

UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



LIMITED
A/C.1/PV.925
6 December 1957
ENGLISH.

Twelfth Session
FIRST COMMITTEE
VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 6 December 1957, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. ABDOL

(Iran)

The question of Algeria 59 (continued)

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol A/C.1/SR.925. Delegations may submit corrections to the summary record for incorporation in the final version which will appear in a printed volume.

AGENDA ITEM 59

THE QUESTION OF ALGERIA (A/3617 and Add.1; A/C.1/L.194, L.195 and Corr.1)
(continued)

Mr. GUNewardene (Ceylon): If there is one matter on which there is perfect unanimity in this Committee, it is that, in the name of humanity and in the interests of international peace and harmony, the tragic situation now obtaining in Algeria should not be allowed to continue any longer.

The sponsors of the seventeen-Power draft resolution have had always in mind the attainment, as painlessly as possible, of an objective which is dear to us all. The sponsors have made a sincere effort not to exacerbate the feelings that already exist between the two parties.

None of us desires a weakened France. None of us wants the moral authority or prestige of France to suffer. At the same time, however, we are anxious that there should be some alleviation of the human suffering now going on in Algeria.

In order that both purposes should be served, we have introduced a draft resolution which, I am sure all the members of this Committee will agree, is mild and moderate.

If any testimony was required with regard to the attitude of the people who have advocated Algeria's cause, that testimony is abundantly found in the speeches that have already been made on this subject -- speeches that have demonstrated a breadth of vision and a sincere desire to achieve peace without in any way condemning or attacking the French people. We all admire the contribution that France has made to humanity. The world owes France a debt which can hardly be repaid. Those of us who have achieved the independence of our own countries have been greatly influenced by the ideals, the philosophy and the thinking of France. I am sure that the nations of the Arab world would agree that they, too, owe a great deal to France and its inspiration. If Algeria is struggling for freedom today, it is because of the impact of that great French culture.

So it is not without a realization of France's important position in this world and the great task that lies ahead of France that we have ventured to introduce the draft resolution in this form. I have been at great pains to try to find out what really is objectionable in the draft resolution we have submitted. I have read and reread the draft, and I cannot see what conceivable objection can be taken to its wording. We have avoided as far as possible phraseology that can embitter the feelings of either party. We have tried to avoid ambiguity. We have done our best to effect a clarity of views so that the draft resolution itself may not be subjected to various interpretations.

This Committee must make up its mind what it is to do. I have no doubt that we all want peace in Algeria, in that sensitive part of the world. If peace is to be obtained, how is it to be achieved? There must be some method or means. I cannot conceive of any method other than that suggested in the seventeen-Power draft resolution.

I see that the seven-Power draft resolution is also inspired by the selfsame motives. I desire to pay tribute to the honesty and sincerity of the sponsors of that draft resolution. They have, in their own way, made an effort to bring conflicting views together. As the elder statesman of Peru, our esteemed friend Mr. Belaunde, stated, the sponsors of the draft resolution had tried to find the highest common factor of agreement. I cannot understand how, if they were searching for the highest common factor of agreement, they found it possible to introduce into the resolution the statement contained in the first operative paragraph. This states:

"Takes note of the attempts to settle the problem both through the good offices of Heads of State and French legislative measures."

Surely the representative of Peru and his colleagues will realize that there was a sharp division of opinion with regard to the legislative measures that recently have been introduced in France. I do not for a moment challenge the good faith or the earnestness of the French people or of the French Parliament. I have no doubt that they sincerely believe that the introduction of the loi-cadre would be an effective and constructive step towards peace, but the stark fact remains that these legislative enactments are not acceptable to Algeria. That is a fact we have to recognize.

It is also a fact that the view held by the people of Algeria is shared by the vast majority of the peoples that inhabit the Asian and African continent. When there is such a diversity of opinion, it is incomprehensible, if the objective was to obtain the highest common factor of agreement, why the sponsors should have introduced a matter of such great controversy. If the objective was, as the representative of Peru stated, to obtain through this Committee a unanimous resolution, one would have expected the deletion of that paragraph. If they merely wanted an innocuous resolution, one would have expected that there would not be any introduction of controversial matters.

As it is drafted, the paragraph asks the Committee to recognize the loi-cadre as an attempt at a settlement of the problem. In other words, the Committee is called upon to endorse the statement that it is an attempt to settle the problem, when there is such a conflict of opinion on the subject.

(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

I would have expected the complete deletion of that paragraph. We certainly appreciate the fact that note has been taken of the very commendable efforts made by two Heads of States to help in the negotiations, but I think that, while they appreciate that compliment, those to whom the compliment is directed consider it a doubtful one. The representatives of Morocco and Syria both gave expression to that point of view. They were not so concerned about appreciation for what they have done or what they propose to do, but rather they are concerned about the introduction into this draft resolution of an expression of opinion that the loi-cadre is an effective solution to the problem. I can quite understand that point of view. I would, therefore, appeal to the sponsors of the seven-Power draft resolution to consider whether the introduction of a controversial matter makes for unanimity. If unanimity is the objective, it is abundantly clear that unanimity is not possible on this draft resolution, judging by the various speeches that have already been made on the subject.

If unanimity is not possible, and it is their objective, then I think that there is no alternative for the sponsors of the seven-Power draft resolution except to withdraw the draft resolution itself. I would make a sincere and genuine appeal to them to withdraw it so that the Committee may vote on the seventeen-Power draft resolution without any confusion of issues.

The issues are very clear in the seventeen-Power draft resolution, and each and every member of the Committee will have an opportunity to express his view clearly without being influenced by extraneous considerations such as the attempts made by Morocco and Tunisia and the legislative measures by France.

The representative of Peru discovered a meeting of minds between the sponsors of the seventeen-Power draft resolution and the sponsors of the seven-Power draft. There is a meeting of minds in one respect, namely, that both draft resolutions are aimed at achieving peace in that troubled spot. I observe that there is no distinct effort on the part of speakers, and even of the sponsors, to point out what is wrong or unacceptable in the seventeen-Power draft. They seem carefully to avoid two issues. One is what is contained in the fourth preambular paragraph of the seventeen-Power draft resolution, namely, "Recognizing that the principle of self-determination is applicable to the Algerian people". May I ask why it is that the sponsors of the seven-Power draft resolution fight shy of this important principle?

(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

The wording of the seventeen-Power draft resolution is in accordance with the wording of the Charter. We have even avoided the use of the words "right to self-determination". We have spoken of the principle of self-determination as enunciated in the Charter. But the Charter provides that all nations inhabiting this globe shall have the benefit of the principle of self-determination. If all nations in the world are assured of the benefits of this principle, which is held so sacred in the Charter, can it be argued, by any stretch of imagination, that this principle is not equally applicable to the Algerian people? I know that very often my juridical friends in the Latin American countries in particular were very eloquent on this principle. I would have expected them to be the first to concede that, as stated in the fourth paragraph of the preamble of the seventeen-Power draft resolution, the principle of self-determination is applicable to the Algerian people, just as it is applicable to all nations of the world.

We ask for no special treatment, no favoured treatment, no privilege; it is a benefit which we expect to accrue to all nations of the world. It is the repetition of a patent fact of a recognized principle. Why is it that those who sponsor the seven-Power draft resolution wish to avoid the repetition or affirmation of a principle that has been accepted already by the nations of the world?

