

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



FOURTH COMMITTEE, 305th

MEETING

Saturday, 13 December 1952, at 10.30 a.m.

Headquarters, New York

CONTENTS

Page

The Ewe and Togoland unification problem: special report of the Trusteeship Council (A/2289) (<i>continued</i>)	393
---	-----

Chairman: Mr. Rodolfo MUNOZ (Argentina).

The Ewe and Togoland unification problem: special report of the Trusteeship Council (A/ 2289) (*continued*)

[Item 32]*

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

1. Mr. CALERO RODRIGUES (Brazil) proposed that the text of the statement made at the 304th meeting by Mr. Kpodar, representative of the Parti Togolais du Progrès and the Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo should be circulated as an official document.

2. Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark) seconded that proposal.

It was so decided.¹

3. The CHAIRMAN reminded the petitioner that he was not obliged to reply to all the questions asked by the members of the Committee.

4. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) asked whether the petitioner felt that the terms of reference of the Joint Council for Togoland Affairs were sufficiently broad to enable it to consider political questions, including the unification of Togoland.

5. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) replied that the Joint Council was required to give its opinion on all political, social or cultural questions of common concern to the two Togolands. The members of the Council were fully entitled to place before it any political question and consequently, had they so desired, they could have included on the agenda the question of the unification of Togoland.

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

¹ The statement was subsequently circulated as document A/C.4/222/Add.2.

6. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) asked whether the parties represented by the petitioner were in favour of the equal representation of the two Togolands on the Joint Council.

7. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) pointed out that the Joint Council was common to both Territories. Its task was to examine questions of interest to two regions forming part of a single entity and the relative numerical importance of the constituent elements must be taken into account. The Parti Togolais du Progrès and the Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo were therefore in favour of maintaining the proportional representation of the Territories on the Joint Council.

8. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) asked whether the petitioner thought that the Council would be able to function if the representatives from Togoland under French administration were elected by universal suffrage.

9. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) replied that that would not affect the problem. Before deciding how the members of the Joint Council should be elected, the French Administration had consulted the political parties in the Territory. The Comité de l'Unité Togolaise had come out in favour of universal suffrage but the Parti Togolais du Progrès had asked that, in view of the large number of elections which had already taken place in the course of the year and in order to avoid complications, the members of the Joint Council should be elected by the existing advisory bodies. That method of election was a form of indirect universal suffrage. The Parti Togolais du Progrès had thought that the members of the Council should be elected by the Territorial Assembly, whereas the Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo had thought that they should be chosen by the *conseils de circonscription*. As a compromise, the Administering Authority had decided that the representatives should be selected by the Territorial Assembly and the *conseils de circonscription*.

10. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) asked how many members of the Parti Togolais du Progrès were officials of the Administration.

11. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) said that more officials belonged to the Comité de l'Unité Togolaise than to the Parti Togolais du Progrès.

12. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) would like to know the membership of the Parti Togolais du Progrès and the Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo.

13. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) replied that the Parti Togolais du Progrès had 80,000 registered members, not counting unregistered supporters. The Comité de l'Unité Togolaise had no following except in the Lomé and Palimé regions. From Sokodé northwards, the Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo represented practically the entire population, except for about a hundred members of the Comité de l'Unité Togolaise who had originally come from the south.

14. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) asked for approximate figures of the population in the north, who, according to the petitioner, were almost unanimously in favour of the Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo.

15. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) replied that the peoples in the north constituted almost three-quarters of the total population of Togoland under French administration.

16. He pointed out that although the Comité de l'Unité Togolaise claimed to have 200,000 supporters, it had never sent any petitioner to the United Nations except Mr. Olympio. On the other hand, Mr. Kpodar himself was the third petitioner, and doctor, that the Parti Togolais du Progrès had sent to the United Nations.

17. Mr. COOPER (Liberia) noted that the petitioner was a doctor with a private clinic in Togoland. He asked whether the clinic was subsidized by the Administration.

18. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) explained that financial assistance from his parents had enabled him to study medicine at a French university and acquire a private clinic.

19. Mr. COOPER (Liberia) asked whether the Parti Togolais du Progrès had been founded before the Comité de l'Unité Togolaise.

20. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) recalled that the Comité de l'Unité Togolaise had been the first party to be founded after the Second World War; the Parti Togolais du Progrès had been founded only in 1946.

21. Mr. COOPER (Liberia) asked the petitioner whether he had ever been a member of the Comité de l'Unité Togolaise.

22. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) replied in the negative.

23. Mr. COOPER (Liberia) said he would like to have a rough estimate of the population of Togoland under French administration.

24. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) replied that there were 1,080,000 inhabitants of various races in Togoland under French administration.

25. Mr. COOPER (Liberia) asked whether the petitioner considered that the Parti Togolais du Progrès and the Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo represented the majority of the population in Togoland under French administration.

26. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) replied in the affirmative. He added that in his statement at the previous meeting he had explained that the two parties referred to represented from 85 to 90 per cent of the population of Togoland under French administration. It was true that he had also said that the Parti Togolais du Progrès had 80,000 registered members, but it must be remembered that the figure of 1,080,000 for the total population of the Territory included men, women and children. It was necessary to be over twenty-one years old to be a member of the Parti Togolais du Progrès.

27. Mr. COOPER (Liberia) asked the petitioner what proportion of the population of Togoland under French administration he thought Mr. Olympio represented.

28. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) replied that it would be easy to compute that proportion from the percentages that he had just given.

29. Mr. COOPER (Liberia) asked whether the petitioner had the impression that United Nations intervention in the Ewe and Togoland unification problem had retarded the advancement of the Trust Territories towards independence or self-government within the framework of union with another country.

30. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) replied that so far the United Nations could not be considered to have intervened since it had taken no final decision on the Ewe and Togoland unification problem. Mr. Olympio himself had admitted that in the interval between the visit of the 1949 United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa and that of the 1952 Mission, progress had been made, particularly in the building of schools, dispensaries and hospitals. It could not be said therefore that the rate of progress under the Administering Authority had been slowed down by the fact that the United Nations was examining the problem.

31. Mr. COOPER (Liberia) asked whether the Parti Togolais du Progrès was opposed to the unification of the two Togolands.

32. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo)

replied that his party was certainly not opposed to the unification of the two Togolands. The establishment of an Ewe State, however, would not satisfy the people of Togoland who were aware of the need for bringing about the territorial unity of Togoland.

33. Mr. COOPER (Liberia) asked whether the petitioner believed that there were economic reasons why Togoland could not attain independence in the near future.

34. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) replied that economic considerations were not the only ones involved. First, the Territory must have the necessary political and administrative institutions and its population must be given sufficient training to enable it to administer itself. It was better to work with time than against it. In that connexion, the example of Libya showed that it was not ideal to pass abruptly from a stage of apprenticeship to complete independence.

35. Mr. COOPER (Liberia) would like to know if the French Administration had placed any obstacles in the way of freedom of association, more particularly in the case of political parties.

36. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) replied that no restrictions had been placed on freedom of association as long as the meetings were not such as to disturb public order. In one specific case, namely during the stay of the 1952 Visiting Mission, a public meeting had been banned for the reasons he had stated at the previous meeting.

37. Mr. COOPER (Liberia) asked whether the Parti Togolais du Progrès had had an opportunity to explain its view or submit petitions to the Visiting Mission.

38. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) replied that full information on that point was contained in the special report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa, 1952 (T/1034).

39. Mr. COOPER (Liberia) asked whether the petitioner felt that the Visiting Mission had done its duty.

40. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) replied that the Visiting Mission had granted all the hearings requested by the representatives of his party. The Comité de l'Unité Togolaise, too, had had every opportunity to get in touch with the Mission. Mr. Olympio himself had said that he had met the Mission on several occasions.

