

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



FOURTH COMMITTEE, 288th

MEETING

Tuesday, 2 December 1952, at 10.30 a.m.

Headquarters, New York

CONTENTS

	Page
Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/2150) (<i>continued</i>)	275

Chairman: Mr. Rodolfo MUNOZ (Argentina).

Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/2150)
(*continued*)

[Item 12]*

HEARING OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MERU CITIZENS
UNION (A/C.4/221, A/C.4/L.242) (*continued*)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Japhet and Mr. Seaton, representatives of the Meru Citizens Union, took places at the Committee table.

1. Mr. JAPHET (Meru Citizens Union) said that the United Kingdom representative had suggested at the 287th meeting that the Meru tribe was opposing progress and development in the Territory by its stubborn conservatism and that it was unwilling or unable to recognize the public benefits that would result from the development of a cattle-ranching and meat and dairy industry in Tanganyika. The Wa-Meru were not opposed to economic planning or to the development of a meat and dairy industry. What they opposed was the decision to develop such an industry on racial lines and the exclusion of any participation by Africans. The United Kingdom representative had regretted that the Administering Authority's scheme had been described as racially discriminatory, but it was difficult to see how else it could be described when no reason had been given for depriving Africans of the opportunity to participate in it. Large-scale cattle-ranching by Africans was not an impossibility given the proper training and encouragement. Indeed participation in the scheme might be the best way of introducing Africans to modern, scientific agricultural methods and improving their standards of living.

2. The United Kingdom representative had drawn attention to the primitive conditions existing in Africa before the arrival of civilization in the form of European settlement. Similar conditions had at one time or another existed in every European country. They had been eliminated through education and better scientific techniques. The Africans, too, wished for education of all kinds and better standards of living and culture.

3. In view of the lack of time at the Committee's disposal, he would not reply to all the assertions made by the United Kingdom representative or contained in the White Paper¹ which he considered were not in accordance with the facts. He would like to mention, however, that he had a letter from the District Commissioner in Arusha admitting that certain cattle had been slaughtered by the police for rations. Many of the assertions contained in paragraphs 15 to 20 of the White Paper could be rebutted in that way.

4. With regard to the assertion that more land had been taken from Europeans for Africans than from Africans for Europeans, the total area of the Ngare-Nanyuki lands from which 3,000 Meru people had been evicted was 78,000 acres. The total area of the European farms to be returned to the Meru people was 10,900 acres. All the farms belonged to German owners who, with one exception, had not occupied them since 1939 or even 1914. When the Germans had left the Territory during the First or Second World War, their farms and livestock had been taken over by the Custodian of Enemy Property. Some of the farms had been sold to European settlers, the proceeds going to the Treasury for war damages or reparations. Other farms had been set aside for African tribes such as the Chagga and the Meru. The Chagga had received 11,000 acres, but no one had suggested that they should give up any of their land on that account.

5. The Africans had been told that the reversion of the farms to them was intended to relieve their acute land shortage and was the Government's response to their repeated requests for the return of some of the alienated land. There was no connexion between the return of 10,900 acres to the Meru tribe and the scheme to take from it 78,000 acres in the Ngare-Nanyuki area in order to consolidate European holdings there.

6. The Tanganyika Legislative Council was not a representative body. Its members were chosen at random by the Administering Authority, not elected by individuals or groups. None of them had taken the

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

¹ See *The Meru Land Problem*, White Paper, Legislative Council of Tanganyika, Government Printer, Dar-es Salaam, 1952.

trouble to visit Ngare-Nanyuki or Kingori before agreeing to pass the special legislation authorizing the Government to evict the Meru people by force. Nor had they met any members of the tribe or replied to letters from the tribe protesting against the proposed scheme. They were obviously representatives of the Administering Authority, not of the people of Tanganyika.

7. The United Kingdom representative had said that the Administering Authority would be in a difficult position if the General Assembly recommended the return of the lands to the Meru tribe. That could have been avoided had the Administering Authority agreed to the Meru tribe's request to suspend eviction pending consideration of the petition (T/Pet.2/99 and Add.1 to 7) by the United Nations. The Wa-Meru, however, had been evicted only a few days before the Trusteeship Council heard the oral statement by representatives of the petitioners.

