



C O N T E N T S

	<i>Page</i>
The Ewe and Togoland unification problem: special report of the Trusteeship Council (<i>continued</i>).....	349

Chairman: Mr. Santiago PEREZ PEREZ (Venezuela).

The Ewe and Togoland unification problem: special report of the Trusteeship Council (A/2424) (*continued*)

[Item 31]*

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Antor, Mr. Odame and Mr. Armattoe, representatives of the Joint Togoland Congress, Mr. Olympio, representative of the All-Ewe Conference, and Mr. Brenner, representative of the Parti togolais du progrès, took places at the Committee table.

1. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) said that he concluded from Mr. Brenner's statements at the 367th and 368th meetings that the Parti togolais du progrès was not in principle opposed to the unification of Togoland, but that it seemed to fear that if unification should take place before Togoland became independent, Togoland under French administration might find itself within the British sphere of influence. The Parti togolais du progrès believed that the organizations from Togoland under British administration to which the Committee had given hearings intended to bring about the unification of Togoland with the Gold Coast, and it was for that reason that the Parti togolais du progrès was opposed to the reconstitution of the Joint Council.

2. The representatives of the Joint Togoland Congress had declared that the people they represented were opposed to the fusion of Togoland with the Gold Coast. He wondered if that was enough to dispel the fears of the Parti togolais du progrès.

3. Mr. BRENNER (Parti togolais du progrès) pointed out that the statements made before the Committee had appeared to be on the subject of the unification of the Ewes rather than the unification of Togoland. As there were Ewes not only in the two Togolands but also in the Gold Coast, uncertainty as to the scope of the term "unification" made his party fear lest a resolution recommending unification might serve the purposes of the Gold Coast Government as revealed in the secret document which had recently come before the Committee (T/Pet.6/L.11). A clear distinction should therefore be drawn between the unification of the Ewes and the unification of Togoland. The Parti togolais du progrès was in favour of the unification of Togoland but felt that it should not take place before

the people of Togoland had attained political maturity. Then and then only could they make their choice, and it would be for them to make it. The people had already been consulted and had opposed the reconstitution of the Joint Council, as could be seen from the proposal adopted by the Congress of the Parti togolais du progrès which he had read at the 367th meeting.

4. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) believed he was right in assuming that the Parti togolais du progrès would not object to the unification of Togoland if the country were then placed under the trusteeship of France.

5. Mr. BRENNER (Parti togolais du progrès) said that it was not a matter of choosing between the trusteeship of one or other of the Administering Authorities. The Parti togolais du progrès wanted Togoland to be unified under the French flag because that solution was in the interests of the people of Togoland as a whole: the educated indigenous young people of French education who would be required to administer Togoland numbered 200 in Togoland under French administration, as compared with a mere ten of British education in Togoland under British administration. The desire not to lose that group already trained in Togoland under French administration was quite legitimate since it was much larger than the number educated in Togoland under British administration. Togoland had already suffered a loss of the some kind when the German administration had come to an end: the training received under that administration had lost all its value and the class which had been so trained had disappeared.

6. Mr. ARMATTOE (Joint Togoland Congress) thought those fears unjustified since the party expressing them certainly represented the majority of the Togoland population and would undoubtedly obtain the majority of votes in the elections. He wished to assure the Togoland of French background that they had nothing to fear from the Togoland at present administered by the United Kingdom; as the population of Togoland under French administration was greater than that of Togoland under British administration, the contrary would be more likely to occur. Besides, Togoland were Africans before anything else; he did not see why a French training need prevent a doctor or technician from following his occupation in a self-governing Togoland.

7. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) asked whether the problem raised by Mr. Brenner would not occur in any case, whether the country were unified before or after becoming independent. In addition, he wished to know whether the argument that the fusion of Togoland under British administration with the Gold Coast would justify the Union of Togoland under French administration with neighboring French territories was officially put forward by the Parti togolais du progrès.

8. Mr. BRENNER (Parti togolais du progrès) said that if it was admitted that Togoland under British administration could become self-governing within the

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

Commonwealth, his party could not be reproached for wanting Togoland under French administration to become self-governing within the French Union.