41. Mr. COOPER (Liberia) asked whether the Parti Togolais du Progrès was opposed to the unification of Togoland because it feared possible incorporation in the Gold Coast.

42. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) reiterated that the Parti Togolais du Progrès and the Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo

did not in any way object to the unification of Togoland.

43. Mr. CALERO RODRIGUES (Brazil) asked whether the procedure followed in selecting the representatives from Togoland under French administration to the Joint Council was fully satisfactory.

44. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) recalled that it was at the suggestion of the Parti Togolais du Progrès and the Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo that the Administration had decided that the representatives from Togoland under French administration should be elected by the Territorial Assembly and the *conseils de circonscription*.

45. Mr. CALERO RODRIGUES (Brazil) asked whether the Parti Togolais du Progrès would object to the Joint Council's being composed of representatives elected on the basis of universal suffrage.

46. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) said he had already explained in reply to a question from another member of the Committee why the Parti Togolais du Progrès, unlike the Comité de l'Unité Togolaise, had not requested that the elections should be held by universal suffrage.

47. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) noted that the Parti Togolais du Progrès wanted the unified Togoland to be placed under French administration. He wished to know whether the party was willing to co-operate with the other parties in seeking a solution for the problems of unification without imposing any prior conditions.

48. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) said that the reasons why the Parti Togolais du Progrès wanted the unified Togoland to be placed under French administration were essentially realistic. Togoland under French administration constituted three-quarters of the former Togoland, possessed the only port in the Territory and the only system of railways; even Mr. Antor had admitted that Togoland under French administration had already made much progress and had far more dispensaries, hospitals and schools than Togoland under British administration. It should be added that the level of development of the people of Togoland under French administration was markedly superior to that of the people of Togoland under British administration. It was normal that that part of the Territory which had made least progress should join that in which the people had reached a higher degree of development. Thus, it was logical that the Parti Togolais du Progrès should advocate a solution which was the only one that would in fact ensure the Territory's progress.

49. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) asked whether the Parti Togolais du Progrès would be willing to co-operate with the other parties if the latter would not accept its conditions.

50. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) said that the Parti Togolais du Progrès was willing to seek an area of agreement with the Comité de l'Unité

Togolaise with regard to the unification of the Territory.

51. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) asked whether the Parti Togolais du Progrès was in favour of universal suffrage.

52. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) said that his party was clearly in favour of universal suffrage, provided that the voters had reached an adequate level of education.

53. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) wished to know whether the elections which had so far been held in Togoland under French Administration had given rise to disturbances which led the Parti Togolais du Progrès to believe that elections by universal suffrage could not be held in the near future.

54. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) did not care to answer for the future. He had merely explained why the Parti Togolais du Progrès had advocated electing the members of the Joint Council by indirect suffrage. He recalled that within one year there had been eleven elections by universal suffrage and the Parti Togolais du Progrès had felt that that method of voting could not be used yet again to elect the members of the Joint Council. The Administering Authority had agreed with that view.

55. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) asked how the Territory could be unified within the French Union if in Togoland under British administration there was not a majority in favour of the unification of the Territory.

56. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) explained that the people of Togoland under British administration also wanted the unification of the Territory. It was true that the Dagombas in Togoland under British administration were asking to be united with their brothers in the Gold Coast, but that claim was merely the result of the Ewe example. If the plan to unite the Ewes was abandoned, the Dagombas would certainly not insist and the entire population of both Togolands would undoubtedly rally to the support of the unification of the Territory.

57. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) asked how many Ewes there were in Togoland under French administration.

58. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) did not think that there were more than 100,000 Ewes in Togoland under French administration, out of a population of 1,080,000.

59. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) was surprised that the number of Ewes in Togoland under French administration should have been put at 175,000 by the Visiting Mission, at 250,000 by the French representative and at 280,000 in the records of the Trusteeship Council.

60. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) pointed out that the estimates were very rough and

had been made in very different circumstances and according to very different criteria.

61. Mr. SPRAGUE (United States of America) noted that Mr. Kpodar had talked a great deal of the Comité de l'Unité Togolaise, but had not referred to the Togoland Union, the Joint Togoland Congress or the Togoland Farmers' Union, which would appear to have members in Togoland under French administration.

62. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) recalled that the reports of the two Visiting Missions which had gone to Togoland had referred only to the two major parties, the Comité de l'Unité Togolaise and the Parti Togolais du Progrès. As regards the Joint Togoland Congress, he could state definitely that it had no members in Togoland under French administration.

63. In reply to a remark by Mr. SPRAGUE (United States of America), Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) said that the Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo should be added to the two major parties he had mentioned.

64. Mr. SPRAGUE (United States of America) asked what the position was with regard to freedom of speech, freedom of assembly and freedom of the Press. He would also like to know whether it was true that the Administering Authority was preventing the exercise of those freedoms.

65. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) said that there was no restriction on freedom of speech except in the case of meetings in public places; for that purpose it was necessary to obtain the prior permission of the Administering Authority. Such permission had only once been refused, in circumstances he had already described. With regard to freedom of the Press, the Comité de l'Unité Togolaise and the Parti Togolais du Progrès brought out several newspapers, the publication of which was free provided that they did not commit Press offences punishable by French law.

66. Mr. SPRAGUE (United States of America) asked what was meant by Press offences and what penalties were imposed. He recalled in that connexion that Mr. Olympio had mentioned a case of imprisonment.

67. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) thought that the representative of France was better qualified than he was to answer that question.

68. Mr. SPRAGUE (United States of America) asked what the attitude of the population of Togoland under French administration would be if Togoland under British administration wished to be attached to the Gold Coast, and whether the petitioner's party insisted that unification must be carried out within the French Union.

69. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) said that he had already explained why the Parti

Togolais du Progrès was in favour of retaining French trusteeship and of unification within the French Union. Clearly, the party had no right to oppose the aspirations of the people of Togoland under British administration, but he was sure that all Togolanders wanted the unification of the two Trust Territories.

70. Mr. SPRAGUE (United States of America) asked whether any unification plan would depend upon the choice of the subsequent form of association of the Territory.

71. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) thought that that was a matter for which the Committee must assume responsibility.

72. Mr. KONDAPI (India) recalled that the All-Ewe Conference, the Togoland Union, the Joint Togoland Congress and the "Juvento" had made a joint declaration in which they set forth a five-year programme for the development of the Territory towards independence, and asked why the Parti Togolais du Progrès had not joined with those organizations.

73. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) explained that the Parti Togolais du Progrès kept a sense of reality and that it was impossible for it to say with any accuracy how soon the country would be capable of self-government. The necessary period of preparation might be more or less than five years. He pointed out in addition that the organizations in question had not consulted the Parti Togolais du Progrès.

74. Mr. KONDAPI (India) asked whether the statutes of the Parti Togolais du Progrès contained any provisions relating to the methods which it proposed to use in order to achieve its objectives, or in other words whether the party advocated peaceful parliamentary methods or direct action.

75. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) said that his party had no intention whatever of resorting to violence. That was why it had sent a representative to the Fourth Committee to help in the search for an equitable solution.

76. Mr. ELIAV (Israel) wished to know whether the peoples of the two Togolands had cultural and linguistic bonds comparable to those between the various groups of the Ewe people.

77. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) pointed out that the Ewes were a small minority of the population. The people of the southern part of the two Territories were more highly developed than those in the north, but it was undeniable that there was a national feeling in Togoland, whereas there was no Ewe nationalism.

78. Mr. ELIAV (Israel) asked whether the Parti Togolais du Progrès, although in favour of unification within the French Union, would agree to the unified Territory remaining outside the French Union if the majority of the people wished it to do so.

79. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo)

said that it would, but made it clear that his party would accept that formula only on condition that the unified Togoland State was independent.

80. Mr. ELIAV (Israel) asked whether the Parti Togolais du Progrès was prepared to take the opposition which might be encountered among certain groups of the population into account in any plan of unification.

81. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) presumed that the representative of Israel was referring to the Dagombas and Mamprusis, who wished to be united with their brothers on the Gold Coast. The claims of those two groups had been inspired by the Ewe claims. He repeated that there was such a thing as Togoland nationalism. There were elements in Togoland under British administration which desired union with the Gold Coast because that territory had a more advanced political status than Togoland. However, if Togoland became independent, there was no doubt that those elements would wish to be part of it.

82. Mr. ELIAV (Israel) asked what the reaction of the Parti Togolais du Progrès would be if those elements preferred union with the Gold Coast in any event. He also asked whether the Parti Togolais du Progrès had any suggestions for dealing with the situation which might arise from the division of the Ewes between a unified Togoland and the Gold Coast.

83. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) did not think it would be the first time that people speaking the same language had found themselves separated by a frontier. He repeated that what mattered most was the unification of the two Territories.

84. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) recalled that Mr. Kpodar, like the French representative, Mr. Ajavon, thought that Togoland could not attain independence at once because its economic resources were inadequate. He asked whether Mr. Kpodar thought that economic independence was an essential requirement for political independence.

85. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) said that political independence could not be attained until the indigenous inhabitants had acquired some experience of government; however, it must be recognized that economic independence was equally essential.

86. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) asked the petitioner whether he thought that a basically agricultural country could have economic resources adequate to bear the cost of self-government and independence.

87. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) said that he did, and gave France, which was primarily an agricultural country, as an example.

88. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) asked whether the soil of the Territory was fertile and whether water supplies were sufficient.

89. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) said that, as in all countries, some were more favoured

than others. However, the soil of Togoland was fertile and there were abundant supplies of water. The important thing was to develop the country and find markets.

90. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) wished to know the proportion of cultivated land in the Territory.

91. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) said that all arable land in the north was under cultivation. The same was true in the extreme south of the Territory, but the land in the rest of the country was not yet sufficiently developed.

92. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) asked whether the indigenous population was large enough to cultivate the whole Territory, or whether immigrants would be needed.

93. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) replied that when farming was completely mechanized and modern methods were used, there would be ample indigenous labour.

94. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) wondered whether in the petitioner's opinion the Administering Authority would be able to supply the material needed to modernize agriculture.

95. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) said that first the required credits must be available.

96. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) inferred that United Nations assistance would be a help to Togoland.

97. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) asked whether the Parti Togolais du Progrès would be willing for Togoland to have complete independence, or whether it was resolved that the Territory should become independent within the French Union.

98. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) pointed out that at the present time all the great Powers were tightening the bonds which united them and for the sake of survival were consenting to sacrifice their sovereignty to a certain extent. It would therefore be Utopian to expect a small country like Togoland to be completely independent. That was why the Parti Togolais du Progrès wished the Territory to become independent within the French Union.

99. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) wondered whether the political institutions of Togoland under British administration were more liberal than those of Togoland under French administration.

100. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) thought that they were not.

101. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) asked whether the Parti Togolais du Progrès would be in favour of some form of association of the unified Territory with the Gold Coast, within the Commonwealth or the French Union.

102. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) said it was impossible to prejudge that question. The

first and most important step was the unification of Togoland and its advancement towards independence.

103. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) remarked that according to the petitioner, Togoland under French administration was more advanced than Togoland under British administration. It would seem, therefore, that if the two Togolands were united under French trusteeship, Togoland under British administration would be dominated by Togoland under French administration.

104. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) did not think there was any question of domination. There were two Territories, one of which was much more advanced than the other. In their association the less advanced Territory would logically be raised to the level of the more advanced one, since the object was to ensure the progress of the population.

