

GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

INDEX UNIT

4



FOURTH COMMITTEE 233rd

MEETING

Friday, 21 December 1951, at 10.30 a.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

## CONTENTS

Page

Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/1856) (continued) .....	209
--	-----

Chairman : Mr. Max HENRÍQUEZ UREÑA (Dominican Republic).

**Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/1856) (continued)**

[Item 12]\*

THE EWE PROBLEM (A/C.4/195, ADD.1 AND ADD.2,  
A/C.4/198) (continued)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Ajavon and Mr. Grunitzky, representatives of the Parti togolais du progrès and Mr. Fousséni, representative of the Union des chefs et des populations du nord du Togo sous administration française, took places at the Committee table.

1. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) wished to reply to certain comments made by Mr. Sylvanus Olympio, representative of the All-Ewe Conference. Mr. Olympio had criticized the terms of reference of the proposed joint council as set forth in paragraph 4 of the Anglo-French memorandum (A/C.4/198), which referred to development plans for the frontier areas and the amelioration of conditions caused by the existence of the frontier. Sir Alan pointed out that it was precisely the existence of the frontier which had created the problem. He had been Governor of the Gold Coast when the matter had first come up, and he could assure the Committee that at that time it had been simply an economic question. Mr. Olympio had also said that the proposed joint council did not differ in any way from the earlier enlarged Standing Consultative Commission for Togoland Affairs. Actually, there were two fundamental differences between them: first, the Council could deal with political matters of common concern and, secondly, it would be responsible for administering the funds which might be placed at its disposal.

2. In reply to Mr. Antor's critical remarks concerning the central and local government institutions in Togoland under British administration, Sir Alan said he would confine himself to speaking of the southern part of the Territory, which had a population of 200,000, since this appeared to be the only part in which Mr. Antor

was interested. The southern part of the Territory had three seats in the Legislative Assembly of the Gold Coast. Two were held by members elected by the rural divisions and the other by a member elected by the Southern Togoland Council. In the rural divisions, elections were carried out in two stages, by universal suffrage and secret ballot. In Southern Togoland, about 30 per cent of the electors had applied for registration on the roll of electors, roughly the same percentage as in the Gold Coast—sufficient evidence to rebut Mr. Antor's allegation that only foreigners had registered—even though in the region of Atando, where Mr. Antor was active, the latter's appeals against registration had met with some success. The principles on which the new electoral system was based seemed to guarantee its representative and democratic nature and ensure that the views of the majority would prevail, and possibly for that reason the system displeased Mr. Antor.

3. So far as local government was concerned, Sir Alan explained that the Territory was in a phase of transition from the system of Native Authorities to the new system of district councils and local councils, two-thirds of whose members would be elected by universal suffrage and secret ballot, and one-third chosen from among the traditional authorities. Mr. Antor had criticized the Native Authorities. Those Authorities were composed partly of traditional chiefs and partly of progressive members of the community chosen by the population. The system had proved very effective during the evolution of the tribal system towards a modern and democratic organization of society. The region of Atando again was the one place where the Native Authorities had failed to work satisfactorily owing to local disputes. It was to be hoped that the people would adapt themselves better to the new system.

4. Proceeding to deal with the question of the Gold Coast Cocoa Marketing Board, Sir Alan pointed out that Togoland's cocoa production accounted for only 8 per cent of the aggregate produced by Togoland and the Gold Coast combined, as the Trusteeship Council's