9. In reply to a further question from Mr. INGLES (Philippines) Mr. BRENNER (Parti togolais du progrès) said that he was not in a position to state his party's views on the possible establishment of a Franco-British condominium for Togoland as a whole. The people must decide and their wish would be the wish of his party.

10. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) asked why the Parti togolais du progrès had not responded to the invitation of the other parties to meet in order to agree on general principles in connexion with the consultations recommended by the General Assembly in its resolution 652 (VII).

11. Mr. BRENNER (Parti togolais du progrès) recalled that his party had taken the first step in making contact with the Unité togolaise but the uncooperative attitude of the latter had convinced it of the futility of attempting further consultation. Furthermore, the only really useful consultations were those of the people; it would be useless for the parties to agree on certain steps if the people did not accept them. The Parti togolais du progrès had therefore taken particular care to hold meetings to inform the people, which representatives of any other party had been perfectly free to attend.

12. Mr. LAWRENCE (Liberia), noting that the various organizations heard by the Committee held different views on the matter of the unification of Togoland, wondered whether the representatives of those organizations would be able to put forward suggestions on the basis of which the Committee might draw up a scheme for the unification of Togoland.

13. Mr. ARMATTOE (Joint Togoland Congress) believed that the divergencies could be explained by the fact that the Parti togolais du progrès objected to the fact that the All-Ewe Conference and the Joint Togoland Congress wanted freedom. All living creatures desired freedom. A people able to choose freedom could not reject it without losing its human dignity. France's work, its mission in the world, were meaningless unless they enabled the French and the overseas populations, united in a common freedom, to help one another in productive endeavour and to defend one another in case of war. The Togolandians certainly sought no quarrel with France; they were proud of its past, they had been enriched by its cultural contributions and they had assisted it in its wars. The example of Governor Eboué was proof that given the opportunity, the overseas peoples were capable of great achievements, whether inspired by gratitude or the hope of a brighter future. To refuse them freedom was to betray France's mission and, in the long run, to jeopardize French interests. The value of the work that France had accomplished in Dahomey, Senegal and other colonies whose destiny was linked with that of France should not be underestimated; but Togoland was in a different situation. It was going through a period of transition, and France's role was to prepare the people for the freedom which, in keeping with the French tradition, must be granted.

14. Replying to a question by Mr. LAWRENCE (Liberia) regarding the reaction of the Gold Coast population to the publication of the secret document which had been mentioned earlier, Mr. ODAME (Joint Togoland Congress) stated that the Gold Coast popula-

tion, which was itself struggling to achieve self-government, felt the keenest sympathy for the people of Togoland and their struggle for independence. A distinction should therefore be drawn between the aspirations of the Gold Coast population and the actions of the government of that territory. In his opinion the United Kingdom Government was the author of the secret document; the Convention People's Party, a tool of the Administration, was to ensure the execution of the plan set forth in that document. Applying the golden rule of the colonial Powers—divide and rule—the United Kingdom sought to sow discord between the people of the Gold Coast and the people of Togoland in order to subjugate both. The latter would frustrate that attempt by refusing to quarrel with their Gold Coast brothers.

15. Replying to a further question by Mr. LAWRENCE (Liberia) regarding the extent to which the population of Togoland under British administration participated in commercial activity, Mr. ODAME (Joint Togoland Congress) recalled the information he had furnished at the 366th meeting on the terms of sale of cocoa, the production of which constituted the primary source of income of Togoland farmers. Since the price arbitrarily fixed for that product covered only production costs and the bare subsistence of the producers, Togoland farmers had no reserve capital that they could use to engage in trade. When they applied for a loan to the Agricultural Loans Board a body recently created by the Administration, they were asked their political opinions and their application was rejected if they admitted membership in a party favouring unification.