105. Mr. YURANS (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked Mr. Kpodar what was the object of his petition to the United Nations.

106. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) explained that the Parti Togolais du Progrès wished the Ewe question to be forgotten. Furthermore, it advocated the unification of the two Togolands under French trusteeship and wished the Administering Authority to grant political organs which would enable the Territories to govern themselves.

107. In reply to a number of questions by Mr. YURANS (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) observed that that representative appeared to have misunderstood the statement he had made before the Committee, and requested him to refer to the text, which would shortly be distributed to the members of the Committee.

108. Mr. YURANS (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked what proportion of public opinion was represented by the party's demand that the Territory should be unified under French trusteeship.

109. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) pointed out that he was the spokesman for the Parti Togolais du Progrès, which was supported by the Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo. The members and supporters of those two organizations comprised between 85 and 90 per cent of the population.

110. In reply to a further question by Mr. YURANS (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) stated that the Parti Togolais du Progrès had written statutes and a clearly defined programme.

111. Mr. YURANS (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he would like to acquaint himself with those documents.

112. Mr. PEON DEL VALLE (Mexico) asked whether the petitioner considered it important that information about the principles and the work of the United Nations should be disseminated in Togoland,

and whether the Parti Togolais du Progrès would be willing to help in doing so. He suggested that Mr. Kpodar might take advantage of his visit to New York by getting in touch with the United Nations Department of Public Information.

113. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) considered the dissemination of such information to be essential. As it was, the debates of the Fourth Committee were frequently the subject of articles in his party's papers, and also in those of the Comité de l'Unité Togolaise. He would certainly get in touch with the Department of Public Information.

114. Mr. PEON DEL VALLE (Mexico) asked whether the Parti Togolais du Progrès would like to see the United Nations flag flown in Togoland beside the Administering Authority's flag and the flag of the Territory if it had one.

115. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) replied that it would have no objection.

116. Mr. PEON DEL VALLE (Mexico) asked whether the petitioner would like the United Nations specialized agencies to give technical assistance to Togoland.

117. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) thanked the Mexican representative for his suggestion, which he heartily endorsed.

118. Mr. SHEIKIN (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) asked the representative of the Parti Togolais du Progrès whether he thought that the unification of Togoland would be possible without independence, or independence without unification.

119. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) replied that it would be possible for the two Territories to advance separately towards independence, but that they ought to be unified because they shared a common destiny.

120. Mr. SHEIKIN (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) could not see how that reply could be reconciled with the petitioner's previous statements that Togoland after unification should remain under French trusteeship, or with his reply to the representative of Israel that the Parti Togolais du Progrès would be in favour of independence for Togoland even, if necessary, outside the French Union.

121. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) repeated that the Parti Togolais du Progrès was in favour of independence for Togoland. If its independence was to be effective, it would have to be preceded by a period of preparation. That was why, as he had already explained more than once, his party wanted the period of preparation to be passed under the ægis of France. He considered that when a united Togoland became independent, it would be well advised to remain within the French Union, but that question could not be settled until then.

122. Mr. SHEIKIN (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) pointed out that at the sixth session of the General Assembly the representative of the Parti Togolais du Progrès had stated that Togoland would not be able to become independent immediately or in the near future.² He asked Mr. Kpodar whether he thought the bulk of the population of Togoland shared that view.

123. Mr. KPODAR (Parti Togolais du Progrès and Union des Chefs et des Populations du Nord Togo) replied that to marry in haste was to repent at leisure; the example of Libya was a proof of that. The length of the necessary period of preparation could not be laid down in advance; when Togoland was ready for independence, it would be an easy matter for a visiting mission to confirm the fact.

124. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to proceed to the general debate on the Ewe and Togoland unification problem.

