

UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



LIMITED
A/C.1/PV.924
5 December 1957
ENGLISH

Twelfth Session
FIRST COMMITTEE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 5 December 1957, at 3 p. m.

Chairman:

Mr. ABDOH

(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.924. 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) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): The Committee has now received the draft resolution submitted by a number of delegations in document A/C.1/L.194, and therefore we can now proceed to examine this draft resolution.

Mr. SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia): On behalf of the seventeen sponsors, including Indonesia, I have the honour to submit to this Committee the draft resolution on the Algerian question tabled early this afternoon, after the general debate closed this morning. In presenting this draft resolution we have been guided by the general feeling in the general debate that a peaceful solution of the tragic situation in Algeria can be found through negotiations between the parties concerned.

The meaning of this draft resolution is clear from its wording and the opinions which the sponsoring Member States expressed during the general debate and on other occasions. The draft resolution before us has been discussed at length among delegations from the Asian and African countries after many contacts and consultations with some other delegations. The draft before us is the result of the general consensus of opinion of the delegations from Asia and Africa whose countries and peoples have been most concerned with the Algerian question for a long time and who have been able to see the Algerian situation in the light of their recent experiences.

It is the considered opinion of the sponsors of the draft resolution that, after the prolonged and exhaustive deliberations of the Committee, this draft resolution is the minimum amount of action that can be expected from the Assembly under the present circumstances in dealing with this international question before us. When this draft resolution is examined in an objective manner, the members of this Committee, I believe, will not fail to see that the ideas underlying it are in accordance with the Charter and also in response to the mission that the United Nations is expected by the peoples of the world to fulfil for the sake of liberty, peace and international co-operation. We therefore sincerely hope that this draft resolution will be approved by this Committee.

Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands): When the matter of Algeria was discussed at previous sessions, my delegation consistently took the view that, unless a draft resolution were proposed which was acceptable to the French Government, it was not within the competence of the General Assembly to make any recommendations concerning the manner in which France should deal with this problem, which under the terms of our Charter clearly falls within the domestic jurisdiction of that country. We still hold that view. Since the representatives of Belgium, Cuba, Peru and Israel have lucidly and eloquently upheld this same thesis in the recent debate, it is not necessary for me to repeat the arguments which they have so ably developed.

The Netherlands delegation has always been firmly convinced that France, true to its great tradition, would be able to find the means of reaching a settlement that would do justice to the many divergent aspirations of the inhabitants of Algeria as a whole. The exposé of the French position, which the Minister of Foreign Affairs gave us as an introduction to the discussions, proved that the Government of France has made considerable progress in overcoming the difficulties created by outside interference as well as in clarifying and elaborating the methods which will ensure that the settlement that will eventually be reached shall be based on the free and democratic expression of the will of Algerian people.

(Mr. Schurmann, Netherlands)

This being the case, my delegation will maintain its determination of giving its vote only to a draft resolution which will not impede the French Government in the performance of its task, a draft resolution which is acceptable to that Government and which, for that reason, is compatible with the principles laid down in paragraph 4 and 7 of Article 2 of the Charter of the United Nations.

I regret to say that the joint draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.194 does not meet with these requirements, and my delegation will therefore have to vote against it.

U THANT (Burma): As one of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.194, let me make this brief statement. It will be recalled that in the course of my intervention on the question of Hungary in the plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 12 September 1957, I made the following observations:

"In our view, the Algerian question belongs to the same category and is at least as important and urgent as the Hungarian question. In Algeria blood is being shed every day. Why then was no thought given to calling a special session to consider the grave situation in Algeria?" (A/PV.674, p. 1413)

The general debate on the question of Algeria has confirmed the need for an immediate and peaceful settlement of this issue. My delegation, along with a number of other delegations, has submitted this draft resolution with the sincere desire of arriving at a peaceful solution of the problem, the gravity of which no one can doubt.

This draft resolution is but a logical sequence of the previous resolution adopted on 15 February 1957 by the General Assembly, by 77 votes to none. That resolution, in its operative part, expressed the hope that, in the spirit of co-operation, a peaceful, democratic and just solution will be found through appropriate means, in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

In the period since the adoption of that resolution, the situation in Algeria has continued to deteriorate. The Afro-Asian group, which in the meantime has kept in touch with the developments in Algeria, sent a note to the Secretary-General on 15 April 1957, in which it stated its belief that every possible effort must be

(U Thant, Burma)

made to ensure "that the instructions of the General Assembly resolution earlier this year were fulfilled and not frustrated". On 17 July 1957, twenty-one Afro-Asian countries formally requested that the question of Algeria be made an item of the agenda of the twelfth session. Subsequently, the Union of Burma formally associated itself with this request.