16. Mr. ARMATTOE (Joint Togoland Congress) supported Mr. Odame's statement. It was not generally known that cocoa of superior quality was produced in Togoland under British administration, because the Gold Coast was shown as the country of origin on the sacks in which it was transported. Togoland under British administration received no share of the profits derived from cocoa production; that was why, during the period of United Kingdom trusteeship over that territory, the Administration had not built a single mile of road.

17. Mr. ANTOR (Joint Togoland Congress) stated that the funds of the Gold Coast Cocoa Marketing Board were entrusted to a body composed of members of the Convention People's Party set up to handle credit operations. To obtain a loan the farmers had to provide information regarding their real property and mortgage their holdings. The profits of the Board, and consequently the funds entrusted to the credit body, were derived from the difference between the very low arbitrary price fixed for the product and the price on the world cocoa market. Hence the funds that the farmers borrowed in reality belonged to them. The purpose of that policy was to stifle the economic activity of the Togolandians and to reduce them to poverty in order to deprive them of any means of action.

18. Mr. LAWRENCE (Liberia) asked whether there was a system of scholarships in Togoland under British administration analogous to that in Togoland under French administration.

19. Mr. ARMATTOE (Joint Togoland Congress) replied that the Administration granted no scholarships to the inhabitants of Togoland under British administration. A scholarship had been granted to a medical student but had been withdrawn. Togolandians could not even avail themselves of the scholarships of-

ferred by the United Nations. He cited the case of a student who had obtained a scholarship to continue his studies in India. He had not been able to obtain his passport until the United Nations, as a result of petitions addressed to it, had intervened with the Administration. The Gold Coast Government had obtained loans from the Cocoa Marketing Board to finance scholarships which had been granted to persons who had no school or university diploma, and who were therefore unable to derive any real benefit from it, whereas no scholarships had been granted in Togoland, which provided most of the revenue and where there were qualified persons for whom the scholarships would have had real value. Those facts were proof of a deliberate policy of discrimination against the people of Togoland.

20. Mr. ANTOR (Joint Togoland Congress) drew attention to the fact that the Administration of Togoland under British administration had not availed itself of the United Nations Technical Assistance Programme. With regard to scholarships, three teachers employed by the missions had received scholarships granted by the missions themselves. No other inhabitant of Togoland under British administration had received a scholarship to study abroad. He had raised that question at the ninth session of the Trusteeship Council and the Council had adopted a resolution (405 (IX)) calling for the establishment of a committee to examine cases involving the allocation of scholarships in Togoland. The resolution had remained a dead letter, and the United Kingdom continued to bar the Togolandians from access to study which would enable them to acquire the training that they needed.

21. Replying to Mr. LAWRENCE (Liberia), Mr. BRENNER (Parti togolais du Progrès) stated that his party had loyally co-operated in the Joint Council created pursuant to a General Assembly resolution (555 (VI)). On the other hand, the party representing the other Togoland organizations heard by the Committee had refused to take part. It was inadmissible that one party should be in a privileged position, allowing it, first, to impede the normal functioning of the Joint Council, and, subsequently, to have that Council established contrary to the express wish of the population.

22. Mr. ANTOR (Joint Togoland Congress) wished to specify the reasons which had led his party to dissociate itself from the work of the Joint Council for Togoland Affairs. The members of the Council had not been elected by universal adult suffrage. Furthermore, the supporters of the Joint Togoland Congress in the area under French administration had not been allowed to elect their chosen candidates. And in Togoland under British administration, the members of the Council had simply been appointed. That being the case, his party had felt that the Council was not qualified to defend the interests of the people concerned.

23. Mr. ODAME (Joint Togoland Congress) affirmed that the existence of two separate Administrations in Togoland, one French and the other British, meant that each of the two Territories was a separate entity, entitled to the same representation as the other, irrespective of its total population. That was the principle prevailing in the United Nations where all Member States, whether minor or major Powers, had equal representation.

24. In reply to Mr. LAWRENCE (Liberia), Mr. ANTOR (Joint Togoland Congress) remarked

that the French authorities had resorted to repressive measures in preventing the electors who did not belong to the Parti togolais du progrès from sending representatives to the Joint Council. Consequently, it could not be said that the inhabitants of Togoland under French administration had been consulted through free elections. For that reason, the Joint Togoland Congress did not consider that the Joint Council would lead to the desired end.