Another issue which they carefully avoid is the use of the word "negotiations". I should like to ask, what do these sponsors of the seven-Power draft resolution expect in expressing a hope that, "in a spirit of co-operation, a peaceful, democratic and just solution will be found, through appropriate means"? What exactly do they mean by "appropriate means"? The appropriate means are prescribed for us in the Charter, and one of the appropriate means is negotiation. If, therefore, the sponsors of the seventeen-Power draft resolution wish to be more specific as to what the appropriate means are, I do not see any reason why the sponsors of the seven-Power draft resolution can object to it. If they prescribe appropriate means, and negotiation is an appropriate means under the Charter -- and in this case the only appropriate means -- I cannot understand or see what difficulty there is in accepting the suggestion that negotiations should be undertaken by both parties in order to try to bring about a solution of this problem.

(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

What exactly do the sponsors of the seven-Power draft mean by "in a spirit of co-operation"? Co-operation with whom? Co-operation between the two parties. How is this co-operation to be secured? Is it by some magic process? It is by two groups of people sitting together and talking the problem over. How is that to be achieved? Simply through the medium of negotiation.

(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

I cannot understand why the seven-Power draft resolution should fight shy of these things. These are foreseen in that draft resolution except that they lend themselves to interpretation, and I am trying to ask what the interpretation is.

What do they mean by "in a spirit of co-operation" except that negotiations should take place between the two parties? What do they mean by "appropriate means" except that they are thinking of some method or means? Do they object to the method of negotiation? If negotiation is not the process to be adopted, what else remains?

I should like a clear answer on these points. What exactly do they have in mind? If they express a hope, do they expect that hope to be fulfilled? I have no doubt that they expect that hope to be fulfilled. If they expect that hope to be fulfilled, in what manner is that hope to be fulfilled? It can be fulfilled by the achievement of the objective, and how is that objective to be attained except by negotiation?

I see no reason why one should not be clear in his thinking. Why should we not be more specific? Why should we be afraid of putting down what we honestly think should be the procedure to be adopted? It is far better in our resolution to exhibit a little bit of clear thinking, to be straight, to face the issues that are before us. The issue before us in Algeria is what? Perpetual disaster for that country, for both countries. It is in the interests of France whose achievements we are proud of; it is in the interests of Algeria which is struggling for independence; they have dedicated themselves to the task of setting themselves free from all kinds of domination. It is in the interests of both parties that we have ventured to introduce the draft resolution of which Ceylon is proud to be a co-sponsor.

With regard to all other paragraphs, on the position there is perfect agreement between the seven-power draft resolution and the seventeen-Power draft resolution. I do not think that the Members of this Assembly can conceivably object to the first part of the preamble which reads "Having discussed the Algerian question". Well, if they prefer to say "Having heard the statements made by various delegations and having discussed the question of Algeria", we have no objection to that. Either way is alright because that is a fact.

(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

The second preambular paragraph reads "Recalling its Resolution 1012 (XI) dated 15 February 1957". That is also the recital of a fact. I do not know why it is necessary for the seven-Power draft resolution not to include that, but they include it in a different way by saying "Expresses again the hope". What does "again" mean because they have already expressed the hope before? I have no objection to either that form or the form adopted in the seventeen-Power draft resolution. That idea is fully expressed.

The third preambular paragraph reads "Regretting that the hope expressed in that resolution has not yet been realized". Are we happy that that hope has not been realized? Do we not sincerely and genuinely regret that there is no peace in Algeria? Is not the same idea conveyed in the operative part of the seven-Power draft resolution when it expresses the hope once again? Why do they express the hope once again except that they regret that the first hope has not been fulfilled? I cannot understand how there can be any objection to the statement of fact that we as a body and a Committee regret that the hope we expressed last year has not been fulfilled.

I now come to the next paragraph. I have already made a comment about recognizing that the principle of self-determination is applicable to the Algerian people. I think that I would like it very much if the Committee were to say that it does or does not recognize this principle. I should like it to say whether it is not applicable to the Algerian people. It is a straightforward issue. Then we will know that there are two types of people that can avail themselves of the benefits of the principle of self-determination: one set of people like the people of Algeria who obviously are not entitled to it, and the other people in the world who are entitled to it.

But the Charter makes no such distinction and provides that this principle is available to all nations inhabiting this globe. I see no objection whatsoever to the adoption of a principle that is held sacred under the Charter. I think that if we are not prepared to recognize this important principle, the reason for the existence of the United Nations cannot even be seen.

What are the political problems that we meet face to face every day? They revolve around this sacred and important principle. If we are not prepared to accept that principle, what then is the reason for the very existence of the United Nations?

(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

The next paragraph states:

"Noting that the situation in Algeria continues to cause much suffering and loss of human life".

That too is agreed to by the seven-Power draft resolution which states:

"Having regard to the situation in Algeria which is causing much suffering and loss of human lives".

There is no objection to that on the part of the sponsors of the seven-Power draft resolution.

The next paragraph, the operative part reads:

"Calls for negotiations for the purpose of arriving at a solution in accordance with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations".

I have already indicated that there is no method by which peace in Algeria can be ensured unless it is by the method of negotiation. I have already commented that the sponsors of the seven-Power draft resolution also think in a similar way when they introduce into their resolution the words "through appropriate means" and "in a spirit of co-operation". All that we seek to do is to make it clearer. It is crystal clear that there is no other method by which peace can be achieved except by negotiations. And I do not think that France suffers in its prestige in any way by accepting the well-known procedure of negotiation in international disputes. Surely this is not the first time that France has negotiated for the solution of political disputes. It has done so in the same region, in Morocco and Tunisia, and in this case a favourable atmosphere has been created for negotiations by reason of the fact that the people of Algeria are themselves ready for negotiations. The Heads of State of Morocco and Tunisia have offered their services to make negotiations possible. What is more, France has conceded that it is prepared to speak with the people that have taken up arms against them for the limited purposes of a cease-fire. If the seventeen-Power draft resolution asks them to continue the process or procedure and talk further in order that a lasting and durable solution of the problem may be achieved, what is there wrong in it, what is there in it unacceptable to the Members of the Committee? And what is there unacceptable in it to France? In what manner will France lose its prestige or dignity if France is prepared to parley on a cease-fire, how does it suffer in dignity or prestige by so doing? How does it suffer in prestige by covering the

DR/pim

A/C.1/PV.925
14-15

(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

whole field of the dispute that now obtains in Algeria? I would most respectfully submit that there is no other course open except negotiation. I firmly and sincerely believe that if two sets of human beings meet together and discuss matters in a calm and dispassionate way and in a cooler atmosphere, we sometimes find that they are disturbed from rigid positions which they have taken up.

(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

With a cease-fire and with harmony restored, and with a correct atmosphere revived, what is there to prevent France and Algeria from working out a solution that will redound to the benefit of both countries? What a wonderful vista opens before our eyes: a free Algeria in a North African federation within the framework of a Franco-Arabian relationship, in the larger framework of a family of nations. What a contribution that would be to world peace, and what a tremendous asset to the world, if Franco-Arabian co-operation can develop that vast region of the Sahara on a basis of mutual partnership and friendship. What a service to the world, indeed. What a service to Africa. The desert of Sahara would yet be the unifying factor for the whole continent of Africa and it may yet be the unifying factor for both Asia and Africa and the whole world. That is the vista that I see before me. I would ask most earnestly my friends of France not to let slip an opportunity so great. The time is already too late. Feelings have run high. Peace has to be achieved at the right time in order that it may be durable and lasting. This is the opportunity, and if this opportunity is missed it may spell disaster, not only to Algeria and France, but it may imperil the peace of the world.

It is from a grim realization of the future that we in Ceylon have ventured to support the seventeen-Power draft resolution.