The draft resolution now before this Committee is a simple, straightforward and constructive attempt to resolve the deadlock and create conditions for a peaceful settlement of the problem. No one will deny that the hope entertained in the previous resolution has not been realized, and I am sure no one will question the assertion that the principle of self-determination should be applicable to the Algerian people. It is also an undeniable fact that the situation in Algeria continues to cause much suffering and loss of human life. The only operative paragraph is one which 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.

This Committee is aware that France is opposed to the idea of negotiations, and, in this connexion, let me take this opportunity of making a few observations on the difference between the post-war British approach to colonialism and the French approach. Britain understood the upsurge of national consciousness in Asian colonies as a tide which no imperialist Canut could stem, and she played the role of a willing midwife in the birth of new Asian nations: India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon and Malaya.

Because of this foresight and magnanimity, the traditional bitterness between Britain and her colonies is no more, and now the relations between Britain and the newly-emerged countries from British colonial bondage are very friendly. Only the other day Britain and Burma celebrated with pomp and ceremony the tenth anniversary of the signing of the Nu-Attlee Agreement which launched Burma's independence.

It therefore puzzled me when the representative of the United Kingdom told this Committee on 30 November that his Government sympathized with the French stand on the question of Algeria. Does this signify a withdrawal from the high ideals set by the British Labour Government and so nobly taken up by the Conservative Government, as evidenced by the grant of independence to the Republic of Malaya?

(U Thant, Burma)

Or is the present British stand merely meant to window-dress her solidarity with a useful ally, in the face of the intensification of the cold war? Surely my delegation fails to understand the motivation behind the present British stand, which is so alien to her glorious record of understanding and liberalism in Asia.

The French approach to colonialism in Asia is different from the British approach. The French colonial record in Indochina, for instance, had not been, to say the least, an inspiring one. Immediately after the Japanese surrender the people of Viet-Minh took matters into their own hands, proclaiming the Democratic Republic of Viet-Namh under the presidency of Dr. Ho Chi Minh. France then embarked on a long and costly war, which was ruinously to drain the French economy during the coming years. Nor were her military operations crowned with success. After six years of fighting, no victory had been achieved. Thirty thousand French soldiers, apart from the casualties among the colonial troops, had lost their lives, and still the popular forces were unsubdued.

(U Thant, Burma)

It was indeed remarkable that while France was spending \$1,300 million a year on the Indo-Chinese campaign, far less efficiently equipped resistance was so persistently maintained. What, then, was the result of this unreal policy in Indo-China? As everybody knows, Indo-China was divided into two sections, one half completely hostile to France and the other half lacking in warmth towards France. I am afraid that France, despite its long and proud traditions of democratic ideals and of culture, has again shut its eyes to the realities in Algeria as it did in Indo-China. Approximately 900,000 men, comprising army units, naval units, auxiliary police and civilian armed militia are now operating in Algeria. The number of these French armed forces is about one tenth of the total population of Algeria, and when one remembers that only 50,000 men in uniform were stationed in Algeria three years ago the fantastic expansion of French armed forces to the present colossal size is an unmistakable testimony to the mounting gravity of the situation. It will certainly be against the interest of France to keep up this policy and, therefore, a way should be found to get out of this impasse. The situation in this unhappy country is daily deteriorating and is assuming very serious dimensions.

The draft resolution before this Committee is but an honest attempt to help France rediscover itself, to live up to its ideals, to avoid the repetition of mistakes committed in French Indo-China, to help the agonized Algerian people to live once more in peace and freedom and, last but not least, to establish friendly relations between France and an independent Algeria, without malice, without hatred and without bitterness on either side.

My delegation is perfectly aware that the issue before this Committee is not a straightforward one. It is complicated by the fact that there are more than one million French men and women in Algeria, and obviously they cannot be abandoned by the mother country, particularly since they have been there for almost four generations. Nor is it practically possible for the mother country to uproot these French settlers, or "colons", and find employment for them elsewhere. The problem, therefore, is one not merely of granting independence to the peoples of Algeria but of resolving a situation whereby over one million white settlers or "colons" and nine million Arab Moslems can coexist in confidence, in security and in peace.

(U Thant, Burma)

My delegation, therefore, has much pleasure in co-sponsoring this draft resolution which alone, in the present circumstances, can bring about a peaceful settlement of the question, taking into account the legitimate rights of the French settlers to whom Algeria is as much a homeland as it is to the indigenous population. Its adoption would certainly help to create the necessary atmosphere for such conditions. I should like to appeal to the conscience of this Committee and ask it to give serious thought to the implications of this draft resolution, and to support it fully.

Mr. de la COLINA (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to deal very briefly with the seventeen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.194) which has just been submitted. Before doing so, however, I wish to state that, as was the case at the last session of the General Assembly, my delegation's silence during this year's general debate on Algeria was due only to our desire not to prolong unduly the consideration of an item which concerns delegations other than our own. Furthermore, the Mexican position on this problem has been stated quite fully during previous sessions.

