



Wednesday, 2 January 1952, at 3 p.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

	Page
Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/1856) (continued).....	217

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

Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/1856)
(continued)
[Item 12]*

THE EWE PROBLEM (A/C.4/195 AND ADD. 1 AND 2, A/C.4/198, A/C.4/L.163, A/C.4/L.168, A/C.4/L.182, A/C.4/L.182/REV. 1) (continued)

1. At the request of the CHAIRMAN, Mr. ALEKSANDER (Secretary of the Committee) read the following two cablegrams addressed to the Chairman of the Fourth Committee and sent from Lomé on 26 December 1951:

“ We protest vigorously against spurious cablegram of 18 December¹ calculated to confuse terms of reference of delegation of *Parti progrès* to your Assembly. Since the above-mentioned cablegram is undoubtedly a forgery, we are immediately taking steps to have the matter brought before the courts and to find the forger. Our policy, which has not changed, is as described by Grunitsky, Ajavon and Fousséni, who have our full confidence.

(Signed) AQUAREBURU and BRENNER ”

“ At a special meeting on 24 December to take note of report of delegation of *Parti progrès* to your Assembly, the Executive Committee solemnly protested against tendentious manoeuvres revealed in spurious cablegram of 18 December, the work of a forger and an offence punishable by the courts. Would like to assure your honourable Assembly of the permanence of our unchanged ideals. Has confidence in its delegation's ability to develop its policy and programme.

(Signed) SEGLA ”

First Vice-President

2. The CHAIRMAN that Mr. Sylvanus Olympio had asked leave to make a brief explanatory statement.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Sylvanus Olympio, representative of the All-Ewe Conference, took a place at the Committee table.

3. Mr. OLYMPIO (All-Ewe Conference) thanked the Chairman and the members of the Committee for giving a hearing to Mr. Antor, Mr. Aku and himself, and especially those members who by the questions they had put had shown their interest in the Ewe problem. He wanted to address the Committee in his own name as well as in the names of Mr. Antor and Mr. Aku.

4. He had been greatly disappointed by the statement of the French representative (229th meeting) who had denied the truth of all that the Ewe representatives had said. In fact, even while he himself had been pleading his people's cause in Paris, further incidents of oppression had taken place in Togoland under French administration.

5. It had not been easy to persuade the Ewe people once again to incur the trouble and expense of sending representatives to the United Nations, after five years of virtually fruitless efforts. After an auspicious start, the Trusteeship Council had gradually surrendered to the Administering Authorities and, with the exception of a few members, had turned a deaf ear to the report² of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa, which it had itself sent out and which had found that the Ewes' demand for unification was genuine and legitimate. If the United Nations was to be effective, it must command the confidence of ordinary people all over the world. The problem of Ewe unification might be insignificant as compared with the problems of Europe, America and Asia, but it might be regarded as a test not only of the purposes and principles of the United Nations and the Charter, but of the sincerity and honesty of the kind of civilization that was being imposed on Africa.

6. The Ewe people had had troubles before they appealed to the United Nations, but they had been free to organize and to fight for justice. Now they had lost those freedoms; since their case had come into the international limelight every effort was being exerted to suppress them.

Mr. Sylvanus Olympio, representative of the All-Ewe Conference, withdrew.

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.
¹ The substance of the telegram referred to is set forth in document A/C.4/195/Add.2, para. 2.

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

7. Mr. TAJIBNAPIS (Indonesia) suggested that the Committee should at once take effective action to realize the long-deferred hope that a final solution of the problem would be found.

8. When, during the Assembly's fifth session, there had been complaints of unmerited arrests and reports of undemocratic elections in Togoland under French administration, the Indonesian delegation had made its position clear.³ It had not felt the least doubt that the unification movement was genuinely nationalistic, and that had also been the opinion of the Visiting Mission, whose report the Administering Authorities had considered to be valuable. Yet now the French representative described the unification of Togoland as a mere vision and said, moreover, that there was no need for anxiety about conditions in the Territory inasmuch as the population was living in a completely peaceful and orderly way. Such statements had long been familiar to the people of Indonesia, and he had listened to them with scepticism.