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

report showed (A/1856, p.165). He also drew attention to the Trusteeship Council's conclusions and recommendations on that question, as contained in the report (A/1856, p. 167 and 168). Mr. Antor's real complaint was that a separate marketing board had not been established for Togoland; but quite possibly a small independent board handling only comparatively insignificant quantities of cocoa might not meet with the same acceptance and respect on the world market as the Gold Coast Cocoa Marketing Board, which was in a sound and stable position by reason of its large reserves. Whatever advantages a separate board might bring to a few individuals, it could not serve the interests of Togoland farmers so well as the Gold Coast Cocoa Marketing Board. Mr. Antor had also mentioned the fact that the Board had recently been placed under the control of the Government of the Gold Coast. Sir Alan pointed out that when he was Governor of the Gold Coast he had had a good deal to do with installing a marketing board independent of government. Since then the Gold Coast had advanced politically and its internal affairs were almost exclusively in the hands of Africans. If the African Ministers felt that the Board should be placed under their control, there was no reason why Mr. Antor should find fault with such a step. Indeed, the question of the Cocoa Marketing Board was quite irrelevant to the problem under consideration.

5. Mr. Antor had represented himself as being the spokesman of the Joint Togoland Congress and had tried to convey the impression that he was acting for all the principal sections of the populations of both Trust Territories. Yet all the documents and all the individual testimonials Mr. Antor had used in 1950 to support his statements before United Nations bodies had come from only one small area around Atando, in the southern part of Togoland under British administration. That area represented a twelfth of the whole Territory at most, and even if it were assumed that Mr. Antor enjoyed considerable support among the people in the south, the northern part of the Territory was being overlooked.

6. In reply to a question Mr. Antor had stated that the Dagomba problem was not very important, that the tribe was not very large and had never taken a definite stand on the question of unification. Sir Alan pointed out that the aspirations of the northern peoples for unification with their brothers in the Gold Coast had decisively influenced the delimitation of frontiers at the time of the creation of the Mandates. As the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa had confirmed in its report,<sup>1</sup> the northern peoples had never asked for anything but closer union with the Gold Coast. The 1950 annual report on Togoland under British administration<sup>2</sup> showed that the area of the Trust Territory inhabited by the Dagombas contained

more than 100,000 inhabitants and the Mamprusis in the Territory numbered more than 71,000. Since the total Ewe population of Togoland under British administration amounted to 113,000, it was wrong to maintain that the Dagomba question was of only slight importance. Furthermore, the Ewes themselves were not united; it was precisely because the populations of Togoland had different aspirations that the Administering Authorities were convinced that no unification plan which they might put forward would be likely to meet with the approval of the majority of the indigenous population.

7. Accordingly, the two Administering Authorities had submitted the proposals contained in their joint memorandum. They were convinced that the joint council would be able to do a great deal for the Ewes and other elements of the population if it could rely on their collaboration. Conversely, should the population fail to collaborate, the proposals made by the two Authorities would be doomed to failure. Those proposals had been made after a careful study of the situation. Sir Alan urged the Committee to show by its decision how much confidence it placed in the goodwill of the Administering Authorities.

8. Mr. AJAVON (*Parti togolais du progrès*) explained that his party had about 40,000 members, not taking into account the members of the *Union des chefs et des populations du Nord du Togo sous administration française*, which represented almost the entire population of the north. His party's programme was to collaborate with the Administering Authorities in promoting the economic, social and political advancement of Togoland so that it might progressively develop towards independence as a member of the French Union. The most important among the many problems in the Territories was that of the unification of the Ewes. At the local level, "unification" meant the unification of the two Togolands, not that of the Ewe people. At the international level, the two interpretations had become so intimately merged that they raised many problems which had finally obscured the actual substance of the question.

9. Mr. Sylvanus Olympio, representative of the All-Ewe Conference, had said at the Trusteeship Council's seventh session<sup>3</sup> that his supporters were not asking for the unification of the two Trust Territories, but for the unification of the Ewe people. Mr. Olympio was an Ewe and wished to be nothing but an Ewe; hence he could not be interested in the rest of Togoland. Mr. Ajavon said he would accept unification as so defined provided, however, that it was a final and not a provisional arrangement. Only after the restoration of the former Togoland as it had been constituted during the German occupation would the populations of the territory be able to demand the unification of the Ewes under a single Togoland administration. It was absurd to base an entire political system on a common language. That conception of Ewe unification revealed an outmoded point of view and furthermore,

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Trusteeship Council, Seventh Session, Supplement No. 2, Report on Togoland under British administration.*

<sup>2</sup> See *Report by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the General Assembly of the United Nations on the Administration of Togoland under United Kingdom Trusteeship for the Year 1950.*

<sup>3</sup> See *Official Records of the Trusteeship Council, Seventh Session, 20th meeting.*

would deprive the northern tribes of any access to the sea, an injustice which the more progressive inhabitants could not tolerate.