Algeria is still beset by conflict. France's relations with the nearby countries of North Africa become strained and are broken off at times, as is true also of its relations with other countries whose inhabitants have close ties of culture, race or religion with the majority of the Algerian people. Fundamental human rights are still being violated because of an exceptional state of violence which, unfortunately, tends to become not only chronic but usual.

I believe that all of us here are concerned with this problem, and we are saddened, as are France and Algeria, to note that the hope that we had voiced when the Assembly adopted resolution 1012 (XI) is daily being dissipated. In view of this painful and regrettable situation, it is only natural that our concern should grow.

As everyone knows, my delegation did not hesitate to uphold the competence of the General Assembly to consider matters of this nature. However, we have always believed firmly that those of us who interpret the Assembly's competence thus widely are, more than anyone else, convinced that it is our duty objectively to study the political reality serenely and as moderately as possible, to consider

(Mr. de la Colina, Mexico)

controversies and to stint no effort to draft resolutions which, on the one hand, will be equitable and in accordance with the provisions of the Charter, and, on the other hand, will be viable and conciliatory, so that they will not only not exacerbate differences but endeavour to mitigate them. In explaining its vote on this very same question at the eleventh session, my delegation said that in this case:

"Our mission is not exclusively that of imposing an unacceptable solution upon one or other of the parties. Nor is it to declare that this party is right and that that party is not. What we should do is to try to establish conditions which might facilitate the negotiations between the two parties and open the door to a political formula which could be accepted by both. And at the same time any solution should take into account the transitory interests of the two parties, and it should certainly be based on justice." (A/C.1/PV.845, page 48-50)

The foregoing reasons and our profound and historical adherence to the principle of self-determination of peoples -- without which we could not justify the emergence of our own country as an international entity -- lead us to view this draft resolution sympathetically. Generally speaking, we consider it to be moderate and constructive. But what does France say? France's Minister for Foreign Affairs has already told us his view, and in the light of so negative a stand it is necessary for us to say that although we do not agree with him we do understand the reasons for his taking such a stand.

(Mr. de la Colina, Mexico)

We feel, however, that we should then try to find some new text which, like the resolution adopted at the Assembly's last session, can be adopted unanimously. Perhaps we should reiterate the resolution adopted on 15 February of this year and add some words which will reflect the Committee's anxiety and stress the urgency of finding the kind of solution described in that previous resolution -- that is, a peaceful, democratic and just solution. The new text should also take into account factors which had not as yet come to light in February -- namely, the adoption of the loi-cadre, which has been described to us here, and the offer of good offices by His Majesty the King of Morocco and the President of Tunisia, whose representatives here have once again given proof of their political maturity and far-sightedness.

In accordance with the above considerations, my delegation's vote will depend on the way in which the Assembly adapts itself to the new circumstances. I trust that a single text will be found which all of us can support without any reservations and which will enable a step forward to be taken on the rocky path leading to the lasting tranquillity and peace of the countries of North Africa, on the one hand, and France, on the other. We believe that France's assistance is indispensable to the future welfare of that promising region. We therefore hope that friendship among these countries will once again reign.

Mr. WALKER (Australia): Australia did not participate in the general debate on the present item because, in our opinion, the situation in Algeria falls essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of France and, as such, lies outside the General Assembly's scope of action under the terms of Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter. Our position on this matter, therefore, is the same as it was last session and on other previous occasions when this item was discussed.

We may be -- and indeed we are -- deeply concerned over the conflict and bloodshed that have taken place in Algeria. But that concern does not, in our view, entitle the United Nations to intervene in a matter that is the responsibility of the Government of France. There is no doubt in our mind that Algeria is constitutionally part of France. The fact that some other countries have encouraged and assisted the Algerian rebels may call at some stage for attention by the United Nations, but it does not remove the question of the government of

(Mr. Walker, Australia)

Algeria from France's domestic jurisdiction. And, while the problem of Algerian refugees in neighbouring countries also arouses international concern, that, too, does not remove the Algerian situation from France's jurisdiction and responsibility.

Our stand on Article 2, paragraph 7 is not a mere pretext for opposing action by the United Nations on matters entrusted to it by its Members under the Charter. Article 2, paragraph 7 is as much a part of the Charter as any other Article. Its purpose is quite simple: to protect States against intervention by other people in their domestic affairs. Such a provision is a necessary safeguard. It was considered necessary by those who drafted the Charter, and it has been agreed to by all who have accepted the Charter. Those who choose to disregard this provision or to interpret it so loosely as to deprive it of its meaning are embarking on a dangerous course that could imperil the future influence and authority of this Organization, which in the last resort relies on the willing co-operation of its Members. Consequently, we believe that France would have been within its rights under the Charter if it had again opposed the discussion of this matter in the General Assembly.