8. Fortunately the Europeans to whom the land had been allocated had shown some hesitation in taking it up, presumably because they felt that the General Assembly might recommend that it should be returned. No real inconvenience would therefore be caused to anyone if the lands were returned, whereas the Wa-Meru would be inconvenienced if they were not. Failure to return the land would cause disillusionment, frustration and resentment to all Africans in Tanganyika. Many individuals of all races shared the Meru tribe's grief at its hardships, and its hope in the United Nations. The Wa-Meru had received great moral and some financial support from their Church. Indian traders living in the district had expressed their sympathy and some Europeans had voiced their dislike of the principle of removing Africans from their land by force in order to give it to European settlers. The Meru tribe and its sympathizers hoped that the General Assembly would not disappoint them.

9. Mr. TAJIBNAPIS (Indonesia) introduced a draft resolution sponsored by his delegation together with the delegations of El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Liberia, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and Syria (A/C.4/L.242).

10. At the previous meeting the United Kingdom representative had reproached the Indonesian delegation, among others, for being over-hasty in drafting a resolution. Each delegation was sole judge of its actions and their timing and any attempt to restrict that concept must be considered an infringement of the inherent rights of delegations and, consequently, improper. It was not true that his delegation had not been in possession of the essential facts on the previous day. The questioning had been drawing to a close and the members of the Committee had before them the Trusteeship Council's report (A/2150) and records on the matter² and the United Kingdom Government's White Paper. He therefore felt that the remarks of the representative of the United Kingdom had been unwarranted.

11. The most vital issue for the advancement of the Trust Territories—and many other territories—was land and land policy. Land was the principal eco-

nomie resource of almost every Trust Territory; its disposal and use were the key to the economic prosperity of the people and to their political and social development. Equitably shared and used for the common good, the land produced not only food and the commodities of trade but much more intangible crops such as security, tolerance and mature citizenship. But if policies dictated or influenced by greed, inequity, racial or social privilege, or short-sighted expediency were applied to the distribution and use of land, the harvest would be one-sided poverty, smouldering grievances, suspicion, distrust and hatred.

12. Those were familiar truths which should be axiomatic in the United Nations approach to the problem of under-developed peoples, especially in the Trust Territories, where the United Nations had specific responsibilities and the land question was complicated by past errors and neglect. The United Nations' supervisory role over the Trust Territories required it not merely to affirm general truths and guiding principles but, to the limits of its influence, to ensure that they were applied. It was in specific cases rather than generalities that the United Nations met the real test of its effectiveness. He regretted that the Trusteeship Council had failed to meet the test.

13. The Council's failure could not be ascribed to lack of factual knowledge, since the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in East Africa, 1951, had been in Tanganyika when the objections of the Meru people had reached a critical point. The Visiting Mission had sounded two warning notes in its report (T/946 and Corr.1). First, in paragraph 202, while conceding that there were practical reasons for the removal of the Meru people, it had stated that the removal of any land from occupation by Africans in that heavily congested area was open to question and warranted serious consideration by the Council. In that connexion, the Mission had recalled the Administering Authority's statement that if any land was approved for alienation, the Africans occupying it would be given the option of remaining or removing to any other area they wished. It would be interesting to hear from the United Kingdom representative why the Tanganyika Government had changed its policy on the latter point. Secondly, in paragraph 210, the Visiting Mission had observed that most of the alienated land it had seen was of good quality and situated in areas enjoying a good climate and rainfall. The amount of such land still available was limited and while much of it might be surplus for existing African requirements, the Visiting Mission had felt that proposals to alienate it for as long as ninety-nine years must be considered with the greatest caution, given the prospective increase in the African population and expected improvements in African agricultural methods. The Visiting Mission had clearly intimated that there was a shortage of good land in Tanganyika and that the good land should be reserved for the indigenous population. The Wa-Meru case was simply a dispute over good land coveted by white settlers.

14. The petitioners had presented their case ably. There could be no dispute about the facts. The question was whether the eviction of the Meru people had been justified and, if not what measures must be taken to right the wrong done to them.