May I, in conclusion, as the representative of a small nation that is dedicated to the cause of peace, address an appeal to the Foreign Minister of France, for whom I have great affection and admiration, that he should make use of his good offices to see that France faces realities and makes a lasting and notable contribution towards peace in this world -- peace that we badly need in this world.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Before calling on the next speaker, I want to remind representatives who are going to speak in the debate that at the moment we are discussing the draft resolutions. It is true that there are certain extremely important aspects of the Algerian question, but these have been to a large extent and adequately discussed in the Committee in the course of the general debate, and we do not want to prolong the debate unduly. Therefore, I respectfully request the representatives who are going to speak to refer to the draft resolutions and not to cover other aspects of the question which are no less important but which have already been thrashed out in the Committee and therefore do not need to be repeated.

Mr. BLANCO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like briefly to refer to the draft resolutions that have been submitted to the Committee on the question of Algeria.

We have co-sponsored the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.195 because substantially it reproduces the one we co-sponsored at the eleventh session, which was unanimously adopted. At present, we do not believe that the General Assembly can do anything other than to ratify the decision taken at the eleventh session. Furthermore, as the head of the Cuban delegation, Mr. Nuñez-Portuondo, stated in the course of the general debate on this question, Cuba can vote in favour only of draft resolutions which France, principally committed to defend its national sovereignty and its rights, has previously been willing to accept as well. We believe that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.195 would probably be acceptable to France.

The only thing that differentiates the resolution adopted at the eleventh session from the one that we have submitted is the third paragraph, which states:

"Takes note of the attempts which have been reported to the General

Assembly to settle the problem both through the good offices of Heads of State and French legislative measures ..." (A/C.1/L.195)

Yesterday, with pellucid clarity, the representatives of Argentina, Spain and Peru explained the reasons that prompted us to include this paragraph in the draft resolution, and, therefore, we shall not labour the question. This paragraph, may I say, merely registers the progress achieved since February 1957, the day when the General Assembly adopted the resolution which our draft resolution reproduces.

The draft resolution stresses the measures that have been taken to achieve a peaceful, democratic and just solution to this painful question. We are not prejudging these attempts. We are merely taking note that such attempts have been made. Although the parties concerned have so far said that they are not ready to accept them, the General Assembly should, however, recognize the existence of such steps. We believe that such recognition would hurt no one.

For these reasons, the Cuban delegation hopes and trusts that this draft resolution, like the one adopted at the eleventh session, will receive unanimous approval.

With regard to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.194, the Cuban delegation considers that, in view of the short space of time that has elapsed since 15 February 1957, the time has not yet arrived for us to accept the third paragraph, which states:

"Regretting that the hope expressed in that resolution has not yet been realized ..." (A/C.1/L.194)

A matter of this nature, fraught as it is with complications and difficulties, where even a cease-fire has not yet been achieved, obviously cannot be solved within one hour. The first step must be taken, and that is a cease-fire. The first thing that must be done is to end the armed conflict so that no more suffering and loss of human life be caused.

With regard to the fourth paragraph, the Cuban delegation, in accordance with its views on this matter, does not believe that the General Assembly is competent to declare that the principle of self-determination is applicable to the case of Algeria. We might say a great deal regarding the correct application of this principle but, be that as it may, the General Assembly cannot invoke this principle in matters of the essentially domestic jurisdiction of States which do not fall within the purview of its competence, and it certainly cannot do so exclusively in the case of Algeria.

The other day we thanked the representative of Tunisia for his kind words addressed to Ambassador Nuñez-Portuondo when he referred to General Nuñez, the father of our Ambassador, one of the greatest heroes of Cuban independence. But the representative of Tunisia drew a comparison between the cases of Algeria and Hungary, saying that, though these were identical cases, the Cuban delegation acted differently when discussing the competence of the Assembly with regard to each of these questions. With all due respect and affection for the representative of Tunisia, I must make clear to him --

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I am sorry to interrupt you, but we are discussing the draft resolutions. We cannot go into a discussion of the Hungarian issue at the moment. Will you be good enough to limit yourself to discussing the draft resolutions?

Mr. BLANCO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): I am referring to the draft resolutions. I have merely pointed out one paragraph in order to reply to the representative of Tunisia. This will not take up even a minute of the time of the Committee. I do not think that the Chairman's gavel should be applied so severely when the representative of Cuba is speaking at this specific moment.

I shall not go into the details because I do not think it is timely to repeat them. Nevertheless, with regard to the question of Hungary, I must say that the issue was the violation of Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter. It was a legitimate Government of Hungary that requested the General Assembly of the United Nations to take a stand on the matter and end the armed intervention of a foreign Power that was drowning in fire and in blood the right of self-determination of that people. Yet that same Power when discussing Algeria stands up as the paladin of the principle of self-determination.

From all the above, it will be obvious that my delegation is not able to vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.194. The majority of the delegations present here have recognized and greatly praised the political genius of France -- France, the cradle of our individual liberties and of our democratic institutions. If this is the case and if this is recognized by the great majority of the representatives in this Committee, then this body and the Assembly can do nothing but express its confidence in France by stating that it trusts France to solve the question of Algeria in a peaceful, democratic and just way. This can be done by voting in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the seven delegations.

Mr. SHUKAIRY (Saudi Arabia): I feel that it is hardly necessary to speak on the draft resolution that stands in our name as well as in the name of sixteen other delegations. It is worded so simply and clearly that it speaks for itself. Indeed, it calls for no elucidation. Our colleague, the representative of Indonesia, Mr. Ali Sastroamidjojo, has ably introduced our

(Mr. Shukairy, Saudi Arabia)

draft resolution with a remarkable clarity of mind, a characteristic typical of him. None the less, certain delegations have expressed doubts as to the import of our proposal. It is due to this that I deem it necessary to explain certain aspects of it. Before doing so, I must stress, however, that our draft resolution, in essence, does not fully meet the national aspirations of the Algerian people. What Algeria stands for and what it is fighting for is national sovereignty and political independence. For Algeria this is an inherent right that cannot be alienated by any draft resolution.

We are here to support, to defend and to realize the rights of all peoples, large and small. We are here not to destroy and not to liquidate established principles already accepted and contained in our Charter. At least, we are not here to tailor our principles in order to make them fit in with out-moded ideas of colonialism and imperialism. Yet we have chosen a draft resolution that we hope will commend itself to the Committee.

After all, this draft resolution is not the result of a hasty effort. It is the result of lengthy deliberation and profound reflection. It is true that our proposal has been drawn up by the Afro-Asian States. But in its last formulation, it has taken full account of the various reactions which we were able to feel in the course of the informal meetings that we were able to hold with the various delegations. Formally, it is our draft resolution; we do not deny it. But it has certainly taken full account of all the views that have been urged, including those in the Committee. That is why the language of our draft resolution has undergone various processes of refinement until it has reached the most refined stage. Thus, as it stands before you, it is the net result of labour, restraint and moderation.

This draft resolution is a maximum of accommodation for a minimum of principles. If we delete the word "Algeria" from it, there will be nothing left but the words and the phrases of our Charter. A vote against our draft resolution is, in fact, a vote against the Charter. Let us, therefore, see what it stands for. I shall examine it, Mr. Chairman, with your permission, paragraph by paragraph.

(Mr. Shukairy, Saudi Arabia)

The first two paragraphs of the draft resolution are not contentious. By their factual nature they are incontestable. First of all, we cannot deny that we are the General Assembly. We cannot deny that we have discussed the Algerian question. We cannot deny that at the last session we adopted a resolution pertinent to the Algerian question. These are the first two paragraphs of the draft resolution that stands now in our name before the Committee.