25. Mr. BRENNER (Parti togolais du progrès) strongly objected to that allegation, and recalled that the French Administration had not been able to bring pressure to bear on the electors, since it was the Territorial Assembly which had elected the representatives of Togoland under French administration to the Joint Council.

26. Mr. OLYMPIO (All-Ewe Conference) observed that the body under discussion was not the Joint Council for Togoland Affairs, the re-establishment of which had been recommended by General Assembly resolution 652 (VII), but the Joint Council created pursuant to resolution 555 (VI). It was wrong to state that the members representing Togoland under French administration on that Council had been elected by the Territorial Assembly. Only three of those members had been elected by that Assembly, whilst the remaining twelve had been appointed by the district councils; and everybody was well aware that the members of those councils were themselves elected by the village chiefs, who were officials of the Administering Authorities. If those Authorities genuinely desired the composition of the Joint Council to represent the wish of the people, they must organize free elections and abstain from any intervention which might influence the results. For that reason, the All-Ewe Conference supported the General Assembly resolution for the re-establishment of the Joint Council on the basis of universal adult suffrage.

27. Mr. BRENNER (Parti togolais du progrès) again wished to stress, in order to avoid the confusion which might arise from so many contradictory and tendentious statements, that the elected members of the Joint Council had indeed been freely chosen by the inhabitants, and that the French Administration had not imposed its own candidates. The best evidence of that was that in Lomé, the candidate of the Parti togolais du progrès had not been elected, since it had not a majority in the constituency. The other members of the Joint Council had been appointed by the Territorial Assembly.

28. Mr. OLYMPIO (All-Ewe Conference) was gratified to note that Mr. Brenner himself conceded that the members of the Joint Council had been appointed and not elected, since that was the important point for the Committee to bear in mind.

29. Mr. BRENNER (Parti togolais du progrès), in reply to another question by Mr. LAWRENCE (Liberia), declared that his French citizenship did not in any way preclude him from speaking on behalf of the indigenous inhabitants of Togoland. He never forgot that he was a Togolander by birth and by sentiment, which gave him an absolute right to take part in his country's affairs. In any event, the point was irrelevant to the present debate, the purpose of which was to find a fair solution to the problem of unification and decide on the future of Togoland.

30. In reply to a further question by Mr. LAWRENCE (Liberia) concerning the required qualifications for inclusion in the electoral registers, Mr. BRENNER

NER (Parti togolais du progrès) pointed out that, as the French authorities had prepared the electoral system in force in Togoland under French administration, the French delegation was best qualified to give the required information.

31. Mr. LAWRENCE (Liberia) thanked the petitioners for the courteous way in which they had presented their respective points of view.

32. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) recalled that at the 366th meeting Mr. Olympio had stated that the consultations undertaken by the Administering Authorities in accordance with the General Assembly resolution had been on an unnecessarily large scale, that the re-establishment of the Joint Council was an indispensable step towards unification, and that the party represented by Mr. Olympio had not seen fit to take part in the first Joint Council, the members of which had not been elected. Did Mr. Olympio consider that the Administering Authorities should organize fresh consultations with the political parties before re-establishing the Joint Council, and if so, what methods should be employed to obtain the best results?

33. Mr. OLYMPIO (All-Ewe Conference) repeated that the French authorities had invited all the inhabitants, even members of sporting organizations, to write to the Governor declaring their hostility to the re-establishment of the Joint Council. That was not the way to consult the population. The political parties represented every shade of opinion now to be found in the Territory. It was consequently sufficient for the Administering Authorities to inquire of those parties whether or not the inhabitants were favourable to the re-establishment of the Joint Council. Those inhabitants who did not belong to any political party could choose any candidate they wanted during the free elections organized on the basis of universal adult suffrage.