9. The French-United Kingdom proposals (A/C.4/198) should be considered in the light of the history of the Enlarged Standing Consultative Commission for Togoland Affairs. The most important points of Trusteeship Council resolution 345 (IX) concerned, first, the terms of reference of the proposed joint council and, secondly, the composition of that body. On both those points the Administering Authorities had failed to carry out the Trusteeship Council's decision. The terms of reference for the joint council proposed by the United Kingdom and France differed from the Trusteeship Council's recommendations. The most important part of the Trusteeship Council's resolution was the recommendation that competence to deal with the political aspects of the Ewe problem should be added to the proposed functions of the joint council. The United Kingdom representative had argued that the phrase "on matters of common concern", in the third paragraph of the preamble of the French-United Kingdom draft resolution (A/C.4/L.163) included everything the Trusteeship Council wanted; the fact was, however, that that phrase was somewhat vague and the Indonesian delegation therefore preferred paragraph 4 of the amendment (A/C.4/L.168) to that draft resolution submitted jointly by Brazil, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Pakistan, the Philippines and Uruguay.

10. The Trusteeship Council had recommended that the methods of determining the composition of the joint council should be such as to ensure the participation of the major groups in the two Trust Territories. Paragraph 3 of document A/C.4/198 was the answer of the two Administering Authorities to that recommendation. The Indonesian delegation had grave doubts whether the proposed method of electing the members of the joint council would induce the most important groups in the two Trust Territories to participate in its work. In the light of the history of the Ewe problem the Trusteeship Council's recommendation

could only mean that the Administering Authorities should seek ways and means to ensure the participation of representatives of the Ewe and Togoland unification movements. He was convinced that the proposals contained in the joint draft amendment (A/C.4/L.168) would be more likely to attract the co-operation of the Ewe peoples' leaders than those embodied in the French-United Kingdom proposal.

11. An important aspect of the problem was its urgency. In order to deal with it adequately the Trusteeship Council should devote more attention to it than in the past. In the opinion of the Indonesian delegation, a mission, perhaps a special mission, should be dispatched to the two Trust Territories to study the problem on the spot and to make specific recommendations to the Trusteeship Council.

12. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) said that there were several points in the joint draft amendment to the French-United Kingdom draft resolution with which he was unable to agree. Nevertheless he was anxious to co-operate as far as possible by accepting those points which he felt would contribute to a solution of the problem. He would therefore submit an amendment to the joint draft amendment and he hoped that the sponsors would accept it in the spirit in which it was put forward. He read his proposed amendment (A/C.4/L.182).

13. Mr. PIGNON (France), replying to the representative of Indonesia, denied that he had ever described the unification of Togoland as a vision. A reference to the summary record of the 229th meeting would show that he had applied that term to the conception of an Ewe state. With regard to the unification of Togoland, he had indicated the difficulties which prevented its immediate realization, but had not said that it was impossible or undesirable.

14. Referring to the joint draft amendment contained in document A/C.4/L.168, he would have no objection to the adoption of paragraphs 1 and 2 of that joint draft amendment.

15. Paragraph 3 appeared to imply a criticism of the Trusteeship Council which he felt was unjustified.

16. With regard to paragraph 4, he would only say that the United Kingdom representative and he himself had already given identical interpretations of the terms of reference of the joint council.

17. Paragraph 5 in its essence contained what the Trusteeship Council resolution had been designed to achieve. The system chosen by the Administering Authorities would ensure at least three representatives for the « Unité togolaise. »

18. He had serious objections to paragraph 6. He had already expressed his views at the 229th meeting and had replied in advance to the questions arising out of sub-paragraphs (a) and (b). It was impossible to frame a plan which would be acceptable to all parties. What had been done was merely a beginning, but it was practicable and opened the door to a peaceful settlement. The proposed method was both democratic and fair. With reference to sub-paragraph 6 (b),

³ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, fifth Session, fourth Committee, 161st meeting.*

the sponsors had heard the statements of the Administering Authorities and of the petitioners; they should take into consideration all the opinions submitted to the Committee. It was superfluous to emphasize the importance of the opinion of the Administering Authorities, who bore the direct responsibility for the solution of the problem.