10. As the Trusteeship Council dealt only with questions affecting the Trust Territories, its competence did not extend to colonies like the Gold Coast or Dahomey. Accordingly, the request that part of the Gold Coast should be ceded to form the hypothetical Ewe state concerned only the United Kingdom Government and the Government of the Gold Coast, on the one hand, and the All-Ewe Conference, on the other.

11. He had learned recently that the Ewe question had reached the stage where it was no longer confined to Togoland, since there was talk of an African federation. While it was true that there happened to be a geographical area inhabited by peoples with the same customs and similar languages, it was also true that through colonization a group of people of different races and customs had been forced to live together for several generations and a sort of national consciousness had developed among them. Hence, an attempt to create an Ewe state would jeopardize the very existence of the rest of the community. Most of the populations had favoured the maintenance of Togoland as an entity.

12. Fortunately, Mr. Olympio's ideas coincided with those of the *Parti togolais du progrès* when he said that he had never visualized a unified Ewe state or a unified Togoland cut off from the rest of West Africa, and recalled that Africa had been divided not by Africans but by Europeans. Thus, for the first time since the Ewe problem had arisen, the representative of the All-Ewe Conference was implicitly admitting that a tribal state could be viable only if it was incorporated in an economically strong entity. But the *Parti togolais du progrès* parted company with Mr. Antor when the latter said that, for the moment, he was asking only independence or autonomy, so that the peoples concerned might themselves settle the problem of unification at a later date; for it was questionable whether Togoland was in a position to preserve its independence once it had acquired it. Political independence depended on economic independence, but Togoland was basically an agricultural country. The resources necessary for preserving independence were so large that even the great nations were compelled to surrender part of their sovereignty and associate with others in order to form economically strong groups. As Togoland's resources were limited, it had to become a member of an economic partnership. Such a partnership existed: the French Union, which in addition to administrative autonomy offered Togoland the advantage of being able to retain its international character.

13. Immediate and full independence was impossible because Togoland had no trained indigenous personnel. Draft legislation to establish, by 1952, a legislative assembly elected by universal suffrage, with an executive council, was under consideration. Togoland should also be provided with an administrative and economic framework by the formation of a body of indigenous higher officials similar to the higher civil servants in metropolitan France.

14. He asked the members of the Committee to urge both Administering Authorities to try to institute such reforms as soon as possible. If those reforms were actually put into effect, they would help the country more than any sterile agitation. Constructive work could be done only in peace.

15. Mr. FOUSSENI (*Union des chefs et des populations du nord du Togo sous administration française*) said he was taking the floor to give the Committee such further particulars as it might require in order to take a considered decision in due course on the obviously complex problem with which it was faced.

16. He himself was racially a pure Togolander, without any ethnic ties with the peoples of the neighbouring territories, and he had been asked as Assistant Secretary of the *Union des chefs et des populations du nord* to convey that organization's views to the Fourth Committee. He wished, therefore, to explain to the Committee the views of the chiefs of northern Togoland on the Ewe question and their attitude to any possible rearrangement of the two Trust Territories, and then to suggest a solution which paid due regard to the facts.

17. In the first place, the peoples of northern Togoland under French administration had originally misunderstood the nature of the Ewe question. After 1947 however—the year of the election of Mr. Aku, of the *Unité togolaise*, to the National Assembly of the French Republic—the Ewe movement had taken on a distinctly particularist colour, and the chiefs of northern Togoland had realized that the *Unité togolaise* was not interested in defending the interests of all the inhabitants of Togoland, but was, rather, following a separatist policy. They had therefore left that party and associated themselves with the *Parti togolais du progrès*, whose programme covered all the ethnic elements which made up the population of Togoland.