The third paragraph expresses regret that the hope expressed in the resolution adopted by the General Assembly has not been realized. There is nothing contentious in that paragraph either. In the last resolution, we expressed our hope. This is a fact. Now, we find that our hope did not materialize. This is also a fact. It would only be human in the minimum degree to express our regret. Surely this paragraph should raise no opposition. This is not a condemnation of France or any party.

(Mr. Shukairy, Saudi Arabia)

We had hoped for a peaceful, democratic and just solution. That solution has not come about. On the contrary, the war in Algeria has been stepped up. It is now time for us at this session to express in a resolution regret that our hopes for a settlement were not fulfilled.

I come now to the fourth paragraph, which recognizes the principle of self-determination as a right applicable to the Algerian people. This paragraph calls for little advocacy, if any at all. Self-determination is a basic principle of the Charter. Self-determination has been the cornerstone of many international declarations. Self-determination has been invoked by the colonial powers here at the United Nations as a last line of defence. Self-determination is a principle of general and comprehensive application. Unlike the different statements that were made by some of our colleagues, particularly by the representative of Cuba, we claim that the principle of self-determination is of a general and comprehensive application -- it is to be applied to the people in their entirety, in their totality.

This principle is not confined to a people of one race. A people embracing fractional minorities, or, to put it at its worst, a people wholly composed of multi-racial mixtures, should not be denied the principle of self-determination. After all, a people of one single pure race does not exist in this world. In every people and in every nation we are bound to find racial intermingling. Even a single race is often the outcome of past assimilated and intermingled races. It is too medieval, and I say this with all due respect, to invoke concepts based upon race in this enlightened age.

Mr. Pineau, in an effort to neutralize or perhaps to paralyse the principle of self-determination, emphasized individual rights, and, in particular, the rights of the French colons in Algeria. I respectfully submit that, with regard to our draft resolution on the principle of self-determination, such an attitude on the part of France is a mutilation and not an interpretation of the principle of self-determination. Our stand on the status of the French colons has been made amply clear in the general debate. We do not wish to reopen this question at this stage of our deliberations. We simply want to assure the Committee that the reference to the principle of

(Mr. Shukairy, Saudi Arabia)

self-determination in our draft resolution constitutes no derogation of the legitimate interests of the French colons in Algeria. On the contrary, those legitimate rights remain unchallenged, and every conceivable guarantee can be made to respect those rights fully.

In his closing statement, Mr. Pineau referred to the colons as inhabitants of Algeria, where the graves of their ancestors are to be found. We see no reason why Mr. Pineau should refer to the graves of the early French settlers. The status of the colons is not in dispute, not in our draft resolution and not in any draft resolution which now stands before the Committee. The issue before us, the issue in our draft resolution, is not the rights of settlers whose ancestors rest in their graves in Algeria. The issue is to make sure that in this draft resolution, or in any other draft resolution, the right of self-determination of a whole people should not be buried in a graveyard without peace and without dignity. This is the question before us. It is for this reason that we refer in our draft resolution to the principle of self-determination.

In the fifth paragraph we simply state a fact: we note that the situation in Algeria continues to cause much suffering and loss of human life. To say that much suffering and loss of human life is taking place in Algeria is the least that we can say. The representative of France has described the situation in Algeria in his opening statement as a drama that has already caused too much bloodshed and too many tears. The words of the French Foreign Minister go beyond what we say in our draft resolution. When France itself speaks of too much bloodshed and too many tears, we do not see how we can fail in our draft resolution to refer to suffering and loss of human life.

Lastly, I come to the only operative part of the draft resolution, which calls for negotiations for the purpose of arriving at a solution in accordance with the principles and purposes of the Charter. In actual fact, this paragraph is not one of substance; it calls for a procedure or a method to give effect to the principles and purposes of the Charter. As to these principles and purposes, they are there in the Charter. They are already in the Charter, whether we like it or not.

(Mr. Shukairy, Saudi Arabia)

As to method, negotiations are an international practice provided for in the Charter. Again it is a method on which France has pivoted its case here in the Committee. Mr. Pineau has pleaded his case with vigour and eloquence on the basis of negotiations, the very same idea of negotiations which appears in our draft resolution. Mr. Pineau has offered negotiations in unequivocal terms. It is therefore quite normal and natural that we should include the idea of negotiations in our draft resolution. Negotiations are also part of the stand of the Algerian case. Thus, negotiations constitute common ground for both France and Algeria. It is only the timing of negotiations which is the source of contention. Still, our draft resolution remains silent on the timing. Our draft resolution is focused on the idea of negotiations. Once the idea is accepted, we shall start to unlock the deadlock.

In a sense, calling for negotiations is simply adopting the very step which was suggested by France. If we should object to this paragraph, I am afraid that we would be more royalist than the king himself; indeed, we would be more French than France herself. To reject what France has accepted and to reject what France has already offered certainly would be to act in a manner more French than France herself.

This is our draft resolution, simple, clear and moderate.

In criticizing our draft resolution a few delegations have raised the question of domestic jurisdiction. The delegations of Australia and the Netherlands have made this point the main target in their attack on it. I do not wish to reopen this issue. Much has been stated and restated on it.

(Mr. Shukairy, Saudi Arabia)

The Algerian question is an international issue. It has demolished the fictitious confines of its own fiction. At the last session, here in the United Nations, we passed a unanimous resolution on the question of Algeria. That itself is a verdict against the plea of domestic jurisdiction. Even France itself has exploded this defenceless "defence". France has offered a cease-fire and negotiations. Mr. Pineau is a statesman with vast knowledge of international affairs. France is a master in the art of international norms and terminology. We all know that "cease fire" and "negotiations" are terms that do not admit of any ambiguity. By offering negotiations and a cease-fire France has crushed to its very roots the question of domestic jurisdiction. It is inconceivable that France is offering to negotiate with France. It is inconceivable that France extends to France the offer of a cease-fire. Negotiations and a cease-fire are legal matters that form part of international law. They do not fall within the province of domestic law. If the question of Algeria is one of domestic jurisdiction the juridical situation becomes a riddle. Mr. Pineau would then be offering to negotiate with Mr. Pineau, which would be a complete paradox.

I shall proceed now to explain my delegation's position on the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.195 and Corr.1) submitted by Argentina and a number of other Member States. To begin with, I must make it perfectly clear that the sponsors of that draft resolution are worthy of our respect and admiration for the interest which they are taking in the problem. Their intentions are, indeed, on the side of peace. Yet we can safely say -- without, I hope, any lack of courtesy -- that their good intentions are not reflected by their words as they appear in their text. It is with those words that we quarrel. We do not quarrel with their intentions. It might be remembered, incidentally, that the road to hell is paved with the best of intentions. In this case, too, the road may be paved with the best of good will. It is, therefore, with great respect that I must say forthrightly that this seven-Power draft resolution does not lead to tranquillity. It is not conducive to understanding. I say to you, gentlemen, that it definitely will not implement your desire for quiet, law and order to reign in Algeria.

(Mr. Shukairy, Saudi Arabia)

Let us, for a moment, take a bird's eye view, as it were, of the seven-Power draft resolution as a whole. I shall not deal with the preamble, although defects are to be found in it here and there. The two operative clauses are, in essence, not operative at all. By their nature they are preambular. They have been made operative just by a stroke of the pen: a tense has been changed, and they have become operative. Instead of "taking note" of attempts, and so on, the phrase was made to read, "Takes note" of the attempts, etc., and instead of "expressing again the hope" the text was made to read, "Expresses again the hope".