² See *Official Records of the Trusteeship Council, Eleventh Session*, 431st, 432nd, 442nd, 451st and 452nd meetings.

15. With regard to the motives of the Tanganyika Government, it was an over-simplification to consider the Meru tribe as a minority group who had been unfortunately but unavoidably the victims of a large resettlement scheme designed to benefit the great majority of the peoples concerned. Far from being an essential part of a wider and generally advantageous plan to give the congested African tribes room for expansion, the forced removal of the Meru people from the particular lands in question was in European rather than African interests. He did not suggest that the Administering Authority had deliberately sought to conceal those motives, but the Council's records indicated that they had not been fully discussed or understood.

16. It was clear from the Administering Authority's statements in the Council and the Committee that the alienation of land under the German régime had resulted in a patchwork of European and African settlements in northern Tanganyika. It was to resolve that situation that the Arusha-Moshi Lands Commission had been set up in 1946. In its report,⁸ that Commission had recommended the return of considerable areas of alienated land to the Chagga and Meru tribes—approximately 11,000 acres in each case—and the opening up of certain other areas to the Meru tribe. As the White Paper stated: "As part of this plan and to balance it, the Commissioner further recommended that the largely unoccupied area of some 130,000 acres lying between Kilimanjaro and Meru Mountains should be made into a single homogenous block for ranching and dairy enterprise". The word "homogeneous" was the key to the reasons why the Meru people had been evicted. They were to be moved off the farms which lay between those of European settlers so that the Europeans might enjoy a solid unbroken block of land from which the Africans would be excluded.

17. That motive could be seen in the Lands Commission's terms of reference, which were drawn up in such a way as to ensure that African interests would not be safeguarded at the expense of European interests. The Commission had not been asked to make proposals to ensure that the needs of the Africans for land would be met, but "to make comprehensive plans and recommendations for the redistribution of [alienated and tribal] lands with a view to (a) improving the homogeneity of alienated and tribal lands respectively . . .". The idea of "improving the homogeneity" of land was part of the disarming language of modern colonialism. It concealed the old and ugly practice of racial segregation and *apartheid*.

18. The Commissioner, Judge Wilson, had himself realized the true nature of the Commission's task. In a passage (para. 78) in its report which had apparently escaped the Council's notice, he had admitted, after outlining the apparent administrative and other advantages of homogeneity, that he doubted whether that ideal should be pursued in Tanganyika. He had questioned whether it was necessary or desirable to segregate races each of which had something to contribute to the common good. Having said that, however, Judge Wilson had apparently felt bound by his terms of reference and his proposals had followed the pattern of racial segregation laid down therein.

⁸ See *Report of the Arusha-Moshi Lands Commission*. Tanganyika Territory, Government Printer, Dar-es-Salaam, 1947.

19. It was a great disappointment to the Indonesian delegation that the very crux of the Wa-Meru case had been glossed over by the Council. In the face of the terms of reference of the Lands Commission and the misgivings of Judge Wilson, the Administering Authority had insisted that there was no element of racial discrimination in the scheme and that Africans would be as free as Europeans to apply for farms on the lands taken from the Meru people. It had admitted however that it was improbable that any African would be in a position, at that time, to take up large-scale ranching in the area. In view of the principles on which the scheme had been based, it was clear that there never had been any possibility of Africans being allowed to return to the land set aside for Europeans.

20. There was another disturbing aspect of the case. Five years had elapsed between the appointment of the Lands Commission and the actual eviction of the Meru people. There had apparently been no sense of urgency about implementing the Commission's report until a few weeks before the eviction, when legislation legalizing the proposed injustice had been rushed through the Legislative Council. The Administering Authority must have been aware that the Meru people had appealed to the United Nations. Yet, after years of delay it had been unable to postpone matters for a few more weeks until the Trusteeship Council met in 1952. The Council had taken no action, nor had it been encouraged to, at its tenth session and by the eleventh session the Administering Authority had been able to present it with a *fait accompli*. It had informed the Standing Committee on Petitions (T/C.2/SR.35) that the Tanganyika Government had entered into "a contractual commitment" towards the new European occupants of the land. That statement had presumably led the majority of the members of the Council to support a resolution (468 (XI)) which while affirming the principle that Africans should not be removed from their land without their collective consent, had excused the Administering Authority from applying that principle to the flagrant case of the forcible eviction of the Meru people.