34. If they were to be of real use, any new consultations should take the form of direct negotiations between the Administering Authorities and the political parties' representatives. He was convinced that if those Authorities were really willing to agree to the re-establishment of the Joint Council, the people of Togoland under French administration would not oppose such a measure.

35. Mr. ARMATTOE (Joint Togoland Congress) felt that new consultations would be of interest only if the goodwill of the Administering Authorities were an established fact. He was willing to seek a basis of understanding with the French delegation forthwith if its instructions enabled it to commit its Government in that matter; such a direct contact would be an indication of the French Government's sincerity and would, moreover, obviate any such misunderstanding as was likely to occur when negotiations were conducted by intermediaries.

36. It had often been said that the peoples of the Trust Territories were not yet ready for self-government. They were already capable of occupying the administrative posts essential to the life of a country; the mark of self-government was not so much government stability as the continuity of public functions.

37. Mr. BRENNER (Parti togolais du progrès) shared the view that new consultations might be useful.

38. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) thanked the various representatives for their precise and clear replies to his questions.

39. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) asked whether Mr. Brenner's party had in fact adopted the position of advocating that the two Administering Authorities should take the necessary steps to hasten the political maturity of the two Trust Territories, which would not be granted self-government until they were ready to benefit thereby, and that the two Territories would take steps to organize their future only when they had attained self-government. Mr. Brenner had said, too, that if the minority constituted by the people of Togoland under British administration wished, in the meantime, to associate itself with the majority represented by the people of Togoland under French administration, the latter population would gladly accept such a proposal.

40. Mr. BRENNER (Parti togolais du progrès) confirmed that those were his party's views.

41. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) recalled that Mr. Antor had assured the Committee that the majority, i.e., the population of Togoland under French administration, had nothing to fear from the minority, i.e., the population of Togoland under British administration; he asked whether that meant that the party of which Mr. Antor was the spokesman would not oppose the unification of the two Trust Territories even if such unification were to take place under French administration.

42. Mr. ANTOR (Joint Togoland Congress) advocated the immediate unification of the two Trust Territories, the only measure which would prevent the present differences between them from being aggravated by the facts that the young people of the two Territories were not receiving the same training and that the Administering Authorities were continually issuing new ordinances. Once unification had been accomplished, the peoples of the two Territories would establish a body to consider the question of Togoland's future. If Mr. Brenner's party really had the majority of votes in Togoland under French administration, it had nothing to fear from immediate unification since it would also control the majority of seats in the new body which would be set up after the unification. It would be for that body to choose, if necessary, between British and French administration.

43. In reply to further questions by Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) Mr. ANTOR (Joint Togoland Congress) added that the new body to be set up after the unification of Togoland would decide the future of that country by majority vote: if the majority voted for independence, the question of the administration under which Togoland would be placed would not arise.

44. Mr. ARMATTOE (Joint Togoland Congress) observed that the time was past when the two Territories had no alternative but to choose between the two Administering Authorities. The situation in West Africa had developed at such speed, and the changes had been so profound, that the two Territories did not wish to remain under trusteeship, but demanded self-government and independence. Some Togolandese alleged that the peoples of the Territories were not ready for self-government and independence because their cultural development lacked uniformity, some sections being still uneducated whilst others were well educated (over-educated according to some). That theory was absurd; the fact was that the peoples of the two Territories were perfectly capable of governing themselves.

45. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) deduced from Mr. Antor's statement that he was quite aware that it was the majority that would decide the fate of a unified Togoland, and that he was prepared to accept that decision in advance. He wondered, therefore, why Mr. Antor was so insistent that the two Trust Territories should have equal representation on the Joint Council. He was surprised that Mr. Antor's party did not agree to form the minority on the Joint Council, since the people of Togoland under British administration constituted a minority of the Togoland population as a whole.

46. Mr. ANTOR (Joint Togoland Congress) replied that the Joint Council consisted of members from Togoland under French administration and Togoland under British administration; there was no reason why either Territory should have the advantage over the other. If the Parti togolais du progrès really controlled the majority of votes, the elections would prove it.