No, gentlemen, a resolution is not a change of tense. A resolution is the reflection of a situation, and it must rise to that situation. Its operative part must operate in the direction of action. This is an issue of war, and, as I said in my opening statement, it is the only war in the world. We have to meet the challenge of events. If we admit, as we do, that a great deal of human suffering is taking place in Algeria, we cannot just take note of the situation and confine ourselves to expressions of hope. Last session we expressed hope for a settlement. Today we are faced with a veritable situation of war. Hope, with all its fervour is not an adequate remedy. In fact, I would say that it is not a remedy at all. As a minimum we must "recommend", we must "call upon", we must "urge" something. That something, to my mind, could be reflected only by negotiation.

The seven-Power draft resolution entirely ignores even the principle of negotiations. Certainly it is not for us to set out the details of the negotiations, but it is our obligation to call for such negotiations. There are certain problems that do not admit of negotiation because of their very nature, but I submit that Algeria is a classic and typical case where we are called upon to pronounce ourselves in favour of negotiations. Thus, without negotiations the seven-Power draft resolution is without teeth. We have to put teeth into it in order to enable it to crush the deadlock.

I need hardly remind the Committee of the phrase coined and now in general circulation in the United Nations. Negotiated settlement, as against imposed settlement, has become almost a dictum of the Organization. I wonder whether our colleagues who have submitted the seven-Power draft resolution

(Mr. Shukairy, Saudi Arabia)

stand for an imposed settlement? Do they stand for a settlement that is not brought about by agreement and negotiation?

Returning once more to the operative paragraphs, we find there two devastating ideas. We read them in the text itself, and we read them in between the lines. The first refers to the offer of good offices made by the heads of State of Morocco and Tunisia. Here I think our colleagues, the sponsors of the draft resolution, have not placed the matter in its proper context. It is only fair that this offer of good offices should not be referred to except within the framework in which it was made. It constitutes a pronouncement by two heads of State -- the heads of States represented here in the United Nations. We cannot tear it from its context and just inject it into our resolution as a paragraph or a sub-paragraph either in the preamble or in the operative part. Algerian sovereignty is the crux of the good offices that were offered by the two heads of State of Morocco and Tunisia. Should you ignore the pivot, gentlemen, the good offices would then become entirely non-existent. If you mention good offices you are, as a corollary, bound to mention the pivot upon which those good offices have been offered. Otherwise, you will have to relinquish the whole idea.

The second defect is the reference to French legislative measures. I would say that this is a mine which touches off the whole draft resolution. In our draft resolution (A/C.1/L.194) we have not attempted to condemn the French legislative measures. We had arguments enough with which to do so had we wished, but we have abstained from injecting into our draft resolution any reference to the French legislative measures which is of a condemnatory or derogatory nature. Why do we need to take note of these French legislative measures? I submit that, in relation to the last resolution, this idea represents a step backwards. We did not refer to any French legislative measure in the last resolution. We simply expressed our hope for a just, peaceful and democratic solution.

(Mr. Shukairy, Saudi Arabia)

The seven-Power draft resolution is tantamount to calling for a French solution. A French solution is no solution; it is the perpetuation of war. I must state that this idea of French legislative measures goes even beyond the stand of France itself. Mr. Pineau, in his able statement before the Committee, resisted any precondition for a settlement. Why should we then inject the Algerian resolution with conditions? It seems that you are being asked to step into Mr. Pineau's shoes and at the same time replace them even by larger shoes.

These are some of the reasons that go to undermine the seven-Power draft resolution. I shall not tax the Committee with any detailed analysis of the various aspects of that draft resolution. I submit to my colleagues that the seven-Power draft resolution leads us nowhere. Undoubtedly, and against their own objectives, it leads us to the path of conflict, unrest and human suffering. It is our sincere conviction that these sad results are not the objectives of the sponsors of the seven-Power draft resolution. Far from that. Their objectives are to be praised, and I do praise them now. But it is their resolution which does not reflect their sincerity.

I have a final word to say to the Committee. This is an issue that involves war and that involves the liberty of a whole people. The question of Algeria comes to us from North Africa as the last chapter of history which must be closed, and closed forever. As regards the resolution of last year, France has not brought about a just, democratic and peaceful solution. France has not been co-operative with the United Nations. France has rejected an inquiry commission. France has rejected a plebiscite to determine the wishes of the people. France is imposing a solution of its own making. France is enacting a constitution for a people without the consent of the people. France is contemplating a whole system of elections, of assemblies and of provincial entities, without a single Algerian having a say in the matter. Last but not least, France, as represented by Mr. Pineau, has declared to the Committee that it will resist its recommendation if that recommendation does not coincide with its wishes, its taste and its pleasure.

(Mr. Shukairy, Saudi Arabia)

I am not assuming the role of a public prosecutor against France, nor do I wish to do so, even with a plea of "J'accuse". In the main we seriously mean to tackle a serious situation, a situation of war. In his concluding statement Mr. Pineau referred to the movement in Algeria as almost subsiding. He read out to the Committee a declaration by the so-called commander of the liberation movement allied to the French army. I think that this declaration, recited by France, undermines the case of France and is a further support for the draft resolution which has been submitted by the seventeen Afro-Asian States.

It simply proves the disappearance of French authority in the area. When France gives cognizance to an Algerian organization fighting on its side, fighting the FLN, this is evidence of military bankruptcy on the part of France. It is, I would submit, the end, or perhaps, to put it modestly, the beginning of the end.

We are now faced with a challenge of world-wide significance. Should we fail to answer the challenge, should we resign our duty, and should France continue to ignore the wishes of the international community, Algeria will find no other course except to pursue its war of liberation. It is a wholly defensive war in the defence of freedom and liberty. Algeria will not stand alone and all peace-loving and freedom-loving peoples throughout the world will no doubt lend Algeria every support and assistance.

This is no warning; neither is it an intimidation to the United Nations. This is a word of peace intended to alert each and every one of us. For our part, we stand for peace and our draft resolution is only one step to achieve our cherished hope for peace. This is the final word we can say to this Committee.

Mr. HAYMERLE (Austria): The Austrian delegation wishes to make a very brief remark on the two draft resolutions before us. We have studied both texts carefully and have listened with attention to all the arguments put forward so convincingly to support them. There is one question, however, which occurred to us throughout the debate. Are the two texts really so far apart in their meanings as has been suggested by many of my colleagues who have spoken before me?

(Mr. Haymerle, Austria)

In one text the main emphasis is laid on the principle of self-determination. Does not the second draft resolution include this aspect by mentioning in general the principles of the Charter? Is not self-determination one of the basic principles of our Organization? The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.194 calls, furthermore, for negotiations for the purpose of arriving at a solution. The word "negotiations" is missing in the **draft** resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.195, which expresses the hope that a solution will be found through appropriate means. May I submit that "appropriate means" in no way means to exclude negotiations.

The different points of view have been expressed clearly and frankly throughout the debate. Now, at the closing stage of the consideration of the question of Algeria, it is, in our view, the task of this Committee to find, in a spirit of co-operation, a formula which will not widen the gap between us but contribute to the utmost extent to a solution of this problem about which we all are deeply concerned.

It is with this spirit in mind that the Austrian delegation will cast its vote. Let me express the hope that the efforts of the Committee will help to lessen the sufferings caused by the situation in Algeria. If this can be achieved, our discussions will not have been in vain and will have served in the best way the legitimate interests of all the people of Algeria.

Mr. SHABANDAR (Iraq): Before saying anything else, I should like to express my thanks to the sponsors of the seven-Power draft resolution. That draft proves that, in spite of everything, there is a sort of international solidarity among us. We know that these delegations are trying to help us -- both the Arabs and the French. That is why we appreciate their efforts very much, although we cannot accept their draft resolution as it stands. The reasons have been stated by various delegations, mainly from among the co-sponsors of the seventeen-Power draft resolution.