21. The existence of a *fait accompli* could not be allowed to perpetuate an injustice of that kind. Even if the European settlers involved had been settled on the land for a long time, that would not affect the nature of the injustice done to the Meru people and their legitimate claim to have it corrected. In the case in point, moreover, the "contractual commitment" had been entered into when all the parties knew that the United Nations was considering the Wa-Meru petition.

22. Such a policy on the part of the Tanganyika Government was disturbing, as was the Administering Authority's general attitude as expressed in the Trusteeship Council in the words "our responsibility for the administration [of Tanganyika] is complete and undivided" (T/PV.452). His delegation could never agree to a statement implying that an Administering Authority retained the power to defeat the ends sought by the right of petition and thus to nullify that right.

23. The fundamental objection to the Trusteeship Council's resolution was its assumption that the provision of certain other lands was a sufficient *quid pro quo* for depriving the Meru people of the lands they rightfully owned and on which they wished to remain.

Presumably, the Meru people themselves looked forward to the day when all unoccupied land could be brought into tribal use by modern techniques, but they were fully entitled to decline to give up the land they actually occupied as the price of such development, particularly when such sacrifices were called for in the interests only of an immigrant community.

24. The General Assembly had no option but to request the Administering Authority to bring about the return to the Meru people of the land taken from them against their will and to compensate them fully for all the damages and hardships they had suffered. He hoped that the draft resolution submitted by his delegation and seven others would receive the support of the great majority of the Committee.

25. Mr. BAZHAN (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) observed that the tragic story of the Meru tribe was a characteristic example of the way in which modern colonialism exploited the peoples of the dependent areas, practised racial discrimination and segregation and used the Trust Territories as sources of raw materials for the metropolitan countries, thereby violating the terms of the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreements. He had not been convinced by the arguments put forward by the representative of the Administering Authority to justify the cruelty of the Administration, nor by claims that the measures taken had been dictated by concern for the overall interests of the Territory.

26. The Fourth Committee should transmit to the General Assembly a recommendation in accordance with the spirit and the letter of the Charter, that the Administering Authority should forthwith return to the Meru tribe the lands that had been alienated, reimburse the tribesmen for the damage suffered during the eviction, replace the houses that had been burnt down by the police and refrain in future from further alienation of land and other anti-democratic practices. The Ukrainian delegation would support any draft resolution in that sense. He had not had sufficient time to study the eight-Power draft resolution before the Committee, but thought he would probably be able to support it.

27. Mr. RIEMENS (Netherlands) felt great sympathy for the petitioners, but at the same time considered that the case was one which should be seen in perspective. Love of the land was common to all mankind, yet in every country in the world, legislation existed authorizing the expropriation of land in certain circumstances. The construction of an airfield, for instance, might necessitate moving farmers from their land.

28. The Indonesian Government had moved a number of Javanese to other islands, and no doubt they had been settled on land to which others claimed rights. Such a policy was perfectly proper inasmuch as it served the general development of a country; those who were obliged to give up their land must of course be adequately compensated.

29. The Netherlands delegation was strongly of the opinion that the Committee was not in possession of sufficient facts to enable it to judge the question. As the Chairman himself had rightly said on two occasions, the General Assembly was not a court of justice and

therefore the Fourth Committee was neither empowered nor called upon to give judgment in a very intricate case. Those members of the Committee who had had experience in administration must be aware that few legal cases were so complicated as those which dealt with land questions.

30. It was unfortunate that a question asked at the 287th meeting by the Polish representative seemed to have given the Meru representatives the false impression that the United Nations might endow the Trust Territory of Tanganyika with a university. It would be regrettable that such hopes should be raised by a process which was not free from demagoguery. The only organ of the United Nations which might conceivably do something in that field was UNESCO, whose total budget for the entire world was \$18 million, a total to which the Government of Poland contributed nothing.