47. Mr. ARMATTOE (Joint Togoland Congress) did not see that it was necessary to accept minority status at the present stage; the elections would decide that issue.

48. Mr. ANTOR (Joint Togoland Congress), replying to Mr. Brenner, who had disputed that the Joint Togoland Congress had members in Togoland under French administration, recalled that in an official document (A/C.4/222) the previous year he had specified the membership of that party both in Togoland under French and in Togoland under British administration; he also pointed out that he had been turned back at the frontier by the French authorities when he had sought to enter Togoland under French administration to make contact with members of the party in that Territory.

49. Mr. ARMATTOE (Joint Togoland Congress) pointed out to the Belgium representative that when **he said that the Togoland**ers were capable of setting up a modern State, he was not referring to a particular section of the population but to the whole population. The responsibility of educating the backward elements still remaining in Togoland, whose low cultural standard could not constitute an obstacle to the Territory's self-government, rested with the remainder of the population. A country's independence would rest upon the ability of those called upon to guide its fortunes. Togoland possessed men whose competence and absolute integrity would be the firm guarantees of a government worthy of the name. The Togoland~~ers~~ thus lived in the hope that they could one day set up the African State to which they aspired.

50. Mr. ODAME (Joint Togoland Congress) said that the British Administration's claim that the population of the north-eastern area opposed the unification of the two Togolands was false. In support of that assertion, he read a letter which a headmaster, vice-chairman of the local council of Bunkpurugu, in the extreme north of Togoland under British administration, had requested the Togoland Youth Association to transmit to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, because he was afraid that the letter would never reach its destination if it were posted in the place where it was written. The letter said that the population of the area in question wished to be represented in the Joint Council which the United Nations General Assembly had recommended should be re-established. Attached to the letter was a copy of

the summary record of the extraordinary meeting of the local council which had been held on 10 July 1953 and which had examined resolution 652 (VII) of the General Assembly. After the Chairman had fully explained the resolution, the council had unanimously adopted a proposal to send representatives to the Joint Council for Togoland Affairs. At the same meeting, the local council of Bunkpurugu had recommended the division of the B'moba tribe's territory into two electoral districts, because of its dense population. The record listed the villages included respectively in the eastern and western districts. The council had also proposed that there should be a polling station in each district, one at Bunkpurugu for the eastern and the other at Nakpanduri for the western district. The record then stated that the indigenous population of that area sought relief from the ill-treatment to which they were subjected by the authorities of Togoland under French administration. Inhabitants of Togoland under British administration who lived in the frontier area and cultivated land in the Territory of Togoland under French administration had been heavily taxed in 1952; when complaints had been made, the French Administration had given no satisfactory reply. For that reason, the people's representatives in the local council proposed that the question should be discussed in the Joint Council for Togoland Affairs with their neighbours from Togoland under French administration, and an amicable solution reached. Other subjects of discussion would be the threats and unfair treatment which the inhabitants of Togoland under British administration suffered at the hands of the French authorities in the frontier area of Togoland under French administration. It was necessary to put an end to the confiscation by the French authorities of goods belonging to inhabitants of Togoland under British administration who no longer dared to cross the frontier, although the treaty concluded between the French and United Kingdom authorities did not prohibit trade between the two Territories. The population of that area of Togoland under British administration had high hopes of the discussions that might take place in the Joint Council.

51. Mr. KAISR (Czechoslovakia) pointed out that official figures for the minimum wages in the various territories of French Africa were given in Bill No. 6491 introduced into the French National Assembly in 1953. He would like to know why the minimum wage in Togoland under French administration was 60 per cent lower than that fixed for Dakar for example. That difference seemed all the more surprising because, as Mr. Armattoe had said previously, the training and qualifications of Togoland workers were not inferior to those of employees in other territories. He would also like similar information with regard to Togoland under British administration.

52. Mr. BRENNER (Parti togolais du progrès) explained that it was somewhat difficult to define the minimum wages because there were several categories of workers. For example, an unmarried man earned between 12,000 and 18,000 francs; a married worker earned up to 24,000 francs and a married worker with a child, up to 25,000 francs. The minimum monthly wages for day labourers were between 10,000 and 12,000 francs.