I am not going into detail on this matter. I should like, however, to say one thing about a very weak point in the seven-Power resolution. I refer to the "French legislative measures" mentioned there. It seems that the sponsors of that resolution are attaching great importance to the loi-cadre. They say, in effect: Since last year's resolution, something very important has been introduced. This represents a new aspect of the matter, they say -- a new door which is now open for the solution of the problem.

Unfortunately, we do not agree with them. If, after ten months, during which 10,000 Arabs and 2,000 Frenchmen have been killed in Algeria, the result is this loi-cadre, then we say that it is a very meagre and very unacceptable result. The representative of Saudi Arabia described it, the other day, as a little mouse. I disagree with him, because a mouse has a head and a tail, while this loi-cadre has no head and no tail at all.

I am not a jurist and I know nothing about these legal matters. From a logical and practical point of view, however, I am sure that, if it were possible for me to refer this question to my old professor of logic, who was a Frenchman -- and whom, I think, my former fellow-student, the distinguished Foreign Minister of Greece, will remember -- and to ask his opinion about this loi-cadre, he would answer that it is an outstanding example of sophism, of juridical sophistry. And, if one were to ask him why, he would say this: France has been pretending, and is still pretending, that Algeria is an integral part of France. Now, how can France legislate an organic law for an integral part of its territory? If Algeria were an integral part of France, there would be no need for such a law: the French organic law would be enough for Algeria, as for the rest of France.

(Mr. Shabandar, Iraq)

In other words, France is now admitting that Algeria is not an integral part of France, and that is why she is trying to solve the matter by sending us this little mouse mentioned by the representative of Saudi Arabia.

It is for this reason that we cannot accept the seven-Power draft resolution -- because we see nothing at all in the loi-cadre which can solve the situation. But, as the representative of Iran said yesterday, if those seven sponsoring delegations and any other delegations that are willing to help us -- and we are sure they are willing to help -- will join us in the second stage of this debate, that is, in the General Assembly, we will be very happy to collaborate with them on the basis of our resolution, which represents a minimum and which by no means satisfies our brothers in Algeria. As has just been said by the representative of Saudi Arabia, we arrived at our draft after very long discussions, and we did all this for the sake of peace and in order to find a friendly way to solve this matter.

I should now like to say a few words about the seventeen-Power draft resolution. If you examine the text, you will see that we really could not have watered down our resolution much more than we did. There is nothing in the text which can be said to be unacceptable to any of us, including France. After all, France has admitted the right of self-determination and France has always agreed to negotiation. Only in the case of Algeria does she reject it. Of course, the other colonial Powers and their camp followers are against it. Yesterday we heard the representatives of the Netherlands and Australia refuse to give their consent or approval to our draft resolution because of Article 2, paragraph 7. We understand this, although we do not agree with them. Especially now do we not agree with them, because it was only last week, when the question of West Irian came up, that the same two representatives invoked the right of self-determination for a people who had never asked for it. Today, however, they are denying that right to the Algerians, because of Article 2, paragraph 7, although the Algerians have sacrificed 50,000 men, women and children in the last three years because they wanted self-determination. I would not like to characterize this contradiction; I leave it to the two representatives to think about it.

Let us suppose that our very moderate and very logical draft resolution is not carried out. What will then happen? The war will continue in Algeria, many more thousands of Arabs and Frenchmen will be killed, millions and millions of dollars will be spent, the situation will be poisoned in the Middle East as well as in North Africa, and nobody will benefit from it except for one group -- and you know whom I mean. The Arabs will be losers, the French will be losers, the free world will be losers -- indeed, everybody except for the one group which is waiting for such a development.

I would have preferred to see France, for which I have the greatest sympathy and respect, at the head of the liberators and not at the tail of this very sinister caravan of colonialism, a caravan which is being attracted by a mirage and which is going directly to its doom because, sooner or later, Algeria is going to be independent. There is no doubt about it; it is a question of time.

Three years ago, we said the same thing about Morocco and Tunisia. And, when we made similar suggestions, a member of the French delegation said, as I well remember, that they did not need the advice of a small country such as Iraq. However, we are still ready to give them advice because we know that we are right. And we give this advice because we sympathize with France. We are not anti-French. But we are Arabs, and we would like to help our Algerian brothers. And that will be in the interests of the Arabs, of the French, and of the free world.

(Mr. Shabandar. Iraq)

I should like to give an illustration of what I have been saying. When Dien-Bien-Phu surrendered, only three years ago, everyone was shocked. I shared that shock, and the first thing I did was to telephone my colleague, the French Ambassador to Washington. I expressed my sympathy. I told him: "We express our sympathy because" -- and our present draft resolution is based on the same spirit -- "we have a share in this sacrifice; 25 per cent of the French garrison in Dien-Bien-Phu was made up of Arabs -- principally from Algeria".

Is it too much to ask, as our draft resolution asks, for self-determination for the Algerians and friendly negotiations with the French? I do not think so. We still hope that, one day, France will understand this genuine feeling of the Arabs and will find a solution on a friendly basis.

Mr. ARKHURST (Ghana): My delegation wishes to explain its position on the two draft resolutions now before the Committee.

As regards the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.195 and Corr.1), our view is that, apart from restating facts which are already quite evident and reiterating the hope expressed in resolution 1012 (XI), adopted by the Assembly earlier this year, the draft resolution contributes nothing towards a satisfactory solution of the Algerian problem. We are all aware that the resolution on this subject which the Assembly previously adopted and which suggested that the parties concerned should find ways and means of settling the problem has led to no progress. Hence, a mere reiteration of the terms of that resolution would be quite fruitless. In other words, this draft resolution merely marks time, as it were, and does nothing more. For those reasons, my delegation will be unable to support it and will vote against it.

On the other hand, the seventeen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.194), of which we are proud to be one of the sponsors, looks ahead and suggests a general framework within which a solution to the Algerian question may be sought. This draft resolution recognizes that the principle of self-determination is applicable to the Algerian people. This and the call for negotiations constitute the distinguishing features of the draft resolution, as opposed to the seven-Power draft resolution, to which I have previously referred.

(Mr. Arkhurst, Ghana)

The sponsors of the seven-Power draft resolution have tried to impress us with the fact that their main aim in presenting the draft resolution is to try to achieve a unanimous vote. We do not believe, however, that there is any inherent merit in merely voting unanimously on draft resolutions. We believe that the purpose of resolutions adopted by this Assembly is to ensure that some action will be taken and some results achieved. If, however, the sponsors of the seven-Power draft resolution believe that unanimity is the only thing to be desired, then we would recommend to them, as a moderate and constructive effort, the seventeen-Power draft resolution.

In conclusion, I would urge this Committee to adopt the seventeen-Power draft resolution.

Mr. TSIANG (China): My delegation has carefully studied the two draft resolutions which have been submitted to this Committee: the seventeen-Power draft resolution and the seven-Power draft resolution. I must say at once that, in their present form, neither of the draft resolutions has my delegation's complete support.

First, I should like to say a few words about the seven-Power draft resolution.

The seven-Power draft resolution is obviously aimed at winning the Assembly's unanimous approval. That, in itself, is a merit. In the present circumstances, however, this draft resolution has the appearance, at least, of being too negative, of not having taken any step forward. Furthermore, I have not been able to find any useful purpose that could be served by the **third** paragraph of the draft resolution. Instead of serving any useful purpose and helping us to find a solution, that paragraph seems to add to our confusion and our complications. Hence, while we greatly appreciate the efforts made by the seven Powers sponsoring this draft resolution, it seems to us that the text does not meet the requirements of the moment.