France, however, while maintaining its position on the principle of Article 2, paragraph 7, has chosen to meet with the Committee, explain France's policy in Algeria and seek our understanding of it. The Foreign Minister of France, Mr. Pineau, and Mr. Giscard d'Estaing have presented their Government's position with great clarity and authority. Others have discussed the Algerian problem in considerable detail in this Committee.

Now the Committee has before it a draft resolution proposed by Afghanistan and a number of other countries and introduced at the beginning of this afternoon's meeting by the representative of Indonesia. I find it necessary to intervene at this point because, while we consider that the General Assembly is not competent under the Charter to deal with this matter, the content of any resolution that may be adopted is of some consequence to us -- not only as regards the possible precedent in relation to other questions, but also as regards the substance of any United Nations action in this particular case. I wish, however, to make it clear that in commenting and voting on the draft resolution I do not retract our objection to the Assembly's competence to intervene in the Algerian situation.

(Mr. Walker, Australia)

The draft resolution has been offered to us as the outcome of the general debate. Now, it is true that the debate has reflected the deep human concern that we all feel over the continued strife in Algeria and the widespread suffering which that strife has brought in its train. This deep concern has been apparent in the speeches of many representatives, including, of course, those of Tunisia and Morocco, whose offers of good offices have earned the respect and commendation of all of us, despite the real difficulties which the French Government sees in accepting those offers at present.

I must say, however, that in some of the speeches, particularly those of certain communist representatives, the expressions of concern over human suffering have been drowned out, as it were, by denunciations of colonial rule, condemnations of French policies in Algeria, and encouragements to the Algerian rebels to continue their resistance to the French authorities. That is one of the dangers inherent in a discussion of this kind: some delegations are prepared to use the United Nations as a sounding-board for propaganda designed not merely to gain international sympathy for the rebels -- which certainly constitutes interference in France's domestic affairs -- but also to encourage the continued use of violence by the rebels. This is no service to the cause of peace in Algeria or internationally.

In general, however, the debate this session has been marked by a greater restraint and moderation than last session. But, even when that is said, I doubt whether such debates really lay a good foundation for the negotiations which the draft resolution now proposes. The essence of negotiation is a measure of mutual accommodation. And, although both parties to a negotiation will often start by adopting an extreme position, some degree of flexibility is essential if the negotiation is to make any progress. But here in this Committee the position adopted by the Algerian rebels has been taken up, elaborated and defended by certain speakers in a way that tends, I fear, to crystallize -- I might even say petrify -- the position of the rebels, so that, if and when the rebels enter into any negotiations, they will have difficulty in resiling from positions that once were theirs alone but now are also proclaimed as unalterable by a large part of the Arab world.

(Mr. Walker, Australia)

The very attempt to justify the Algerian case in this Committee may itself render it increasingly difficult to undertake the negotiations that are advocated as necessary. In our view, it would not be within the competence of the General Assembly to impose upon the French Government, against its authority, the obligation to negotiate with the those Algerians who are in open revolt. In any case, the French Government has taken the position, understandably, that while it is willing to negotiate, the first prerequisite to negotiations on the future government of Algeria must be a cease-fire and a renunciation of violence, while the second prerequisite is the holding of elections to determine who are the authorized representatives of the Algerian people, representatives authorized by the voice of the people and not by their readiness to resort to violence.

This is surely a reasonable position. It may well be that some discussion will be required to bring about a **cease-fire** and, indeed, to facilitate and arrange the holding of elections, but these are essential preliminaries to the negotiations that will be necessary, in due course, to bring about a peaceful and just constitutional development in Algeria.

The French Foreign Minister has indicated very clearly the way in which France proposes to proceed towards a solution of that problem, and we would not consider it proper for the Committee to spell this out in a resolution. In our view, the United Nations is not competent to work out the stages of a settlement in Algeria. But it would be equally improper, in our view, as well as unrealistic, to issue a simple call to negotiations in the terms of the draft resolution before us. It is no doubt the hope of many delegations, as it is ours, that ways and means will be found to facilitate discussions and to arrive at agreements such as would bring peace in Algeria and make possible the peaceful development of the new constitutional arrangements that the situation of Algeria and the aspirations of the Algerian people make necessary.

But may I be permitted to add that this is a time that calls for a spirit of patience, here in the United Nations as well as in Algeria. If anything has been made clear by the debate of the last session and again this time it is the complexity of the Algerian problem. There are other parts of the world undergoing radical constitutional developments and subject to internal tensions and external, even self-interested, pressures. Happy indeed are they whose problems at such a time can be resolved without violence or fratricidal strife, where there is neither

(Mr. Walker, Australia)

terrorism nor repression. Even under such favourable conditions, it takes time and much effort to work out acceptable solutions to those problems. Solutions that have succeeded in other countries cannot be blindly adopted. In every country's situation there are unique features, and the unique features of Algeria must by now be known to all of us.