18. While the opposition of the chiefs and peoples of the northern region to the Ewe movement had never taken violent form, it was none the less real. It was due both to the need for self-defence *vis-à-vis* the upstart pretensions of a tribal minority with which the peoples of the north had for sixty-five years been living in one homogeneous country, and to the desire to preserve the unity of Togoland and ensure that the people as a whole should together progress towards political emancipation. It was for that reason that those chiefs and peoples had formed an association with the special object of defending the collective interests of the peoples of the north, in the same spirit as the *Parti togolais du progrès*, which recognized no distinction between the various ethnic groups constituting the population of Togoland.

19. The chiefs and peoples of northern Togoland under French administration fervently desired that Togoland, which had been divided since 1919 should be reunited in one and the same entity; but since the two Trust Territories were being administered on behalf of the United Nations by different Powers, it was difficult to see how they were to be unified. That problem, which was in the minds of all inhabitants of Togoland, had been discussed at length by the Enlarged

Consultative Commission; but the Commission had failed to find a final solution, having only come to the conclusion that it would be preferable for the two parts of Togoland to continue to be administered by the existing Authorities, in view of the dangers of an abrupt and premature unification of the two Territories.

20. The wisest course would certainly be to accelerate the political, economic, social and cultural advancement of the peoples of Togoland so that they might attain full maturity as rapidly as possible and so attain self-government, or even independence, after a harmonious amalgamation of all the ethnic groups. When that stage had been reached, the possibility of a union of the two Trust Territories, in the form of a federation, might be contemplated. But such political unity would have to be prepared forthwith by the establishment of an organization which encouraged the formation of close economic and social links between the two Territories.

21. Mr. INGLES (Philippines), noting that Mr. Ajavon was being heard for the first time by a United Nations body, asked what exactly his position was in the *Parti togolais du progrès*. He had been under the impression that Mr. Pedro Olympio, who had made statements to the Trusteeship Council, was the party's chief spokesman in the United Nations. Perhaps he had left the party; if so, it would be interesting to know if he had left it of his own free will or had been excluded from it.

22. Mr. AJAVON (*Parti togolais du progrès*) explained that Mr. Pedro Olympio had had to leave the *Parti togolais du progrès* for purely internal party reasons. He (himself) had consequently succeeded Mr. Olympio as the official spokesman of the party in the United Nations, and was now also President of the party.

23. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) asked if Mr. Ajavon belonged to the Ewe tribe, if he was a French citizen and if he had ever held an administrative post.

24. Mr. AJAVON (*Parti togolais du progrès*) felt that such personal questions were somewhat irrelevant to the subject under discussion. He replied, however, that he was a French citizen, but that he had been born in Togoland and that he was a Mina, a race now absorbed by the Ewes.

25. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) said he had asked the representative of the *Parti togolais du progrès* those questions in order to discover why he opposed the Ewe unification movement.

26. The Philippine representative was under the impression that, while the *Parti togolais du progrès* favoured unification, it took the view that it could not materialize until the two Territories had achieved independence. The party also held that Togoland under French administration could not by itself constitute a viable state. It would seem to follow, therefore, that the Territory would not be able to achieve independence, which suggested that all possibility of unification was excluded.

27. Mr. AJAVON (*Parti togolais du progrès*) felt that perhaps he should once again describe the broad lines of the policy of the *Parti togolais du progrès* on the Ewe

question. The party opposed the unification of the Ewes if such unification took the form of creating an Ewe state, which would deprive the northern part of Togoland under French administration of all access to the sea; but it favoured the unification of the Ewes if it were carried out as part of a reconstituted Togoland.