31. The best course would be for the Trusteeship Council to carry out a thorough investigation and report back to the Fourth Committee at its following session on the whole question and also on the implementation by the Administering Authority of Trusteeship Council resolution 468 (XI).

32. The Netherlands delegation would be unable to accept the eight-Power draft resolution, and particularly paragraph 2 of the operative part.

33. Mr. GAJEWSKI (Poland) said that the Polish delegation had frequently expressed its views with regard to the policy of the Administering Authorities in general and their policy of land alienation in particular. Land was being alienated from the Meru and other tribes on various pretexts, without even a semblance of legal justification. The expulsion of 3,000 Meru tribesmen from their land by brute force recalled the policies followed by the white settlers in America with regard to the American Indians and those followed today in Malaya and other parts of the world. The Poles had suffered similar hardships at the hands of the nazis during the Second World War.

34. The representative of the Meru tribe had cited facts that could not be gainsaid or distorted either by the White Paper or any other document issued by the Administering Authority. It was evident that the Trusteeship Council had not carried out the task entrusted to it and had done nothing to right the wrong that had been done. In spite of the suffering to which they had been condemned by the Administering Authority, the Meru people had not abandoned their cause, although a number of them had died as a result of the inhuman treatment they had received.

35. The importance of the issue far transcended the frontiers of Tanganyika. The case revealed more clearly than any reports the fact that the Administering Authorities were deceiving the United Nations and world public opinion when they claimed to be administering the Trust Territories in accordance with the provisions of Article 76 of the Charter and attempted to prove that their economic policies were designed to further the interests of the indigenous inhabitants. Racial discrimination was increasing instead of diminishing, in spite of the provisions of the Charter and a number of resolutions adopted by the United Nations. The Administering Authority in Tanganyika was creating pales in which the Europeans settled and to which the indigenous population was denied access; contact be-

tween the two was thus rendered impossible. Indigenous inhabitants had been punished for crossing the line separating the two areas. The Administering Authority had rejected requests from the indigenous population to be allowed to participate in branches of industry which were to be developed in the areas that had been alienated from them. The policy of the Administration in creating so-called homogeneous blocks of European settlers in Tanganyika and Kenya implied the relegation of the indigenous inhabitants to sterile areas deprived of water and infested with the tsetse fly and various diseases.

36. The decision taken by the Trusteeship Council with regard to the petition was contrary to the interests of the injured party and in favour of the Administering Authority.

37. The presence of the representatives of the Meru tribe had shown how useful and indeed necessary it was for the Fourth Committee to hear the populations of the Territories when discussing problems bearing on their vital interests. The Administering Authorities had opposed the granting of hearings and had endeavoured illegally to change the procedure of the General Assembly in the matter of petitions because they did not wish contact to be established between the United Nations and the inhabitants of the Trust Territories.

38. In his statement at the 287th meeting Mr. Mathieson had described the system of colonialism followed in Tanganyika and Kenya as modern and had attempted to represent the United Kingdom as a force for progress. He had appealed to the United Nations not to hamper the United Kingdom in carrying out its humanitarian mission, which in fact consisted of deporting large numbers of people to arid and infertile lands. The case was clear and the methods used by the United Kingdom should be condemned by the United Nations. The confidence placed by the Meru tribe in the United Nations must be justified.

39. He would support the eight-Power draft resolution.

40. Mr. KHATTAK (Pakistan) said that he would vote in favour of the draft resolution, of which he was one of the sponsors.

41. He had been amazed to learn that 3,000 members of the Meru tribe had been evicted to make way for thirteen Europeans. According to Mr. Mathieson, the number was only about 1,500, but even if that were true the injustice was no less. Mr. Mathieson had also said that the evictions had been necessary because the soil was exhausted and needed modern methods of cultivation, but there seemed no reason why the Meru people should not be taught modern farming methods. It was the duty of the Administering Authority to improve the economic and social conditions of the inhabitants of the Trust Territory. The people of the Meru tribe were willing to learn and to do their best to develop the Territory, but they were not willing to leave their land. The United Kingdom representative claimed that racial discrimination did not enter into the matter, but it was difficult to see how else to describe the implied notion that one European was equal to more than one hundred Africans.