19. He had been surprised to hear the questions put at the 233rd meeting to the petitioners heard at that time, with a view to verifying their terms of reference. On a previous occasion (222nd meeting) the representative of Cuba had stressed that questions of a personal nature should not be asked of the Reverend Michael Scott. The petitioners heard at that meeting had, however, answered the questions satisfactorily and their opinion was worthy of note.

20. Paragraph 7 (b) gave rise to the most serious objections. He had already pointed out the difficulties and dangers inherent in a method of appointment which would oppose the representatives to those with whom they would have to work in harmony if any good results were to be attained. He entirely supported the draft amendment submitted by the United Kingdom representative.

21. The responsibilities of the Administering Authorities were direct and immediate, and the burdens of government, especially in a period of rapid evolution, heavy and difficult. He asked the Fourth Committee to support the Administering Authorities in a course of action which they sincerely believed to be consistent with the aims and objects of the United Nations.

22. Mr. TAJIBNAPIS (Indonesia) thanked the French representative for pointing out the difference between the unification of Eweland and that of Togoland and explained that he had meant to refer to Eweland in his statement.

23. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that the Administering Authorities, France and the United Kingdom, were obviously the most anxious to find a satisfactory settlement of the Ewe problem. Had there been any easy solution, they would have found it long ago. Unfortunately, the matter was extremely complicated.

24. It had been said that the frontiers imposed on the African continent during the period of colonization had been drawn with no regard for ethnic considerations. While not denying that fact, he pointed out that the lives of many peoples—for instance, of two great States, Canada and the United States—remained undisturbed by the straight and artificial frontier between them. The former German Togoland, now regarded as a desirable entity, had been created equally artificially.

25. He drew attention to the fact that no vote had been cast against Trusteeship Council resolution 345 (IX) and asked the Committee to bear that in mind.

26. He felt that the joint amendment (A/C.4/L.168) to the draft resolution submitted by France and the United Kingdom tended to confuse the responsibilities of the Administering Authorities and those of the Trusteeship Council and the General Assembly. The Assembly was not responsible for the administration of the Trust Territories nor for solving the problems

affecting them. It was for the Administering Authorities alone to find a settlement. The Ewe problem raised such difficult points as the extent to which the right to self-determination included the right of secession, and only the inhabitants of the Territories themselves could find a solution which would be acceptable to all the peoples concerned. The proposed joint council was intended to bring representatives of all parties and groups together in a common effort to reach the best possible settlement. A mere majority vote would not suffice. What was needed was exhaustive discussion and a final compromise. To achieve that, all groups must be represented, but there was no need to ensure that such representation should be exactly proportionate to the amount of support that each group enjoyed. He was not therefore in favour of paragraph 7 (b) of the joint amendment. He also regretted that paragraph 7 (e) of the same joint amendment recommended that the Trusteeship Council should dispatch a special mission to the Trust Territories concerned, or the periodic visiting mission, with special instructions. The Trusteeship Council should not assume responsibility for a solution, but should confine itself to examining the action taken by the Administering Authorities. The Belgian delegation would be unable to support the proposed amendment unless it was acceptable to France and the United Kingdom as the Administering Authorities responsible for both Togolands; it was acceptable, his delegation would support it.

27. Mr. ZIAUD-DIN (Pakistan) requested a short recess to enable the co-sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.4/L.168 to examine the proposals in document A/C.4/L.182 with the delegations of France and the United Kingdom and attempt as far as possible to reconcile them.

The meeting was suspended at 4.20 p.m. and was resumed at 5.10 p.m.

28. Mr. ZIAUD-DIN (Pakistan) said that the nine sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.4/L.168 had agreed to accept with slight modifications the amendment to that amendment proposed by France and the United Kingdom.

29. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) said that the delegations of France and the United Kingdom had accepted the slight alterations to their amendment proposed by the sponsors of document A/C.4/L.168. The agreed version of that amendment appeared in document A/C.4/L.182/Rev.1. He thanked the delegations concerned for their co-operation and expressed his real appreciation of the effort made to reach a compromise.

30. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) said that he had listened with great interest to the statements made to the Committee by the representatives of the various groups in the two Togolands, and had been impressed by their evident sincerity. He sympathized with the difficulties that had been caused by long separation and the differences imposed by differing systems of education and political institutions. He was sure that all delegations wished to see the injustice righted.

31. The United States had been a member of the first Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa and had subscribed fully to the analysis of the situation in the two Trust Territories given in that body's report. Since that time the Trusteeship Council, the General Assembly and the Administering Authorities had given the problem careful consideration. If no solution had been reached, it was because it had been realized how complicated the problem was. Moreover, its terms were constantly changing. The emphasis had shifted now from a unification of the Ewe peoples to the unification of both Togolands and, recent developments in the Gold Coast would undoubtedly affect it further. Much contradictory evidence had been laid before the Committee and it was plain that opinion among the peoples of the two Togolands was in a state of evolution. It would be wrong for the Fourth Committee to attempt to decide at once on a final settlement. It should therefore accept the principle of the proposed joint council as a practical interim measure, and at the same time make arrangements to obtain more detailed and direct information from all the tribes and groups concerned. A second visiting mission should be sent to West Africa with instructions to report on the operation of the joint council and the views of all main groups in the two Togolands.

32. He was glad that the Administering Authorities and the sponsors of the amendment to the joint draft resolution had been able to reach agreement. The United States would have pleasure in voting for the amended draft resolution. He wished to propose, however, that paragraph 3 of the joint amendment (A/C.4/L.168) should be deleted, and the second paragraph of the preamble of the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.163) allowed to stand. For five years, the Trusteeship Council had devoted much careful study to the Ewe problem and in justice that should be recognized.

33. Mr. MANTILLA (Ecuador) said that the Ecuadorean delegation, as a co-sponsor of the amendment to the draft resolution submitted by France and the United Kingdom, agreed to the changes made by document A/C.4/L.182/Rev.1. It had, however, certain reservations to make in regard to the amended version of paragraph 7 (b) as given in paragraph 2 of that document. The new text spoke of devising "satisfactory procedures" for the election of representatives to the joint council, whereas the original amendment had specified direct representation and universal adult suffrage. The revised version was much vaguer than the first and he was also doubtful that results would be achieved by proposing methods of election to the various opposing parties. The Ecuadorean delegation would abstain from voting on that paragraph.

34. He recognized that the Trusteeship Council had devoted much study to the Ewe problem and was inclined to agree with the United States representative's proposal. He felt that it should be made clear, however, that no effective result had been obtained.

35. Mr. ZARUBIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation sympathized with the desire of the Ewe people for unification and inde-

pendence. Their demands were just and should be satisfied. Some points in the joint draft resolution and the amendments to it were acceptable, but it did not take into full account the desire of the Ewe people, and the USSR delegation would therefore abstain from voting on it.

36. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) observed that the Ecuadorean representative seemed to reproach the Trusteeship Council for having failed to find a solution. For his part, Mr. Ryckmans did not consider that the Trusteeship Council was in fact responsible for finding a solution. Its role was to consider the action taken by the Administering Authorities.

37. Mr. DE PAIVA LEITE (Brazil), referring to the Ecuadorean representative's remarks, explained that his delegation, in accepting the revised wording for paragraph 7 (b) of the joint draft amendment, was not in fact abandoning the principle of universal adult suffrage for the election of representatives to the proposed joint council, since the only method likely to meet with the approval of all the various parties to be consulted would be election by universal suffrage. Having that reservation in mind, his delegation agreed to the change in paragraph 7 (b) set forth in document A/C.4/L.182/Rev.1.

38. With regard to the United States representative's appeal for the retention of the second paragraph of the preamble of the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.163), he pointed out that two of the co-sponsors of the proposed deletion, Iraq and the Philippines, were also members of the Trusteeship Council, and they had apparently considered that the efforts of the Council to find a solution to the Ewe problem were not worthy of special mention in a General Assembly resolution. One thing was certain: those efforts had failed, and the proof thereof was that the General Assembly had taken the matter into its own hands. Before commenting further, he would prefer to await the reaction of those two delegations.

39. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) fully endorsed the Brazilian representative's last remarks. The fact that the Ewe problem was now before the General Assembly was sufficient indication that the efforts made by the Trusteeship Council during the past five years had failed. The General Assembly, in taking up the matter, was merely following a general procedure established in similar cases of failure on the part of its subsidiary organs, and there was no reflection on the Trusteeship Council. He was unable to accept the United States representative's view.

40. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) said that his delegation had been impressed by the goodwill and efforts of the Administering Authorities concerned to find a solution to the problem and would accordingly now be prepared to support the French-United Kingdom draft resolution.

41. The Ewe problem was essentially a humanitarian one, whose solution depended upon the Administering Authorities, and he would like, in a purely humanitarian spirit, to suggest that some modification of existing Trusteeship Agreements might be made whereby the

two Togolands and the two Cameroons would be placed under a single administration. As yet, no problem had arisen in respect of the two Trust Territories of the Cameroons under French and British administration, but such action might be a means of avoiding similar problems there in the future. At the same time, it would satisfy the intense desire of the Ewe people for unification and would pave the way for an eventual union of the two Togolands—and perhaps also of the two Cameroons—under a single administration. The proposals in the joint draft resolution were neither wholly satisfactory nor a definitive solution to the problem. The only way to give full satisfaction to the Ewe people would be to unite the two Togolands.

42. Mr. KERNKAMP (Netherlands) endorsed the United States representative's view regarding references to the Trusteeship Council's efforts in the matter and felt that all implied censure of the Council should be deleted from the proposed amendment. He therefore suggested, without making a formal proposal, that the words "devote more intensive", in paragraph 7 (d) of the joint amendment (A/C.4/L.168), should be changed to "continue to devote intensive".

43. The CHAIRMAN put the proposed joint amendment (A/C.4/L.168) to the French-United Kingdom joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.163) to the vote.

Paragraphs 1 and 2 were approved unanimously.

Paragraph 3 was approved by 23 votes to 17, with 5 abstentions.

Paragraphs 4 and 5 were approved by 41 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Paragraph 6, as amended by France and the United Kingdom (A/C.4/L.182/Rev.1), was approved unanimously.

44. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) asked that the sub-sections of paragraph 7 should be voted upon separately.

Paragraph 7 (a) was approved by 41 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Paragraph 7 (b) as amended by France and the United Kingdom (A/C.4/L.182/Rev.1), was approved by 38 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

Paragraph 7 (c) was approved by 35 votes to 2, with 8 abstentions.

Paragraph 7 (d) was approved by 32 votes to 10, with 4 abstentions.

Paragraphs 7 (e) and 7 (f) were approved by 40 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

45. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) explained his negative vote on paragraph 7 (f) on the grounds that the visiting mission would find it impossible to carry out its task satisfactorily and at the same time report to the eleventh session of the Trusteeship Council.

Paragraph 7 (g) was approved by 40 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

Paragraph 7 as a whole, as amended, was approved by 39 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions.

46. Mr. DE PAIVA LEITE (Brazil) asked for a vote by roll-call on the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.163), as amended.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour : Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Chile, China, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway.

Abstaining : Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Belgium, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, Luxembourg, New Zealand.

The joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.163), as amended, was approved by 35 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

47. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) explained that he had abstained in the vote because there were certain paragraphs of the amended draft resolution with which he could not agree and other paragraphs which seemed to him impractical. The original joint draft resolution was one which contemplated immediate action. The amended version would inevitably result in delay, not least in the setting up of the proposed joint council for Togoland affairs. In the past the Trusteeship Council and the Administering Authorities had frequently been criticized for delays in finding solutions to Togoland problems. He accordingly hoped that any delay occurring as a result of the draft resolution just approved would not be laid at the door of the Administering Authorities since it would arise directly from the action of the Fourth Committee.

48. Mr. PIGNON (France) said that the reasons just given by the United Kingdom representative perfectly explained their common viewpoint and hence his abstention.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.