53. The Labour Code applied to the whole of the Territory under French administration and the joint commissions envisaged in the Code had already begun to function.

54. Mr. OLYMPIO (All-Ewe Conference) said that the figures quoted by Mr. Brenner referred to the wages of administrative workers and employees and not of workers employed by private concerns. The minimum wages were fixed by a joint commission, composed of employers and workers. When he had left the Territory, the minimum salary for an unskilled worker had varied between 30 and 140 francs per day; that of a skilled worker or a business employee varied between 6,000 and 18,000 to 20,000 francs per month, according to category.

55. Mr. ARMATTOE (Joint Togoland Congress) said that it was difficult to explain why wages were lower in Togoland than in other French possessions. Before the war Togoland had been the only economically self-supporting colony. Today, the country was divided into two and governed by two different administrations. In Togoland under French administration, workers' salaries were fixed according to a law passed in Paris. The general result was that the workers were poor except for certain privileged persons who obtained reasonable wages, not because of their efficiency, but because of the colour of their skin. In Togoland under British administration, the population was largely composed of simple peasants and the question of wages did not arise.

56. Mr. ANTOR (Joint Togoland Congress) said that in Togoland under British administration the Administering Authority refused to create any industries, so as to subdue the population, induce it to remain under the Trusteeship System and make it desirous of incorporation with the Gold Coast. A carpenter, for example, had to go to the Gold Coast if he wished to find employment in any building undertaking. Police officials were detached from the Gold Coast in the same way as administrative officials. If an inhabitant of Togoland under British administration had the necessary qualifications for entering the Administration, he was sent to the Gold Coast so as to be subject to greater authority. In Togoland under British administration indigenous workers were mainly navvies, who earned from 3s.6d. to 4s. a day.

57. Mr. BRENNER (Parti togolais du progrès) wished to correct Mr. Armattoo's statement about so-called European posts in Togoland under French administration. The name was still given to posts of that kind because they had formerly been occupied by Europeans; but today, by virtue of the Lamine-Queye Law, the posts were open to all Africans who had the necessary qualifications. It was therefore unjust to say that salaries and wages varied according to colour. The only criterion was the work done. There was equal pay for equal work without any discrimination as to race or colour.

58. Mr. KAISR (Czechoslovakia) asked whether there were any trade unions in Togoland.

59. Mr. BRENNER (Parti togolais du progrès) replied that there were two trade unions, the confédération générale du travail (CGT) and the Confédération française des travailleurs chrétiens (CFTC).

60. Mr. ANTOR (Joint Togoland Congress) said that in Togoland under British administration there were no trade unions because there were no industries.

61. Mr. ARMATTOE (Joint Togoland Congress) added that industries were not encouraged in the Territory so as to avoid competition with Gold Coast industries. Production was confined to family crafts.

62. Mr. OLYMPIO (All-Ewe Conference) said that the two trade unions in Togoland under French administration certainly did not correspond to the Czechoslovak representative's idea of workers' trade unions. There was no CGT at Lomé, for example; the federation of unions at Lomé was independent and served the interests of administration and business employees.

63. Mr. ANTOR (Joint Togoland Congress) asked the Chairman to be allowed to speak later on the question of labour.

64. Mr. ITANI (Lebanon) said that he had been struck by Mr. Brenner's insistence that the unification of the two Togolands must not be confused with the unification of the Ewes. He would ask Mr. Olympio if that distinction was vital and if it was justified by differences of language, race and religion which represented an obstacle to unification.