42. Mr. S. S. LIU (China) said that as a member of the Trusteeship Council, China had already had an opportunity of examining the petition of the Wa-Meru in the Council, the records of which showed clearly where Chinese sympathies lay. The Chinese delegation felt deeply for the Meru people, forcibly evicted from their land despite their unanimous protest, and deplored the attendant loss of life and property. The Tanganyika Government's White Paper and the United Kingdom delegation gave it to be understood that those losses had been small, but the results of the eviction must inevitably have been damaging and have caused an upheaval in the lives of the people. With regard to the cattle-ranching project on account of which the Wa-Meru had been dispossessed, it was regrettable that although large areas were available elsewhere, the Tanganyika authorities had chosen to expropriate land that was already occupied. It was also regrettable that the authorities had not devoted more thought to the principle of homogeneity to which so much reference had been made. Judge Wilson had expressed serious doubts upon it, as the extracts read from the report of the Arusha-Moshi Lands Commission by the Indonesian representative showed. It was again to be deplored that despite the request of the petitioners to the Visiting Mission to East Africa in 1951, the Administering Authority had not agreed to postpone the execution of its scheme until the Trusteeship Council had considered the petition. The Council had thus been presented with a *fait accompli* and had felt itself unable to take any action beyond its recommendations in resolution 468 (XI). The Chinese delegation had supported that resolution in a spirit of co-operation, but had reserved its right to reconsider its position at any future time.

43. The Chinese delegation was not convinced that the Administering Authority had been justified in pressing on with its plans on the grounds of public interest despite the material and spiritual losses caused to 3,000 people. The claim that the land prepared for them in exchange was better was flatly rejected by the Wa-Meru. The Chinese delegation deplored the harsh measures that had been taken during the removal, the severity of which had been admitted by the United Kingdom representative himself. It was to be hoped that something could still be done to alleviate the sufferings of the Wa-Meru and to remedy the situation. Every effort should be made to work out an amicable settlement. Since the Chinese delegation had not had time to give the joint draft resolution the study it deserved, it would reserve its position for the time being.

44. Mr. PIGNON (France) had listened with sympathy to the eloquent and moving statement of the petitioners. Their emotions were easily understandable. However, if the public authorities of any nation were to fulfil their duty, sentimental considerations should not be put before the general interests of the population. In France itself, as in all countries which had legislation concerning expropriation in the public interest, such problems had had to be met and dealt with on their merits. He instanced the well-known case of the construction of the Val de Tignes.

45. He could not agree with the Indonesian representative that the Trusteeship Council had been mistaken in its decision. The Council, which was com-

posed of members who had great experience in matters of administration and who held responsible posts, had done all that it could and should do in recommending, after a careful examination, that the Meru people should be given generous compensation and assistance in resettlement. It had been right not to question the authority of the Tanganyika Government or the paramountcy of the public interest, which the eight-Power draft resolution unfortunately appeared to hold very cheaply. The Fourth Committee had neither the legal nor the moral authority to act as a court of law. The Meru people were undoubtedly deserving of every sympathy and efforts must be made to provide them with immediate opportunities of improving their lot. The French delegation, for its part, would have preferred to see compensation awarded before the eviction, and more care taken in carrying it out. Nevertheless, it was unable to accept the wholesale condemnation of the Trusteeship Council and the Administering Authority or, and above all, the unwise principles on which the draft resolution was based. The problem of principles was extremely serious, and the Fourth Committee should reflect carefully before taking any decision.

46. Mr. CALERO RODRIGUES (Brazil) said that although the United Kingdom representative had urged that both sides of the case should be heard before any draft resolutions were submitted on the Wa-Meru question, his subsequent arguments were not likely to change the Committee's conclusions. The United Kingdom delegation had not contested any of the basic facts that had been adduced, either in the Trusteeship Council or the Fourth Committee. It had concentrated instead on the principle of the subordination of individual interests to the well-being of the community, which it claimed was the truly democratic cause. The uprooting of some 3,000 persons was regarded as a negligible matter when the interests of the larger community were at stake. Such an inexorable, almost totalitarian, attitude might well give rise to misgivings regarding the kind of State that was being built in Tanganyika.