125. Mr. GAJEWSKI (Poland) said that the question before the Committee was closely linked with the right of peoples to self-determination and the right of colonial peoples to independence. Under cover of the Trusteeship System, modern colonialism was endeavouring to divide the Ewe people and to stifle their national consciousness and their desire for independence. It was impressive to note the strength of that people's national liberation movement, the development of its forms of political organization and the determination with which it was fighting for independence.

126. He referred to the chief provisions of General Assembly resolution 555 (VI). In his opinion the Visiting Mission sent to Togoland by the Trusteeship Council in pursuance of that resolution had been wanting in impartiality and objectivity. Instead of complying with the General Assembly's instructions, it had obeyed those of the Administering Authorities, which, even before the arrival of the Mission, had taken repressive steps against the supporters of the unification movement. The Mission had associated entirely with representatives of the Administering Authorities and had not been in touch with the indigenous inhabitants. It had closed its eyes to the coercion of Togoland patriots by the Administering Authorities; it had not even protested at such an unprecedented act as the closing of the frontier between the two Territories; it had refused to attend the demonstrations organized by the Comité de l'Unité Togolaise, although it had readily attended those organized by the pro-French and pro-British parties.

127. The representatives of the indigenous population had revealed the abominable methods of repression and persecution resorted to by the French authorities against any Togolandans who dared to avail themselves of the right of petition. In that connexion he read a telegram addressed to the United Nations by the President-General of the Comité de l'Unité Togolaise (T/Pet.7/313).

128. The British authorities, not satisfied with the division of the two Territories, had further subdivided

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Fourth Committee*, 233rd meeting.

Togoland under British administration into a number of provinces which, under cover of the administrative union with the Gold Coast, they were incorporating into that colony's provinces. They were trying to disunite Togoland by separating the north from the south, prohibiting any contact between the peoples of those two regions and, by means of mendacious propaganda, fomenting hostility between the populations of the north and the south.

129. Further, the two Administering Authorities were trying to disunite the people of Togoland by setting up organizations of "collaborators", in the meaning given to that word during the Second World War; the only purpose of organizations such as the Parti Togolais du Progrès in Togoland under French administration and the Convention People's Party in Togoland under British administration was to whitewash the Administering Authorities, and it was not surprising that those organizations continually sang the praises of the administrations.

130. The statements of the two representatives of the Parti Togolais du Progrès had clearly demonstrated that party's real nature. The Togoland-born member of the French delegation had insulted all the States Members of the United Nations by declaring that none of them was entirely independent, and he had accused the United Nations of subversive activities. If those representatives were to be believed, no agricultural country would have any right to independence. It was clear from their statements that their party's only principle was the maintenance of French domination in Togoland.

131. In order to mislead public opinion, the Administering Authorities had set up a simulacrum of legislative organs in the Territories, while making sure that their

supporters had an unassailable majority in those organs: The successive establishment of two Consultative Commissions^a and the Joint Council had fulfilled the same purpose. The real aim of those institutions was to disrupt the unification movement, while giving the contrary impression. The Joint Council was without any executive or legislative power, and its members had been appointed by means of indirect elections which had been rigged. The 1952 Visiting Mission had tried in vain to justify the fact that the Joint Council was made up of members chosen by the French authorities.

132. When replying to the objective arguments of the genuine representatives of the people of Togoland, the United Kingdom representative had referred exclusively to the Visiting Mission's report, which was a proof of its real nature. The Trusteeship Council's resolution 643 (XI) endorsing that report should be regarded as unjust, biased and contrary to the principles of the United Nations.

133. The Polish delegation's attitude with regard to the Ewe and Togoland unification problem was based on its veneration for the principle of the right of peoples to self-determination and its attachment to the United Nations Charter. The Polish people had been enslaved and divided for over a hundred and fifty years. Today, when it had reconquered its independence and its creative energies were in full flood, it was supporting the Ewe people in their struggle for national liberation.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

^a The Anglo-French Standing Consultative Commission for Togoland Affairs, set up in 1948; and the Enlarged Standing Consultative Commission for Togoland Affairs, set up in 1950.