala), Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) and Mr. PEACHEY (Australia) on whether the Australian representative should be permitted to make his statement in his capacity as Chairman of the Visiting Mission, the CHAIRMAN proposed that Mr. Peachey should speak when the Fourth Committee discussed the draft report on the Ewe and Togoland unification problem.

It was so decided.

Question of South West Africa

[Item 38]*

92. Mr. CALERO RODRIGUES (Brazil) explained that the Brazilian and the United States delegations had decided to present their joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.257) following a brief exchange of views during which the Iraqi representative had suggested postponing examination of the question to the second part of the session. The authors of the draft, who had been joined by the Salvadorean representative, had not felt that that solution was practical, since the examination and settlement of the question would require a great deal of time. Moreover, the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on South West Africa (A/2261 and Add.1) did not advance proposals that were suffi-

ciently precise and concrete for a brief consideration on the question to be of any real value. He felt that immediate discussion of the question might even jeopardize the success of the negotiations. On the other hand, he would like to make it very clear that only practical reasons moved his delegation to present the draft resolution to the Committee. That draft should not be interpreted as an indication that the interest of the United Nations in the question of South West Africa was diminishing or disappearing.

93. Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand) supported the draft resolution, which was based on obvious considerations. There was not sufficient time before the end of the session for a sufficiently thorough discussion of such a complex and delicate question. The wisdom of the proposal advanced in the draft was all the more apparent since the head of the delegation of the Union of South Africa had stated in a letter addressed to the United Nations (A/2261/Add.1) that if the Fourth Committee saw fit to extend the mandate of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, his Government would undertake to collaborate with the Committee with a view to reaching an agreement on the matter.

94. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) supported the draft resolution not only for the practical reasons that had been expressed but because the Committee could do very little as long as the *Ad Hoc* Committee was negotiating with the Government of the Union of South Africa. He was glad to note that the Government seemed willing to seek a solution with the Committee. If the Committee postponed consideration of the question until the eighth session, it would have a more complete report at its disposal.

95. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) had studied the *Ad Hoc* Committee's report and congratulated the Committee on the manner in which it had accomplished its task in spite of the difficulties it had encountered. The report mentioned the points on which the Government of the Union of South Africa and the *Ad Hoc* Committee had been able to reach agreement and those on which negotiations should be continued. It might well be advisable to await the result of those negotiations on the pending questions, since it was quite possible that the next report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee would contain new material which would provide fuller information for the Committee's consideration of the question. The Dominican delegation would therefore support the draft resolution before the Committee.

96. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the United Nations had been concerned with the question of South West Africa for seven years. The question had arisen because the Government of the Union of South Africa had violated the provisions of the Charter and disregarded the principle of the International Trusteeship System. To postpone the consideration and settlement of that question still another year would further prejudice the International Trusteeship System and weaken the relevant provisions of the Charter. The USSR delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

97. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) would vote for the draft resolution but emphasized that his delegation's positions of principle remained unchanged.

98. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) found it difficult to express an opinion on the draft resolution, since it was not yet known whether there would be a second part of the session and whether the opening date of the regular sessions would be advanced.

99. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) felt that the decisions of the General Assembly concerning its future sessions had little bearing on the matter. Even if there should be a second part of the session, it was doubtful whether in such a short time the negotiations could achieve results that would warrant consideration of the question by the Fourth Committee.

100. Mr. TAJIBNAPIS (Indonesia) shared the opinion of the Iraqi representative.

101. He had heard that certain letters had been sent to the Chairman of the Fourth Committee by the Reverend Michael Scott and asked whether the Committee members could not be appraised of their contents.

102. Mr. BUNCHE (Secretary of the Committee) stated that the Reverend Michael Scott had sent the Chairman of the Fourth Committee a letter dated 7 December 1952, and two letters dated 15 December 1952. In his letter of 7 December, he had said that if no inhabitant of South West Africa was able to appear before the General Assembly during its present session, he was prepared to present his views orally to the Committee if it so desired.

103. In his letter of 15 December, the Reverend Michael Scott had asked to be allowed to return to South West Africa to consult those who had sent him to New York, correct any misunderstandings that had arisen, report on the performance of his mission and answer for the acts of which he had been accused. The Reverend Michael Scott had stated that he was sending the same request to the head of the delegation of the Union of South Africa.

104. Mr. Bunche noted that the passages which he had cited were only part of the communications in question.

105. Mr. TAJIBNAPIS (Indonesia) said that the communications placed the Committee and his delegation in a difficult position since negotiations were being conducted with the Government of the Union of South Africa. If the Committee adopted the draft resolution before it, the Reverend Michael Scott's communications should be transmitted to the *Ad Hoc* Committee on South West Africa.

106. The CHAIRMAN said that the Reverend Michael Scott had himself already transmitted those communications to the *Ad Hoc* Committee.

107. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) also considered that no further decision of the Committee was needed to bring those communications before the *Ad Hoc* Committee. He also confirmed that his Government thought that consideration of the questions in dispute should be continued.

108. Mr. MUCCIO (United States of America) felt that the primary concern should be to continue the existence of the *Ad Hoc* Committee by adopting the draft resolution.

109. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) said that he might have been able to vote for the draft resolution if he had not learned of the Reverend Michael Scott's communications. As the draft did not take those communications into account, he would now be obliged to vote against it.

110. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) proposed that the words "until its eighth regular session" in the joint draft resolution should be replaced by the words "until the second part of its seventh session".

The Yugoslav amendment was rejected by 22 votes to 12, with 4 abstentions.

111. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) requested a vote by roll-call on the joint draft resolution.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Panama, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Canada, China, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan.

Against: Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Iraq.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, India, Indonesia, Iran, Mexico.

The draft resolution was adopted by 27 votes to 8, with 5 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 8.45 p.m.