47. The Committee had been told that the Administering Authority was not in East Africa to act as the curator of a museum and reference had been made to stubborn conservatism which defied progress. Unfortunately, there appeared to be no place in that scheme of progress for the indigenous population. The Committee had also been told that the theory of homogeneity, on which the Tanganyika authorities had acted, was not a racial principle but a principle of good farming. The Meru people had thus been expelled because their methods of farming were out-of-date and unsatisfactory. Such progress seemed to be taking place in a human vacuum.

48. The terms of reference of the Arusha-Moshi Lands Commission had recognized that the amount of disturbance and distress involved in applying the principle of homogeneity should be a guiding element in decisions at all times. The Brazilian delegation did not consider that that safeguard had been applied in the case in point. The Meru people had made a convincing plea in their own interests; the general interest had been presented only vaguely and a major question left unanswered. It was highly debatable whether the general interest could best be served by the creation of unrest and resentment.

49. The Brazilian delegation deplored the statement made in the White Paper by the Tanganyika Government, and endorsed by the Administering Authority, that there could be no question of that Government's deviating from the policy to which it was irrevocably committed. The United Kingdom representative had hoped that the Committee's decision would not put the Administering Authority in the predicament of having to decide between a resolution of the General Assembly and a policy which it believed to be right. However, the General Assembly was itself in a predicament: either it must disregard the petition of the Meru people because in general it trusted the actions of the United Kingdom as an Administering Authority, or it must take the alternative course of expressing its disapproval of the Administering Authority's conduct. In such a predicament, the Committee could only do its duty.

50. Mr. McINNIS (Canada) said that the Canadian delegation had sought to balance local interests and attachments in the Wa-Meru question against the wider interests of the larger community which were the foundation of the Administering Authority's case. The conclusions it had reached were identical with those of the Netherlands delegation. The Committee could not commit itself to the principle that where there was local opposition to a scheme for general improvement, local interests must be allowed to prevail. Similar problems had arisen in many countries, including Canada, and few authorities had succeeded in obtaining unanimous consent to such measures.

51. The point at issue was whether the broad general interests were such in the Wa-Meru case as to override local attachments. In the absence of more expert knowledge, the Committee must fall back on the conclusions of other bodies which had been able to devote more time to the problem, namely the Standing Committee on Petitions and the Trusteeship Council. The Trusteeship Council's report said that the Visiting Mission to East Africa had recognized the practical reasons in favour of the removal and the Council itself, in its resolution 468 (XI), had recognized that the movement in question formed part of a larger scheme already in an advanced stage of implementation. Both those bodies had regretted that the move was necessary, but had not repudiated its necessity.

52. The Canadian delegation fully agreed that a clear case must be made for the general interest before such disturbing measures were carried out, and it recommended that, in future, the Administering Authority should establish its case fully before taking action. However, it was unable to support such a sweeping and condemnatory resolution as had been proposed (A/C.4/L.242), and would therefore vote against it.

53. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) had listened with great sympathy to the statement and answers of the representative of the Meru tribe. The facts he had quoted were all to be found in the Government White Paper, but that document strove to minimize their gravity. The comments of the United Kingdom representative on those facts had not convinced the Haitian delegation. The Meru tribe did not refuse modern civilization, provided that they were integrated in it; separation was not the best way of promoting civilization.

54. The representatives of France and Canada had said that their Governments had carried out, or would have to carry out, large-scale public works which involved the displacement of groups of people against their will. He could instance the case of his own Government whose project for the development of the Artibonite Valley might likewise lead to such a displacement of population. Such cases, however, could hardly be compared to that of the Wa-Meru, where the interests of thirteen European settlers had been allowed to outweigh those of the 3,000 persons living on the land in question. The United Kingdom representative

had claimed that new land had been prepared for the Meru people, but it was in fact merely part of their own reserves which they had not formerly used because it was infested with tsetse fly and unfit for farming or cattle grazing. The only satisfactory course open to the Fourth Committee was to recommend the immediate restitution of the Meru land and compensation for all the losses that the tribe had suffered. That was the purpose of the draft resolution of which Haiti was a co-sponsor.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.