It is not surprising if there are sometimes sharp differences of opinion inside France on the particular policies that should be followed or if the loi-cadre had its critics in France as well as its defenders. Algeria's ordeal is France's ordeal, and the best course of action is not always readily discernible, even to those most deeply involved, and those outside critics who would do things differently or more quickly must bear in mind that in the last resort only France and Algeria can work out solutions that are accounted acceptable and that take account of all the aspirations and interests involved. The French Government asks for our understanding, and it merits also our forbearance and respect in these challenging moments.

A draft resolution has been introduced this afternoon, and I do not know whether it is intended to press for a vote this afternoon or whether, in view of the fact that it has been said that some efforts are being made towards the production of other ideas or that moves are being made towards accommodation, it would not be considered more appropriate, in accordance with our rules of procedure to defer any final decision on the matter a little longer. To us, there would seem to be some advantage in that, and in the event of a vote being taken now on the draft resolution in its present form, the Australian delegation would vote against it.

Mr. MENA-SOLORZANA (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish): If this draft resolution is to be put to the vote, I would request that we be given a reasonable time to consult with our respective Governments before we cast our vote.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): In reply to the question asked by the representative of Nicaragua, I would draw the attention of the Committee to rule 121 of our rules of procedure. According to this rule, as a

(The Chairman)

general rule, no proposals shall be discussed or put to the vote at any meeting of the Committee unless copies have been circulated to all delegations not later than the day preceding the meeting. However, according to the same rule, the Chairman may permit the discussion and consideration of amendments or of motions, even though they have not been circulated or have only been circulated on the same day. Although I have the right to put this question before the Committee, I do not have the right to put it to the vote before tomorrow, unless there is a proposal to do so. To sum up, we can examine this joint draft resolution today, but the vote upon it, unless a decision to the contrary is taken by the Committee, which is master of its own procedure, will be postponed until tomorrow.

Mr. de MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) (interpretation from Spanish):

With regard to this question, my delegation hopes that the Chairman will understand and appreciate the position of many delegations, not only with regard to this draft resolution, but also with regard to the possibility -- I would almost say the probability -- of another draft resolution being submitted. This leads me to state that, from the experience I have had in this Committee, unless the political situation were to be forced, which would not be possible, we would expect to vote on the draft resolution tomorrow afternoon. My delegation would appreciate it if the Chairman would give the Committee all possible flexibility and latitude, because most delegations are not eager to have this voted upon tomorrow afternoon. If necessary, we could vote on Saturday morning or, better still, on Monday. This, after all, is a very delicate situation. It is subject to many different fluctuations, and, besides having to consult our Governments, as the representative of Nicaragua has mentioned, we have to consult one another as well. After all, this joint draft resolution is important, and my delegation has inscribed its name on the list of speakers who wish to speak on it, but we are not able or ready to do so until all the other probable draft resolutions have been circulated.

Mr. UMAÑA BERNAL (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like briefly to comment on the question now before the Committee. I agree with and entirely support the request made by the representative of Australia and also the

(Mr. Umaña Bernal, Colombia)

requests made by the representatives of Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic. I noticed, too, that you also nodded your head, Mr. Chairman, which pleased me very much. In this question of Algeria, we cannot act in accordance with the conviction that the debate is being held solely and exclusively in this Committee. In other words, if we in the Committee are going to adopt a resolution by a majority, we must remember that majorities are transitory, but by such a majority we are going to hope to solve a problem which so deeply affects our Governments and our people.

(Mr. Umaña Bernal, Colombia)

On the question of Algeria, there is not simply a debate in this Committee; there are many parallel debates taking place. I would say that there is a simultaneous debate taking place in the passages and corridors of this building, there is a debate in the Foreign Ministries, there is a debate in the newspapers and there is a debate being held by public opinion.

Therefore, we ought to delay not only in order to have consultations with Governments but in order to see whether the situation will mature, will jell, and then decide on something here. But we should not take a hasty decision imposed by a transitory majority. That, I think, would violate the principles of the Charter and would not redound to the benefit of the United Nations. After all, our Organization is a body set up for conciliation of views.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I think I can give the representatives of the Dominican Republic and Colombia assurance that I did not intend to put the seventeen-Power draft resolution to the vote today. Regarding the possibility of postponing the voting on this draft resolution for some time, I feel it my duty to draw attention to the fact that we still have two other items on our agenda and that we should take all practical measures to speed up the tempo of our work.

I think I have clarified that point, and I should now like to ask the representative of the Dominican Republic whether he wishes to make a formal proposal to the effect that we adjourn the debate on this question for a certain period of time.