(Mr. Tsiang, China)

I now come to the seventeen-Power draft resolution. As the representative of Ceylon said this morning, there are two controversial paragraphs in that draft resolution: the fourth paragraph and the final paragraph. I should like to say that my delegation has no difficulty whatsoever concerning the final paragraph. We feel that negotiations must be a very important factor in solving the problem. I cannot imagine a solution of the problem without negotiations.

The other controversial paragraph is the fourth paragraph, the one relating to the principle of self-determination. Now, self-determination is one of the great principles embodied in the Charter. It has the backing of almost a quarter of a century of world development. In every case where this principle has been invoked in United Nations discussions, my delegation has invariably supported it; this has been the case without a single exception, both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly.

In the present case, however, I wonder whether the sponsors of the draft resolution would not be willing to modify the statement in the fourth paragraph. I have two difficulties which are connected with the paragraph. First, can the sponsors assure us that Algeria is in fact ready and willing to fulfil the obligations that naturally arise from the application of that principle? Secondly, what are those obligations?

In the first place, when the United Nations -- whether it be the General Assembly or the Security Council -- tries to settle a question of this type, it invariably starts with a cease-fire. As I have said, one of the principles of the United Nations is self-determination. But another and equally important principle is the peaceful solution of problems and disputes. Without exception, the United Nations has always started in these questions by calling for a cease-fire. Indeed, in disputes which have not reached the point of hostilities, the United Nations starts by cautioning the parties directly involved not to allow the situation to deteriorate, not to aggravate the situation.

(Mr. Tsiang, China)

Therefore, if we are to apply the principle of self-determination in a way consistent with the spirit of the Charter we shall have to start with a cease-fire. Can the sponsors of this draft resolution say that Algeria would accept an immediate and unconditional cease-fire? From the statements that have been made in this Committee, I have the impression that Algeria is not ready to accept an unconditional cease-fire. In other words, in that respect and to that extent, Algeria is not ready to fulfil the obligations of that principle.

Secondly, self-determination means determination of the future of the country in accordance with the wishes of all the people living in that region. Is Algeria today to allow free elections to take place, or does Algeria insist that the FLN must be accepted as the representative and the only spokesman of the people of Algeria? If the statements made in this Committee really reflect the genuine wishes of the people in Algeria, then it seems that Algeria is not quite ready to accept that principle of self-determination in the way that the United Nations must interpret it. Therefore, seeing the facts of the situation in Algeria, the invocation of that principle is not entirely appropriate.

Then, of course, every member of this Committee know that the invocation of that principle has two difficulties. It would make this draft resolution not an unanimous resolution, and probably not even a majority resolution. Facing the situation in Algeria as we do, the limits of action of the General Assembly must be kept in mind as well as the possibilities. It is for these reasons that my delegation is not in a position to accept the seventeen-Power draft resolution as it stands.

Mr. de MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) (interpretation from French): My delegation wishes to reaffirm to you, Mr. Chairman, our feelings regarding the way in which you are presiding over our debates, and, at the same time, we should like to say that we had reasons for not participating in the general debate on the Algerian question and for waiting until draft resolutions had been submitted to the Committee which would reflect the opinions and directions in the light of what has been said, calmly and quietly in the Committee. We must recognize that the statements have been made in such a way as not to damage the cause of peace, since a heated debate would only make it impossible to come to an agreement.

(Mr. de Marchena,
Dominican Republic)

However, since the submission of the draft resolution sponsored by the Latin American countries, among them my own, the atmosphere in the Committee changed, and this required that we should wait still further before making a statement. Now, having carefully considered the draft resolutions and the statements made, we wish to make known our views.

We have to refute the false accusations that have been voiced in this Committee. These accusations obviously were made by representatives who had forgotten that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones. We should not be accused of being traitors to the United Nations and to its principles because, together with the delegations of Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, Italy, Peru and Spain, we tried to submit a joint draft resolution that might solve the question of Algeria. We tried to submit a draft resolution that would permit the General Assembly to take a decision. Above all, we bore in mind the desire for a peaceful, democratic and just solution to the problem. In defence of our position, we might invoke the well-known phrase, honi soit qui mal y pense, evil is to him who evil thinks. That phrase would be perfectly applicable to the statements that were made yesterday afternoon about the seven-Power draft resolution, and it is for this reason that we are more than ever convinced today that in the very human question of the Algerian problem, a problem to which we turn with all sincerity and without any desire to camouflage it, we are not bringing in the poison of ideologies which subvert the normal and sociological process of peoples. We bring to it only the element which will show that the achievement of ideals can depend only on the adjustments of time and, what is more, that will permit ways to be found for a solution to the difficulties, taking as a basis the lowest common denominator, avoiding exacerbations and the shedding of blood and tears.

If it were not for a political interest, how could anyone believe that the seven-Power draft resolution, instead of facilitating a solution to the Algerian question, would worsen the situation? Is the new criterion to be followed by Members that if the majority cannot decide, then we have to recommend or use coercion and thereby establish different facets in conflicts? The seven-Power draft resolution is intended, as the 1956 General Assembly resolution was intended, to find different ways of settling the problem by means of understanding and conciliation, and no one can deny that the entire evolution of this problem since the submission of the loi-cadre and since the offer of good offices by the

(Mr. de Marchena,
Dominican Republic)

two Heads of State of the Arab world, to which we pay tribute, have only occurred in the few months following the adoption of the last resolution on the Algerian question by the General Assembly. Naturally, if one State adheres stubbornly to the position it has taken here, then no possibility exists of a solution being found. Then, obviously, there can be no chance of a settlement, but the seven-Power draft resolution and the seventeen-Power draft resolution both reflect the anxiety of twenty-four countries who wish to find peace once again reigning in that part of the world.

We would have been more indignant at the accusations levelled against us of supporting the cause of colonialism or of not deferring to the principle of self-determination had they come from another delegation than the Soviet delegation. I believe that the representative of the Soviet Union squeezed the trigger too fast. He forgot the whole trajectory of imperialism, colonialism and subjection which were the direct causes of the breaking-up of collectivities set up in ^{free} three States that occurred during the Second World War, and whose people have never stopped claiming their independence from the Soviet Union. These people are there, and we know their tragedy, yet the Soviet Union is impassive about it. These people are still waiting for the liberty which was dreamed of by the Catholic peoples of St. Stephen, who were overrun lately by thousands of armed monsters.

But perhaps the principle of self-determination that we have so often defended in the course of the history of the United Nations, and which was the principle upon which we based our own desires for freedom, is now to be distorted so as to allow events to take place which will not take into account the reasoning of history, of law, of politics, of economy, as well as the need for coexistence between races and between souls.

There are times when what is not said is more important than what is said, because that which underlies any situation is good faith, the balanced desire to see all aspects of a problem. Those of us who submitted the seven-Power draft resolution would protest vigorously if it were not recognized that we had kept that balance in mind, especially bearing in mind the fact that a certain direction was followed in Arab history, this history that once passed close to Europe and left behind a brilliant culture, architecture and a civilization created by great minds, and that we had also borne in mind the immortal glory of France that introduced to the world the declaration of human rights.

Perhaps it is not too difficult for us of the Latin American countries to interest ourselves in this problem, although it is not, geographically speaking, close to us, but because of its human aspects it expresses the aspirations of two friendly nations and is of importance with regard to the stability of a certain part of the world.