28. The *Parti togolais du progrès* wanted Togoland to become independent, but felt that if independence came prematurely and without sufficient preparation, the country would run into very serious difficulties. Accordingly, the party proposed that Togoland should immediately be given institutions of government—a legislative assembly and an executive council responsible to the latter—which would permit the country to start upon its political apprenticeship. A staff of responsible administrative officers, similar to the civil service of metropolitan France, should also be formed, so that young Togolandese who were university graduates could be appointed to administrative posts in Togoland.

29. Answering the Philippine representative, he said that he had explained before that a country must be economically independent if it was to enjoy genuine political independence. Togoland was mainly an agricultural country, but if it were included in a powerful economic group, it would be able to attain true independence.

30. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) said he gathered that, in the opinion of the *Parti togolais du progrès*, Togoland under French administration could form a viable independent state if it were part of a powerful economic group, such as the French Union. But would it not be possible to reach a similar result if the two Territories were integrated in an association which was not the French Union?

31. Mr. AJAVON (*Parti togolais du progrès*) said it would be theoretically possible. A unified Togoland would certainly have greater strength both economically and in terms of manpower than each of the two Territories would have separately. He had mentioned the French Union because it fitted with the facts and with the programme of the party he represented.

32. Mr. MANTILLA (Ecuador) asked what were the principal objects of the party and if the majority of its members belonged to the Ewe tribe.

33. Mr. AJAVON (*Parti togolais du progrès*) replied that the party's executive board consisted of fourteen persons, twelve of whom were Ewes, the remaining two being from Dahomey. The party's policy was to collaborate with the Administering Authority in order to ensure the Territory's political, economic, social and cultural advancement and so lead it rapidly towards independence as a member of the French Union.

34. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) inquired whether the representatives of the *Parti togolais du progrès* considered that the unification of the two Trust Territories would satisfy the Dagombas, who apparently wished to be united with the Gold Coast Dagombas.

35. Mr. GRUNITZKY (*Parti togolais du progrès*) said that normally the Dagombas would have been agreeable to the unification of the two Territories but that one of the results of the claims put forward by the Ewes had been to stir up regional nationalism. As a consequence the Dagombas had tended to form closer relationships with the populations of the Gold Coast with whom they had ethnic links. That was not the correct way of putting the problem. Togoland was a territorial unit in which various peoples had come to live together through the accident of colonial conquest. Through living together they had gradually developed a Togoland national consciousness, and it would be very regrettable to allow the narrow and partisan claims of any one tribe to threaten that national spirit and to bring about the disintegration of the territorial entity of Togoland.

36. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) asked whether the representatives of the *Parti togolais du progrès* felt that the membership of the proposed joint council would ensure equitable representation for the main groups in both Territories and give them equal opportunity to express their views. It would be in the interests of the Administering Authorities as well as of the population for the new body to be truly representative.

37. Mr. GRUNITZKY (*Parti togolais du progrès*) said his party had always desired the establishment of an organ in which all groups would be able to express their views; the Ewes, who were numerically a minority, should not continually claim a majority.

38. Mr. AJAVON (*Parti togolais du progrès*) thought that the principal parties should enter into consultation with a view to reaching a solution of the Togoland problem and should make suitable proposals. So far as Togoland under French administration was concerned, the following parties should take part in such consultations: the *Unité togolaise*, the *Parti togolais du progrès* and the *Union des chefs et des populations du nord*, who represented well-nigh all the views expressed in the Territory; the parties of Togoland under British administration should also send delegates to take part in the conversations.

39. Mr. Ajavon pointed out that his remarks were guided by concern for the interests of Togoland as a whole.

40. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that it was the Committee's duty to try to satisfy everybody. Accordingly, he inquired if the representatives of the *Parti togolais du progrès* considered that the proposed composition of the joint council would offer all important groups in both Territories an opportunity to be heard.

41. Mr. AJAVON (*Parti togolais du progrès*) thought that establishment of a joint council might be tried: if it failed, the solution advocated by the *Parti togolais du progrès* might be adopted.

42. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) believed that it was in the interests of the United Kingdom and France for the joint council to be as representative as possible of all sections of the population. It would of course be difficult to ensure accurate proportional representation

of all parties in that body. He would like to know whether, without such proportional representation, there would be any assurance that all important groups would have the opportunity to present their views. In that way, a solution could be reached through conciliation among all the parties concerned.

43. Mr. DE PAIVA LEITE (Brazil) asked whether the representatives of the *Parti togolais du progrès* had had the opportunity of examining the joint Anglo-French memorandum and whether it had been studied by the party officials in Togoland.

44. Mr. AJAVON (*Parti togolais du progrès*) replied in the negative. He added that, since his arrival in Paris, he had not had time to study carefully all the documents relating to the question and all its aspects.

45. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that, in the circumstances, he would not press Mr. Ajavon to give the information requested immediately.

46. Mr. DE PAIVA LEITE (Brazil) asked whether the petitioners were familiar with the statements made by Mr. Aku, Mr. Antor and Mr. Sylvanus Olympio at the recent meetings of the Fourth Committee, particularly their remarks on the method of electing the members of the proposed joint council and its terms of reference.

47. Mr. GRUNITZKY (*Parti togolais du progrès*) replied that he and his colleagues were familiar with their compatriots' statements. He would, however, refrain from commenting on their attitude towards the Administering Authorities. He merely recalled that the method of voting in two stages had been applied in the election of members of the Enlarged Consultative Commission, after consultation between the Commissioner of the Republic and the *Comité de l'Unité togolaise* and the *Parti togolais du progrès*. At the time, Mr. Sylvanus Olympio, representing the *Comité de l'Unité togolaise*, had agreed that that voting procedure should be used. During the electoral campaign, when the *Comité de l'Unité togolaise* realized that it was losing ground, it had demanded elections by universal suffrage. The *Parti togolais du progrès*, for its part, was not afraid of any method of voting. In that connexion, Mr. Grunitzky said he regretted that his compatriots had charged him with being a lackey of the Administration who had been elected by fraudulent means. That charge was patently false and he protested against it energetically. It was because he had won the confidence of the Togoland people that he was now a representative of his country in the French National Assembly.

48. With specific reference to the method of electing the members of the proposed joint council and to its terms of reference, Mr. Grunitzky pointed out that, however perfect the measures suggested might appear in theory, they would prove satisfactory only in so far as they were applied with good will.

49. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) asked Mr. Fousséni what kind of an organization he represented, how many chiefs were members, what its policy was, how often it met and to what extent the Administering Authority had facilitated its establishment.

50. Mr. FOUSSENI (*Union des chefs et des populations du nord du Togo sous administration française*) replied that his party had been founded after the Ewe problem had arisen, to safeguard the collective interests of the peoples of the north, who did not tolerate any discrimination among the various ethnic groups. The organization was composed of twelve principal chiefs and an undetermined number of local chiefs, who met at least three times each month.

51. Moreover, and quite rightly, the Administering Authority had had no part in the establishment or development of the party; the party enjoyed full freedom of expression and assembly, freely represented the peoples of the north and was therefore sole master of its fate.

52. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) asked how the organization had been informed that it had been granted a hearing before the Committee and whether Mr. Fousséni held the position of chief.

53. Mr. AJAVON (*Parti togolais du progrès*) said that he had received a telegram from Mr. Grunitzky informing him of the hearing and had then sent a telegram to the *Union des chefs et des populations du nord* asking it to send a delegate to Paris.

54. Mr. FOUSSENI (*Union des chefs et des populations du nord du Togo sous administration française*) replied that he was not himself a chief. He had been sent to Paris as a delegate from North Togoland and as Assistant Secretary of the *Union des chefs et des populations du nord*.

55. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) asked what instructions Mr. Fousséni had received from his principals and when he had received them.