Mr. de MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) (interpretation from Spanish): No, we have no formal proposal of that sort to make. We knew perfectly well that we could not vote on the draft today because, according to the procedure, it is very easy to block a vote today. But even that procedure, and even the logical reasoning so brilliantly put before us by the representative of Colombia, mean that it is impossible to consider voting tomorrow morning. I am sure the Chairman does not want to press for a vote tomorrow morning, because I am almost sure that he would find himself in difficulties -- and I suggest that he would meet with the same difficulties in the afternoon. I think the Chairman should give us

(Mr. de Marchena, Dominican Republic)

latitude and leave it to the majority of the Committee to decide. After all, this is a very important draft resolution. Moreover, as the Chairman is well aware, negotiations are taking place for the purpose of submitting another draft to the Committee. Delegations must be given a chance to submit that additional draft. This is a delicate question for the United Nations and for the world itself as well as for our Foreign Ministries. It is therefore hardly feasible to think of a vote tomorrow. That is what we wanted to be sure of. If a proposal were made tomorrow, then we would make a formal proposal that no vote be taken tomorrow on this draft resolution or any other draft resolution which may be forthcoming.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I am compelled once again to ask the representative of the Dominican Republic whether he submitted a formal motion to adjourn the debate on this question until tomorrow afternoon, or until Saturday, or until whatever day he may choose. We must act in accordance with our rules of procedure. Under the rules of procedure, I believe, I might consider that I cannot put this draft resolution to a vote today. As to the question of the meeting at which the draft resolution could be put to a vote, there are two possibilities: we might vote on it tomorrow morning or tomorrow afternoon. If a proposal is made to call the next meeting of the First Committee tomorrow afternoon, I will have to consult the Committee on that proposal. After all, the Committee is master of its own procedure. If no such proposal is made, then, bearing in mind the rather heavy agenda of the Committee, I will be compelled to adjourn this meeting and to convene the Committee tomorrow morning -- unless, I repeat, there is a formal proposal not to hold a meeting tomorrow morning.

In view of the state of our agenda, in view of the necessity of considering the question of Cyprus as well as the question of the peaceful coexistence of States, I am duty bound to ask those delegations which want an adjournment of the debate to assume responsibility therefor and to make a formal proposal to that effect.

Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria): I think we can follow the normal procedure and continue the discussion of the draft resolution without submitting it to a vote today. I do not think, however, that it is necessary to prejudge the issue by wanting to postpone a vote until tomorrow afternoon, with the possibility of another resolution being presented. There is nothing, of course, to prevent any delegation from presenting a resolution before the voting starts. As long as the voting has not yet taken place, delegations have every right to present resolutions -- today or tomorrow morning.

I realize that this question of Algeria, which is of general world concern, is being debated in Foreign Ministries and in the Press and perhaps in many other quarters. But what we are primarily interested in here is that, the general debate having been closed, it is time to proceed to discuss thoroughly any resolution that is presented and to vote on it according to the rules of procedure, so that we may then go on to deal with the two other important items on the agenda of this session -- a session which is about to end.

I am of the opinion that the discussion can proceed but the voting can be delayed until tomorrow -- without tomorrow morning's meeting having to be postponed until the afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Bearing in mind the explanations I gave a few minutes ago, I believe that the best procedure would be the following: We would continue the discussion of the draft resolution as long as we have speakers. Thereupon, in accordance with our regular procedure, we would adjourn the meeting and hold another meeting tomorrow morning. I am not suggesting that the vote would necessarily be taken at the meeting tomorrow morning. It may appear that the discussion of the draft resolution will continue throughout the morning meeting. Perhaps, in the meantime, another draft resolution will be submitted. Perhaps the negotiations which have taken place up to now, and which will continue, I hope, between the parties most directly concerned, will yield happy results, and we might find a compromise draft resolution before us which will prove acceptable to everyone.

HA/gd

A/C.1/PV.924
29-30

(The Chairman)

In this connexion, I entirely share the views of the representative of Syria. It is better not to prejudge what we will do tomorrow morning.

Thus, tomorrow morning, we will continue the discussion of the draft resolution now before us and perhaps of other draft resolutions which may turn up, and then we will see. I certainly will seek the opinion of the Committee before putting the draft resolution to a vote.

I hope that my explanation will prove satisfactory to the representative of the Dominican Republic.

Mr. de MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) (interpretation from Spanish): I would appreciate it very much, Mr. Chairman, if, in conclusion, you were to say that you agreed with me because I agree with you.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): That being the case, I think everybody agrees with everybody else, and I think that I can interpret the last intervention of the representative of the Dominican Republic as proving that he agrees with me. Therefore, I should like to ask again whether there is any other representative who wishes to participate in the debate on the draft resolution.

