



C O N T E N T S

Agenda item 35:	
The Togoland unification problem and the future of the Trust Territory of Togoland under British administration: report of the Trusteeship Council (continued)	421

**Chairman: Mr. Luciano JOUBLANC RIVAS
(Mexico).**

AGENDA ITEM 35

The Togoland unification problem and the future of the Trust Territory of Togoland under British administration: report of the Trusteeship Council (A/3046, A/C.4/L.428/Rev.1, A/C.4/L.429, T/1206 and Add.1, T/1214, T/1215) (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY INDIA (A/C.4/L.428/Rev.1) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the revised text of the Indian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.428/Rev.1) embodied those Liberian amendments (A/C.4/L.429) which the Indian representative had accepted.
2. Mr. KHADRA (Saudi Arabia) noted that some of the people in Togoland under British administration advocated unification with the Gold Coast, others preferred their country to remain a separate entity, while yet others wanted union with Togoland under French administration when it became independent.
3. He realized that the best way to ascertain the wishes of the inhabitants would be to provide the Territory with separate political institutions before a plebiscite was held. That method was not practical, however, because it would delay the date at which the people could become independent. It seemed, therefore, that the only possible course was to hold a plebiscite, despite its drawbacks. It would no doubt have been better to organize the plebiscite after the Territory had been granted independence, but that seemed to raise insurmountable difficulties.
4. With regard to the questions to be asked in the plebiscite, he supported the recommendations (T/1206, para. 105) in the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Togoland under British administration and Togoland under French administration, 1955, as they would give the people greater freedom of choice.
5. As to the date of the plebiscite, obviously the sooner it was held the better. The United Nations should accept any formula which would enable the Territory to gain its freedom.
6. Generally speaking, the delegation of Saudi Arabia felt that a referendum should be organized on the

basis of the Territory as a whole. The method suggested by the Visiting Mission (T/1206, para. 108) was, however, the only practical one, in view of the differences between the northern and southern parts of the Territory.

7. The Liberian delegation had proposed the appointment of a five-member commission to supervise the plebiscite (A/C.4/L.429, para. 8) but he agreed with the Indian representative that it would be more practical to entrust that task to a single commissioner.

8. The delegation of Saudi Arabia supported the Visiting Mission's conclusions and would vote in favour of the provisions of the Indian draft resolution and the Liberian amendments which were in keeping with its conclusions.

9. Mr. AGUERO (Chile) congratulated the Visiting Mission and the Secretariat on their work and on the special report (T/1206 and Add.1).

10. Circumstances—to wit, the coming independence of the Gold Coast, the United Kingdom representative's statement at the 528th meeting, the statements of the petitioners and the observations made on the spot by the Visiting Mission—all showed the need to come to some decision which would solve the complicated problem of Togoland under British administration in the best possible way. Whether it was a question of integration, unification or independence, it was impossible to choose a solution without knowing, as required by Article 73 b of the Charter, the political aspirations of the people who would bear the consequences of such action. The best way of ensuring that the will of the people was freely expressed was by direct consultation, which should take the form of a general and free plebiscite, as required by democratic procedure.

11. The Chilean delegation therefore favoured the immediate organization of a plebiscite by means of which Togoland under British administration would decide whether it wished to be integrated with the Gold Coast and to form an independent State together with that country. Needless to say the plebiscite should take place during the good season. It was the responsibility of the Administering Authority to make the necessary arrangements and to carry them out under the supervision of United Nations observers and with every possible safeguard to the voters. As the great majority of the voters were illiterate, it would be better to limit the questions to be asked to the first of those suggested by the Visiting Mission.

12. With regard to Togoland under French administration, the Chilean delegation felt that it should remain under French administration for the time being, until the people were able freely to decide their own future. There must, however, be no prolonging the trusteeship beyond the strict minimum, for the Visiting Mission had noted that the Territory's economic and social development was quite advanced.

13. The Chilean delegation would therefore vote in favour of any draft resolution which would ensure

the achievement of the objectives it had described, which were simply those laid down in the Charter. It knew that in encouraging and assisting the Administering Authorities to carry out their sacred trust it was working for international peace and security in that it was defending human rights and fundamental freedoms. The process of emancipation outlined in the Charter involved not a revolution but an evolution, which must be effected by peaceful means agreed upon by the dependent peoples and those by whom they were administered, under the supervision of the international community represented by the United Nations.