56. Mr. FOUSSENI (*Union des chefs et des populations du nord du Togo sous administration française*) replied that he had been requested to represent the *Union des chefs et des populations du nord* because he was well-informed on the whole question. In May 1951 he had taken part in the work of the Enlarged Consultative Commission. He had been appointed representative by the Paramount Chief at Sokodé as soon as the telegram had been received; there had not been time to consult all the chiefs in the north and receive their instructions. In any case, he had full knowledge of their opinions and he stressed the fact that the chiefs were in complete agreement. Briefly, his instructions were to uphold his party's views on the Ewe problem.

57. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) believed that Mr. Fousséni had expressed himself in favour of the unification of Togoland, although he had feared it might be difficult to achieve owing to the the Administering Authorities. He wondered if Mr. Fousséni thought that unification might be achieved if those differences were resolved.

58. Mr. FOUSSENI (*Union des chefs et des populations du nord du Togo sous administration française*) pointed out that he had dealt at length with that question in the second part of his statement, and in so doing had merely given faithful expression to the opinion of his

party. He would therefore reply in the affirmative to the Philippine representative's question.

59. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) was surprised that Mr. Fousséni's colleagues had replied to some of the rather personal questions put by the Philippine representative.

60. Furthermore, and although he realized that the joint Anglo-French memorandum had not yet been examined by the *Parti togolais du progrès*, he would like to know Mr. Ajavon's opinion on that document, even if it were only his first impression.

61. Mr. AJAVON (*Parti togolais du progrès*) regretted that he was unable to give an official answer to that question until he had made a thorough study of all the details of the case.

62. Mr. LAWRENCE (Liberia) called attention to the telegram dated 18 December 1951, mentioned in document A/C.4/195/Add.2, paragraph 2, according to which the *Parti togolais du progrès* rejected inclusion within the French Union. In his statement, Mr. Ajavon had made it clear that his party desired the independence of the Territory within the framework of the French Union. Mr. Lawrence would therefore like to know whether the telegram in question had been sent by someone authorized by the party, or whether there were divergent views, or even a split, within the party.

63. Mr. AJAVON (*Parti togolais du progrès*) confirmed the fact that his party had from the outset desired the inclusion of Togoland within the French Union when it ceased to be a Trust Territory. It would be for the people of Togoland to make the decision on that point at the appropriate time. The policy had not changed; Mr. Aquereburu and Mr. Brenner, the alleged signatories to the telegram, fully agreed with the party's views. Mr. Ajavon wished formally to question the authenticity of the telegram.

64. Mr. BALLARD (Australia) requested that the statements of Mr. Grunitzky, Mr. Ajavon and Mr. Fousséni should be published as Fourth Committee documents.

*It was so decided.*

65. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) and Mr. STEYAERT (Belgium) said they would not press for an oral reply from the petitioners to the questions from their delegations, as the petitioners had requested time to make a thorough study of all details of the case before replying.

66. The CHAIRMAN announced that the hearing of the petitioners had ended. At its following meeting the Committee would resume examination of the substance of the Ewe problem.

67. He thanked Mr. Ajavon, Mr. Grunitzky and Mr. Fousséni for their contribution to the Committee's work.

*Mr. Ajavon and Mr. Grunitzky, representatives of the Parti togolais du progrès, and Mr. Fousséni, representative of the Union des chefs et des populations du nord du Togo sous administration française, withdrew.*

68. Mr. TAJIBNAPIS (Indonesia) recalled that the Committee had reserved its position on the question of a possible hearing for the *Association des étudiants togolais*. The Committee would see that the letter from that Association (A/C.4/199) provided all necessary information and that the petitioners were not pressing for a hearing. He therefore proposed that the Committee should merely note that communication.

*It was so decided.*

69. Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) thought that a

mistake had been made in the *Journal of the United Nations* as regards the time limit for the submission of draft resolutions concerning item 12 of the General Assembly's agenda. The *Journal* gave the date as 3 January 1952, whereas the date the Committee had decided upon at its 232nd meeting was 4 January 1952.

70. The CHAIRMAN confirmed that the Committee had decided upon 4 January as the date. He requested the Secretariat to make the necessary correction.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.