Apparently no one wishes to speak on the draft resolution at the moment.

Mr. CALERO RODRIGUEZ (Brazil): May I propose formally that we should meet tomorrow at 3 p.m. and that the morning meeting should be cancelled.

Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria): Just a moment ago we found ourselves in full agreement -- the Chairman, the representative of the Dominican Republic, and myself. In our view, the proposal of the representative of Brazil prejudices the issue. We are opposed to that formal proposal. We believe that our business here necessitates full use of our time and that no useful purpose would be served by postponing the discussion any further. It must be remembered that, at the very beginning, discussion of the Algerian question was postponed for one day, and then there were other brief postponements, so that it is time to consider any draft resolutions that might be submitted. In view of the agreement reached a moment ago, I hope that the representative of Brazil will join in that agreement without pushing his proposal to a vote, so that we can meet tomorrow morning and continue our discussion.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): In view of the statement just made by the representative of Syria, may I ask the representative of Brazil whether he wishes to press his formal proposal?

Mr. CALERO RODRIGUEZ (Brazil): If there are sufficient speakers to warrant the holding of a meeting tomorrow morning I think that we should meet; but otherwise, I think it would be better to allow freedom for the negotiations

(Mr. Calero Rodriguez, Brazil)

which we know are going on. I think it is only sensible not to come here just to listen to one or two speakers for half an hour. It would be more profitable if delegations devoted that time to consultation and negotiations in order to try to arrive at what we are really seeking, namely, a text on which we can all agree. Therefore, I would rather maintain my motion unless there is a sufficient number of speakers to warrant a morning meeting.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Before calling on the representative of Panama I wish to make one point quite clear. What has been proposed is the adjournment of the debate until tomorrow afternoon. In this connexion I shall read rule 117 of our rules of procedure:

"During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. In addition to the proposer of the motion, two representatives may speak in favour of, and two against, the motion, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote..."

I have heard the representative of Brazil, who is the proposer of the motion; I have also heard the representative of Syria. I now call on the representative of Panama.

Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (interpretation from Spanish): I shall endeavour to speak very slowly so that the interpretation may be perfectly clear, as it has been up to now.

If I have correctly understood the words of the representative of Brazil, he does not insist on his proposal if there are sufficient speakers for the morning meeting. If there is no objection on the part of the representative of Brazil -- and I do not see any negative reaction from him -- then I should like it to be clearly understood that that being the case, there is no really formal motion for adjournment of the discussion. I would beg you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of the Committee, in order to maintain the spirit of cordiality that has been manifest this afternoon in the Committee, to allow it to be left to the discretion of the Chairman to convene a meeting of the Committee tomorrow morning if he receives requests from delegations to be allowed to speak. In that case, there would be no reason for any objection on the part of the representative of Syria to the effect that we might be guilty of prejudging

(Mr. Illueca, Panama)

the fate of one of the draft resolutions. I think that it is the privilege of any delegation to do so, and I should like to make this suggestion to you, Mr. Chairman -- so that the cordial spirit that has been observed in the Committee, particularly a few moments ago, may be maintained -- that we leave it to your discretion to call the next meeting of the Committee when you deem it necessary.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I am grateful to the representative of Panama for his willingness to grant me discretionary powers. It is a mark of confidence for which I thank the representative of Panama. I have been told, however, that another draft resolution has been submitted to the Committee. I believe that this draft resolution -- of the tenor of which I am still unaware -- might give rise to a discussion and, without being able to predict the exact number of speakers who might wish to speak tomorrow morning, I am confident that there would be a sufficiently large number to be able to continue our work without interruption. In these circumstances, and if the representative of Brazil does not press his proposal to a vote, I would suggest adjourning the present meeting, assuming that no one wishes to speak this afternoon, and meeting tomorrow morning to discuss both the draft resolution which has been placed before the Committee and the one which will be distributed in a few minutes.

May I add that it might be desirable for us to meet here in the United Nations even if we wish the negotiations which are being conducted outside the Committee to yield positive results. If we lack speakers, representatives will still have an opportunity to continue their discussions informally for the purpose of finding some compromise.

In view of all these considerations, and assuming that the representative of Brazil will not press his motion to a vote, I take it that I may call a meeting of the Committee for tomorrow morning and, if necessary, also for tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. SLIM (Tunisia)(interpretation from French): If the representative of Brazil insists that his proposal be voted on, I should like to state quite clearly that my delegation would oppose any postponement of tomorrow morning's meeting. If the representative of Brazil does not press his proposal and if, in accordance with the suggestion just made by the representative of Panama, we all trust the Chairman to act at his discretion, my delegation will be glad to support this manner of procedure.