14. Mr. WISNIEWSKI (Poland) said that the Committee was faced with a complicated problem which it should examine carefully and cautiously. The question of the unification of the two Togolands had been on the agenda since 1947. A powerful national movement in that direction had taken shape in the two Territories. There was nothing to indicate that that movement had fallen off in recent years. The Polish delegation had on many occasions expressed its sympathy with the aspirations of the Togolandese for unification and independence.

15. It seemed, however, that the Visiting Mission had concentrated almost exclusively on the question of the possible integration of Togoland under British administration with the Gold Coast. Nor had the Trusteeship Council given any thought to the question of the unification of Togoland. There were close ties between the two Trust Territories; to take a decision with regard to one only might well be to bar the way to their unification and independence.

16. The Togolandese were capable of achieving self-government and the United Nations should come to their assistance. The French delegation envisaged the holding of a referendum in Togoland under French administration. Unfortunately, the circumstances in which such a referendum could take place did not seem satisfactory. Moreover, the plebiscite to be held in Togoland under British administration might not perhaps enable the people to express their will freely. The position to which that Territory had been reduced was an example of the dangers of administrative unions. Deprived of a legislative organ and of administrative institutions, Togoland under British administration was a dependency of the Gold Coast. In the circumstances it was difficult to believe that its people could express their views freely. Moreover, the questions that it was proposed to ask in the plebiscite were not compatible with the objectives of the Trusteeship System. If the provisions of the Charter were to be strictly observed, unification and independence should be given priority over any other kind of status for which the population might be asked to vote. His delegation would support any proposals which would help to put those principles into effect.

17. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) pointed out that the United Nations, which was the guardian of the two Togolands, had delegated the authority it had received from the League of Nations to two great Powers, which were among its principal supporters but which were endowed with extremely different characteristics.

18. When the United Nations had first taken up the problems which arose in the Territories it had adopted resolutions in which it approached those problems from the point of view of unification. The interest appeared to have shifted and was now concentrated on the integration of Togoland under British administration with

the Gold Coast. He wondered what had brought that about. Doubtless the attraction of immediate satisfaction, the prospect of integration with the Gold Coast followed by independence, had been sufficiently strong to deflect the people from their original aspirations. He thought that the desire for unification still existed; if that were indeed the case, what was needed was to find out how the two Territories could be united under one administration, so that they could be led towards independence together.

19. Turning to the question of the plebiscite, he emphasized that, first and foremost, there must be no dividing of Togoland under British administration into four electoral units; if the Territory was to vote, it should do so as a single unit in order to avoid subsequent difficulties. Nor must there be undue haste or insistence that the plebiscite should be held in the coming year. It was clear that the people were not yet ready to vote in full knowledge of the facts and without being subjected to external pressure. No one should assume the responsibility for their choice; the only course was to observe and to await developments. Moreover, the Gold Coast was not yet independent. As the Indian representative had pointed out, the wisdom of the Governments concerned would be open to question if they fixed forthwith a date at which the Territory was to become a State. The future of the two Territories should not be staked on a mere contingency.

20. He therefore appealed to the two Administering Authorities, which were the best judges. He felt that they should be left to decide whether it would not be to the advantage of the two Trust Territories to be annexed together in a few years' time, either to the Gold Coast or to the French Union. It would be wrong to jeopardize the prospect of unification of the two Togolands simply in order to relieve the United Kingdom of its responsibilities. In the name of humanity he urged the United Kingdom, the cradle of the parliamentary system, and France, the traditional guardian of liberty, to co-operate in efforts to find a solution in the interests of the peoples for whom they were responsible. He also requested the Indian delegation to consider whether the solution it was proposing was not premature. Lastly, he reserved the right to submit some amendments.

21. Mr. JAIPAL (India) wished to explain that what the Indian representative had meant to say was that in view of the complexity of legislative processes it was impossible to state the exact date upon which the Gold Coast would attain independence; he had nevertheless pointed out that the United Kingdom Government and the Government of the Gold Coast had announced that the proclamation of independence was close at hand and would take place on 31 December 1956 or at the beginning of 1957 at the very latest.

22. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) thanked the Indian representative for his explanation, which did nothing to alter either his interpretation or his conviction that nothing should be done hastily before the Gold Coast had really attained independence.

23. Mr. APUNTE (Ecuador) pointed out that in document A/2660, submitted by the United Kingdom to the ninth session of the General Assembly, the Administering Authority had expressed itself in favour of the amendment, replacement or termination of the Trusteeship Agreement as alternatives from which a choice would have to be made when the Gold

Coast had attained independence and Togoland under British administration could no longer be administered as an integral part of the Gold Coast. In resolution 860 (IX) the General Assembly referred specifically to those alternatives and stated that the wishes of the people with regard to independence for the two Togolands, unification with the Gold Coast or some other self-governing or independent status should be ascertained.

24. He expressed concern at the apparent desire of some delegations to prove that the integration of Togoland with the Gold Coast was the only way of achieving the objectives of the Trusteeship System. Under the Trusteeship Agreement, obligations had been assumed by two parties, the United Nations and the United Kingdom, towards a third party, the people of the Territory. There were no legal ties with the Gold Coast of such a kind as to make its imminent independence a factor of such significance that it led necessarily and inevitably to the conclusion that the people of Togoland under British administration must decide immediately whether or not they wished to be united with the new State. Realizing that it was impossible for the administration of Togoland to continue as in the past, the United Nations must be primarily concerned to ascertain whether or not the objectives of the Trusteeship System had been achieved in the Territory and to take appropriate steps to meet the new situation that would arise.

25. His delegation felt that it was for the people concerned to decide their own future and that it was important to ensure that their decision would be made in full knowledge of the facts and in complete freedom, which would not be possible until the people had attained an adequate level of cultural, economic and political development. The United Nations was directly responsible for the Trust Territory. The United Nations must ascertain whether the objectives of the Trusteeship System would really be achieved and must ensure that the population would be able to express its wishes freely. It was therefore imperative that, in order to guarantee that freedom, Togoland under British administration should be given a minimum of political institutions of its own before there was any consultation of the people.

26. Subject to those reservations he agreed that a plebiscite should be organized on the understanding that the people would be able to choose from among the various alternatives mentioned in resolution 860 (IX) the solution that suited them, whether it was integration with the Gold Coast, union with Togoland under French administration or independence.

27. Mr. S. S. LIU (China) pointed out that there had been complete agreement in the Trusteeship Council on the Visiting Mission's recommendations concerning the plebiscite. All the members of the Council had thought that a plebiscite to ascertain the wishes of the Togoland people should be organized as soon as possible. Despite the contradictory statements of the petitioners, the Chinese delegation was convinced that the plebiscite was a matter of undeniable urgency.

28. As it had already stated, the Chinese delegation considered that the Togoland people should be asked two questions and that the Territory should be divided into four electoral districts for the purposes of the plebiscite. He was glad that several members of the Committee had expressed the same view and that the Administering Authority itself apparently had no se-

rious objection to the Committee's adopting the Visiting Mission's recommendations. In fact, the United Kingdom representative had said (528th meeting) that his Government had instructed him not to oppose the division of the Territory into electoral districts if the majority of the General Assembly favoured that method. Moreover, while it had been said that the United Kingdom would be unable to administer Togoland, or what would be left of it after the plebiscite, it had also been said that it might be possible to find some administrative arrangement to fill the gap, especially as it would be a purely temporary arrangement. It therefore seemed that the Visiting Mission's recommendations should be accepted.

29. The Chinese delegation agreed with other delegations that at the stage now reached it was quite unnecessary to establish separate institutions in the Trust Territory before the plebiscite was held. It would be a waste of time, it would be very costly, and it would not overcome the difficulties that were still in evidence. Furthermore, many petitioners had declared their intention of boycotting the proposed separate legislative body. If only for that reason, the proposal could not be implemented.

30. The Chinese delegation would vote in favour of the Indian draft resolution and the Liberian amendments, subject to the remarks he had just made.

31. Mr. OFER (Israel) said that his delegation was fully aware of the importance of the matter before the Committee. The attainment by Togoland of self-government or independence would be the first instance of a Trust Territory having achieved the objectives of the Trusteeship System.