65. Mr. OLYMPIO (All-Ewe Conference) said that there was no confusion. The All-Ewe Conference had maintained the same attitude since Togoland had been under German control. Its aim was to see the regrouping of Ewe lands occupied by the Ewes long before the Europeans arrived. That was why it had decided to send petitions to the United Nations for the unification of the Ewe territories. Existing conditions were intolerable. The majority of the Ewes were living in Togoland under French administration and Togoland under British administration. It was clearly difficult to ask for unification with the Ewes who were living in the Gold Coast, although there, too, the land belonged to them. If the United Nations considered that the Ewes of the Gold Coast were beyond its competence, it could at least take steps to realize the unification of the two Togolands. The All-Ewe Conference was not opposed to that, as it would permit a large number of Ewes to be grouped together. Mr. Brenner was at pains to prove that the All-Ewe Conference was trying to create an Ewe State and to separate the Ewes from other Togoland tribes. That contention was unfounded. The Ewes had no desire to sever their links with other tribes.

66. The Minas, the race to which Mr. Brenner stated that he belonged, were in fact Ewes, being the descendants of Ga fishermen who had come from Accra in the Gold Coast 300 years previously to settle in the part of Togoland now under French administration and had been absorbed by the Ewes. The Minas, or more precisely the Gas, for that was the name given them in the country, spoke a language which was only a degenerate Ewe. Mr. Brenner should not therefore claim that Mina was a separate language. The Paramount Chief of the Gas, Fio Agbano, was one of the most enthusiastic supporters of the All-Ewe Conference. It was therefore strange to hear a Ga, or Mina, like Mr. Brenner, say that he was opposed to the unification of the Ewes, who represented the original stock in Togoland under French administration. Why was Mr. Brenner afraid of the reunion of the Ewes? Perhaps because he feared lest the more energetic western Ewes should absorb the people of Togoland. The Administering Authorities also feared that danger; that was why they were evoking imaginary distinctions of race to divide the population.

67. He himself was opposed to any annexation of Togoland to the Gold Coast. In the secret document mentioned earlier there was talk of an interview between Mr. Nkrumah and himself. In fact, in several conversations he had had with Mr. Nkrumah, he had

always stated, even before he had been apprised of the existence of that secret document, that there must be no thought of annexation of Togoland to the Gold Coast, since such a measure would be contrary to the interests and aspirations of the population. It should also be pointed out that it was the All-Ewe Conference itself which had discovered the existence of the secret document, published it and asked its members in the ranks of the Convention People's Party to resign in order to show that they were opposed to annexation.

68. Mr. ARMATTOE (Joint Togoland Congress) pointed out that it was the fate of the Togoland peoples that was of concern to the General Assembly. The important point was therefore to study the possibilities of unification. The question of the Minas and the Ewes did not arise at the moment. After unification, it could, if necessary, be brought before the General Assembly or the International Court of Justice.

69. What Mr. Olympio had said about the origin and language of the Minas was correct. The Gas, who had come to settle in the territory now under French administration in 1698 had been absorbed by the Togoland population; and, if they still had religious links with the western Ewes, they had in practice ceased to belong to the Gold Coast and to think like the people of the Gold Coast. There was of course nothing to be ashamed of in being a Mina and talking the Mina language instead of pure Ewe. There were differences of pronunciation of the national language in Western

countries. Mr. Brenner was a Mina, as he himself had stated, and therefore had no grounds for opposing the Ewes.

70. Mr. ANT'OR (Joint Togoland Congress) explained that by local custom patrilineal descent alone prevailed. Mr. Brenner had said that his mother had been born in Dahomey and his father in Togoland; it was the latter fact alone that counted.

71. Mr. BRENNER (Parti togolais du progrès) was astonished that his political opponents had embarked on such an otiose discussion. If he had wanted to follow their example, he might, for example, have asked what was the origin of Mr. Olympio's father.

72. The Ewes were not the only people in Togoland nor the only people to occupy land there. What the Togoland people wanted was the complete unification of the two Togolands.

73. With regard to language, Mr. Brenner pointed out that Mina was the trade medium for the whole country and was spoken in the south as well as in the north. It would clearly be necessary to adopt a national language, but that language could not be imposed from outside and each tribe—the Cabrais and the Haussas, for example—must be left free to speak and teach its own language. If Mr. Olympio no longer had a majority in the country, it was because the people were not willing to allow a few thousand individuals to impose their language on it.

The meeting rose 1.5 p.m.