We do not have to rebut the accusation made against us, the accusation that we have not included the word "negotiations". That word is latent in the fourth paragraph of our draft resolution in which we refer to a solution "in a spirit of co-operation" in conformity with the principle of the Charter. This was made clear yesterday by Mr. Belaunde, the representative of Peru. A far more poisoned dart is the accusation that the sponsors of this draft resolution are partisans of the use of force in Algeria. And from whom did this accusation come? From a country that should be the last to make such an accusation. The only reply that we can make to this is: honi soit qui mal y pense. We were not attempting to set up a smokescreen. We cannot but mention in this respect the deployment of force to smother the cries for liberty of many European peoples, the use of force in hundreds of different cases in order to support a socialistic, anti-Christian and anti-democratic ideology imposed on a glorious people.

(Mr. de Marchena, Dominican Republic)

Neither with treachery to the principles of the Charter, nor with insincerity, nor with lack of understanding of the elements of the Algerian question was the seven-Power draft resolution inspired. It was inspired by a sincere desire to find ways and means whereby France and the French and Algerian troops in Algeria could satisfy the ancient interests -- I am not talking of the new interests that were born yesterday -- that must underlie the solution of the problem. The delegation of the Dominican Republic is pleased and happy to give its support to the maintenance of peace in Algeria and to efforts to solve this question on peaceful, democratic and just lines such as will uphold the prestige of the United Nations. We are convinced of the goodwill of France and its government in the manner in which it is facing the problem -- France, a country proud of its traditions and of its promises and which has never permitted treachery with regard to its principles. These same principles are those upon which our Organization was built because France is the country which is the focus of our attention.

Let us give to France our confidence and our understanding so that France, with its own understanding, can solve the Algerian question. Only thus, and not through any intransigence, can we achieve what we all desire. Only thus can we make sure that the principles of the Charter will be respected because any conflict that would endanger or hamper the normal development of recognized public institutions must be stopped and the Charter respected.

We would not like to conclude our statement, in view of the fact that draft amendments have been distributed sponsored by Canada, Ireland and Norway, without saying that the delegation of the Dominican Republic hopes to be given an opportunity to speak to the co-sponsors of our own draft resolution because there are elements in the amendments which would have to be discussed among us. As regards these amendments themselves, we shall be obliged to explain our position in due course.

Mr. BOLAND (Ireland): My delegation, in company with those of Canada and Norway, has proposed two amendments to the seventeen-Power draft resolution. The text of the changes which we suggest are no doubt already in the hands of members of the Committee; they are contained in document A/C.1/L.196.

I should like to explain very briefly, so far as my own delegation is concerned, the motives which have inspired these proposed changes which, I hope, will commend themselves not only to the sponsors of the seventeen-Power draft resolution, but to the Committee as a whole.

Generally speaking, the purpose of the amendments may be said to be twofold. Their first purpose is to make the draft resolution a somewhat more faithful and accurate reflection of the general sense of the debate which we have had here during the last ten days and of the different shades of opinion which have been expressed during it.

The second motive is the desire and, I might say, the hope, that by doing this, it may be possible to arrive at something which will command the widest possible measure of acceptance in the Committee, if not unanimity.

The actual amendments which we have proposed speak for themselves. I am afraid that they cannot claim the virtue of novelty. Many delegations will recognize them. I admit that the first amendment may, at first blush, inspire some doubts in the minds of those who attach a special magic to the mere words "self-determination", but, as Mr. Belaunde argued so eloquently here yesterday, twelve years of discussion at the United Nations can hardly be said to have clarified the concept of self-determination. Indeed, it might be more true to say that they have surrounded it with so many doubts and obscurities that, whatever value the concept may still have as a general idea, its application and its meaning in the circumstances of specific cases is often a matter of doubt, uncertainty, imprecision.

(Mr. Boland, Ireland)

The amendment we propose has the merit of saying just what it means. It asserts the title and in our view -- and when I say "our view", I mean the view of the Irish delegation -- the just right of the people of Algeria to work out their own political future; it asserts the title and, as I say, in our view, the just title of the people of Algeria to be given an opportunity of doing so by democratic means. It implies the view which I am sure is widely shared by the members of this Committee that it is just and right and vitally important that the voice of the people of Algeria as a whole should be heard through their own freely elected representatives, and that once that position is achieved the question of the future of Algeria will be immeasurably nearer to a solution.

From these points of view I submit that the text that we propose is precise, constructive and an immense step forward. Its adoption by this Committee as a whole would be a positive achievement. I would earnestly urge the sponsors of the seventeen-Power draft resolution to accept it.

The second amendment is mainly of a drafting character. It seems to us important that we should constantly bear in mind in this Committee the character and the limits of our role in connexion with this matter. We are not a compulsive power. We are not in a position to issue a peremptory summons or to impose solutions. Our function is to express the moral conscience of our peoples and the moral conscience of the world. The more accurate the language we use is attuned to the precise nature of the competence we possess, the more effective and the more authoritative our conclusions will be. From that point of view the word "Proposes" which appears in our amendment seems to us infinitely better than the words "Calls for", which appears in the seventeen-Power draft resolution. It is both more in keeping with the extent of the authority we possess, and I think more effective for the purpose we have in view.

The rest of this amendment speaks for itself. We submit that by its acceptance the seventeen-Power draft resolution would lose nothing of its sense or its force, and we are confident on the contrary that it would gain appreciably in clarity and in general acceptability.

(Mr. Boland, Ireland)

On these grounds we have sponsored these amendments and we commend them to the Committee. I want to make it very clear that our support of these amendments is not actuated by any opposition to the seventeen-Power draft resolution. It is actuated solely by an earnest desire to ensure that the lengthy debates we have had here will arrive at something we can all claim and point to as a positive result, believing as we do that in so doing we shall be best serving the interests of the Algerian nation, for which we in Ireland feel and with whom we sympathize so deeply, and we shall also at the same time be serving the best interests of the United Nations.

Mr. UMAÑA BERNAL (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): Point of order. This is for a very simple matter, but I do consider it to be important for information purposes so far as the Committee is concerned. I should like very respectfully to ask the co-sponsors of the amendment that has just been submitted in document A/C.1/L.196 -- that is, Canada, Ireland and Norway -- to be good enough to have a correction made to the Spanish text because the Spanish text that has been distributed is not the same as the English text of the amendment. It may create confusion and it may even give rise to a bad atmosphere in the Committee because I feel that the amendment may be very helpful in this matter and it might even achieve the unanimity of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): In response to the point of order of the representative of Colombia, I shall ask the Secretariat to take into account the point raised by that representative.

I call on the representative of Haiti on a point of order.

Mr. ST. LOT (Haiti) (interpretation from French): I simply want to draw the Committee's attention to a similar observation applying to the French translation which in no way corresponds to the English text as read out by the sponsors.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I shall have the Secretariat of the Committee take into account the observations of the representative of Haiti.

Mr. de MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) (interpretation from Spanish): Point of order. I wanted to submit a point of order and I knew that you would call on me because I had caught your eye earlier. The representative of Colombia "jumped the gun" on me on this extremely important question, but I do want to make one point clear which may perhaps facilitate matters for the Spanish Department of the Secretariat. In the Spanish translation of the original English text, a very correct and precise interpretation must be given of these words, especially regarding as the juridical aspect of the English phrase "entitled to work out". These words must be given their true interpretation. The word "entitled" in Spanish can be given different meanings such as capacity, right, titles and so on. The words "work out" also have a certain structural meaning, something that you construct or build. Therefore, the Spanish-speaking delegations must receive a document that is correctly translated. We know that this document is a provisional translation, and it is so marked. Therefore, I would ask the Secretariat to take these aspects into account and also to take into account the original English in all its aspects.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I call upon the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I am afraid that we are in the same predicament with the Russian translation which, it seems to me, reflects the original English with inadequate accuracy. I would therefore request the Secretariat to take care of that translation also.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): The Secretariat will take that into account also.

The next meeting will be at 3 p.m. this afternoon.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.