32. In considering the matter, the Israel delegation bore in mind four main facts. First, Togoland under British administration had for forty years been administered as an integral part of the Gold Coast; secondly, the Gold Coast was to become independent in the very near future; thirdly, the Administering Authority had stated that the Trust Territory was now ready for independence and that the Trusteeship Agreement for Togoland under British administration should be brought to an end as soon as the Gold Coast achieved independence; fourthly, there was fundamental disagreement among the people of Togoland under British administration about the future of the Territory.

33. In view of those facts, the Israel delegation agreed with the Visiting Mission's conclusion that a plebiscite to determine the inhabitants' wishes with regard to their future should be held in the Territory as soon as possible.

34. With regard to the question or questions that should be put to the population, the Israel delegation's view was based on the following considerations. The integration of the Territory with the Gold Coast, as proposed by the Administering Authority and as desired, to judge from the Visiting Mission's report and the statements of the many petitioners, by a large section of the population, was one of the most outstanding solutions. As the Gold Coast was on the threshold of independence, it was important to ascertain without delay whether the Togoland people accepted or rejected integration. The Visiting Mission's reports and the Fourth Committee's discussions showed that the other solutions put forward, such as the Federation of an independent Togoland with the Gold Coast or its integration with Togoland under French administration when it, too, had achieved independence, did not

seem capable of early implementation. If the inhabitants of the Territory preferred either of those solutions to integration with the Gold Coast, a fresh problem would arise, to wit, that of the transition period between the Territory's separation from the Gold Coast and the time when the solution it chose could be put into effect.

35. That being so, the Israel delegation thought that it would be better and simpler to put a single question and to ask the people only whether or not they desired integration with an independent Gold Coast. The Israel delegation agreed, however, with the Yugoslav and Indian representatives that everything necessary should be done during the preparations for the plebiscite to explain the other solutions as clearly as possible to the Territory's inhabitants.

36. The Israel delegation would vote in favour of the Indian draft resolution in its revised form, for it thought that the resolution showed exactly what action the General Assembly should now take.

37. Mr. BELL (United States of America) said that he was under the impression that at the previous meeting the Venezuelan representative had suggested that the delegations of countries represented on the Visiting Mission to Togoland had rejected the Visiting Mission's report. He was accordingly anxious to explain his own delegation's position on that point.

38. As the Indian and Australian representatives had said, the members of the Visiting Mission appointed by the Trusteeship Council, in carrying out their duties, had not acted as representatives of their Governments. All the members of the Mission had been officially appointed by their Governments, but they had received their instructions from the United Nations and were responsible to the Organization only.

39. As Mr. Robbins had already pointed out at the 536th meeting, the Visiting Mission to Togoland had not tried to dictate to the Trusteeship Council or the General Assembly what they should do. After a study of the situation in the Territory, it had made recommendations on what it deemed to be the best way of finding out the wishes of the inhabitants. The United States delegation had already said that in its opinion the Visiting Mission's report provided a useful basis for the examination of the problem before the Committee. It supported most of the recommendations, including the most important of them. The reason it remained open-minded on the question of the division of the Territory into electoral districts for the plebiscite and on the questions to be put to the population was not that it thought that those recommendations could not be put into effect, but simply that it considered that those questions should be settled in a way that would be satisfactory to the majority of the Members of the Assembly while at the same time ensuring the collaboration of the Administering Authorities.

40. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela), replying to the United States representative, recalled that at the previous meeting he had remarked that it was odd that the Venezuelan delegation should be defending the Visiting Mission's report with more warmth than did the delegations of the countries represented on the Mission. The United States delegation seemed prepared to accept whatever decision the Committee might take, but the Australian and Indian delegations seemed to be speaking against paragraph 108 of the Mission's report.

41. He went on to refer to paragraphs 5 and 6 of General Assembly resolution 553 (VI) concerning the

organization of visiting missions and concluded that, while those who were appointed members of visiting missions acted in a personal capacity, they were obliged to have the assent of their respective Governments.

42. Although Venezuela was not a member of the Trusteeship Council, its delegation defended not only the Visiting Mission's recommendations, but also the Trusteeship Council's conclusions, as stated in its special report (A/3046).

43. However, so far as the Visiting Mission's recommendations were concerned, he associated himself with the comment the representative of Ecuador had just made. The basic objectives of the Trusteeship System were stated in Article 76 of the Charter and included the attainment of self-government or independence by the people of the Trust Territories. In the present case, the General Assembly would be preparing to ask the inhabitants of Togoland under British administration purely and simply to give up their independence and to become part of the Gold Coast or of some other Territory.

44. The Venezuelan delegation saw no need for any hasty action. It might well be that the inhabitants of one or more of the electoral districts contemplated by the Visiting Mission might decide to remain under the Trusteeship System, in the hope that a plebiscite might be arranged in Togoland under French administration before long and that they could then decide to join either a self-governing French Togoland or the Gold Coast. If they were annexed to the Gold Coast immediately, they would no longer be able to make that choice on an equal footing, unless they separated from the Gold Coast. The Venezuelan delegation was not in favour of separation when a province was part of a unitary State.

45. The General Assembly was asking the Togoland-ers to allow it to do their thinking for them, but the reply of the Ewes was that they wished to express their own thoughts for themselves.

46. Mr. PYMAN (Australia) said that his delegation's position was very close to that of the United States delegation. Although the Venezuelan representative might think that the Australian delegation had not shown sufficient enthusiasm in defending the conscientious work and the wisdom of the Visiting Mission, that did not mean that it did not appreciate the Mission's admirable work. It had already spoken highly of that work at the previous meeting. Although the Australian delegation did not altogether approve of the plan to divide the Territory into a number of electoral divisions for the purposes of the plebiscite, it nevertheless understood the Visiting Mission's desire to ensure that the majority decision did not result in large minority groups being carried along. The Australian delegation had said that there was no need to amend a resolution in order to provide for the division of the Territory into a number of districts; it considered that that matter should be left to the Administering Authority's discretion and experience. It had, however, added that, if a draft resolution providing for that division was submitted to the Fourth Committee, it would not oppose it.

47. It had no decided opinion on the two questions to be put to the inhabitants of Togoland under British administration and was interested to hear the opinions of the other delegations.

48. Mr. OSMAN (Egypt) supported the suggestion the Yugoslav representative had made at the previous

meeting with regard to the exact definition of the powers and functions of the supervisory body to be set up by the United Nations to supervise the plebiscite. Chapter IV of the Mission's report not only made recommendations on the subject, but it quoted comments and statements of the Gold Coast Government and so forth. In order to make the task of the Administering Authority and the United Nations supervisory body easier and to avoid any confusion regarding the meaning of the Visiting Mission's recommendations, the Indian draft resolution should do more than simply refer to chapter IV of the Visiting Mission's report. The recommendations would have to be presented in the form of specific rules defining the powers and responsibilities of the supervisory body.

49. He accordingly proposed that the Committee should establish a working group to formulate, on the basis of the recommendations in the report of the Visiting Mission (T/1206), draft terms of reference for the United Nations supervisory plebiscite authority.

50. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that the Togoland question was one of great importance, which called for the Assembly's full attention. He therefore supported the Egyptian proposal.

51. Mr. HOPKINSON (United Kingdom) feared that, if that proposal were adopted, the solution of the problem would be put off for a long time. In the few days left before the closure of the session, a working

group would certainly not have time to codify the Visiting Mission's recommendations. If the Egyptian representative had doubts on any particular point, he could easily ask the Committee for an explanation.

52. Mr. OSMAN (Egypt) still thought that some such codification would assist the Administering Authority and the United Nations body set up to supervise the plebiscite.

53. Mr. HOPKINSON (United Kingdom) pointed out that the Visiting Mission's recommendations were very detailed and gave the Administering Authority all the necessary particulars.

54. In reply to a question by Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela), Mr. OSMAN (Egypt) said that the establishment of a working group would not entail any interruption of the Fourth Committee's work.

55. Mr. TRIANTAPHYLAKOS (Greece) thought that it would be better to postpone further consideration of the Egyptian proposal until the Committee's next meeting.

56. Ato YIFRU (Ethiopia) presented the Greek suggestion as a formal proposal.

The proposal was adopted by 25 votes to 2, with 19 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.