However, I should like to add that the adjournment of today's meeting with a view to resuming our discussions tomorrow morning could not be motivated by the necessity of continuing the negotiations which are at present proceeding because I should like to emphasize that these conversations have already been going on for the last three days without, unfortunately, arriving at an arrangement. Should we therefore close the door on any possible arrangement or compromise? This is certainly not the view of all those who want an amicable and negotiated solution to this unfortunate dispute. My delegation believes that tomorrow morning's meeting and the next meetings should be devoted to the discussion of the draft resolutions which will be before this Committee. My delegation is opposed to any adjournment of the meeting on the grounds that there are conversations or negotiations in process.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I should now like to ask the representative of Brazil if he insists that we put to the vote his motion for adjournment.

Mr. CALERO RODRIGUES (Brazil): No, Mr. Chairman, I shall not insist. It is only 4.20 p.m. now and we have no more speakers on the draft resolution. Perhaps there will be speakers tomorrow -- and I trust you are right in this -- and if we have another draft resolution presented to us we will have more speakers. But I think that it is a pity that we must adjourn at 4.20 p.m., more than an hour and a half before our usual time of adjournment and when a draft resolution is before us. The delegations which are interested in this draft resolution could perhaps speak today instead of tomorrow morning.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): If I understand the representative of Brazil correctly, he does not insist that his proposal be put to the vote. That being the case, we will continue the consideration of the draft resolution before the Committee. We have already disposed of the question of the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. KHOURI (Lebanon)(interpretation from French): I merely wish to say that things are getting more and more complicated since the last intervention of the representative of Brazil.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to make an announcement. A draft resolution will be distributed in a few minutes to the delegations here. This draft resolution has been submitted by the delegations of Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Italy and Peru and is contained in document A/C.1/L.195.

If no one else wishes to speak on the draft resolution, I will be forced to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria): I have a question. Is this new draft resolution going to be distributed right away?

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Yes.

Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria): If that is the case, then we could proceed with our discussion.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): May I point out that this draft resolution was submitted in Spanish, and I do not think that the Secretariat can distribute this draft resolution in English and French before at least a quarter of an hour has elapsed. In that case, the best solution would perhaps be to adjourn the meeting and reconvene tomorrow morning.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): Mr. Chairman, last night you put great pressure on the Indian delegation to speak in order to wind up the general debate. This was not a law that was generally applicable but was only applicable to the Indian delegation. But be that as it may, if a draft resolution has been distributed and is within your esoteric knowledge, there is no reason why it should not be before the Committee in the next quarter of an hour if the Secretariat really wants it to be done. I therefore suggest that we adjourn for half an hour and meet here at five o'clock. This idea of meeting in the early hours of the morning is not preferable to meeting afterwards. If you are going to have long adjournments, my delegation proposes that we should move on to the next item.

There is a resolution of the General Committee asking for the General Assembly to be wound up on a certain date. It is not a target date, it is a fixed date. It will require a two-thirds majority to alter it. Some of us come from countries farther away than Iran and, we are anxious to get back to our countries. Therefore, I move that we adjourn until five o'clock in order to enable the very efficient Secretariat to distribute a reasonably correct translation in English.

Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria): When I asked to speak, it was just to say what Mr. Menon proposed a moment ago. I now second what he has said, especially in view of the fact that if we have this draft resolution before us this afternoon we would be within the rules of procedure in being able to discuss it today and to discuss it tomorrow, and possibly to vote on it tomorrow. There would be a great saving of time if we do this. Therefore, my delegation insists upon a short suspension of the meeting, for a quarter of an hour, until the draft resolution is distributed. We are also ready to accept the draft resolution as it is in Spanish until the time required to translate it.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): May I call the attention of the Committee to rule 119 of the rules of procedure. In accordance with this rule, "during the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the suspension or the adjournment of the meeting." In accordance with rule 120, priority shall be given to motions for suspension of the meeting. Rule 119 also provides that "such motions shall not be debated, but shall be immediately put to the vote." Therefore, if there are no objections ...

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I think there is a misunderstanding here between the representative of India and myself regarding terminology. According to the rules of procedure, when in the course of a discussion of any matter we suspend the meeting for a few minutes, for a half an hour or for an hour, it is a suspension and not an adjournment. You adjourn the meeting when you adjourn the meeting outright. What the representative has suggested is the suspension of the meeting until five o'clock. That is a motion for suspension and I have no choice but to consult the Committee on the suspension of the meeting. If there is no objection to the motion of the representative of India for suspension of the meeting until five o'clock, I shall take it that the Committee accepts it.

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

Mr. DRAGO (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): At this moment a draft resolution co-sponsored by my country, Brazil, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Spain, Italy and Peru is being copied and translated. I shall take the liberty of reading the text to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I regret having to interrupt the representative of Argentina, but we have before us a motion to suspend the meeting which was submitted by the representative of India. I will invite the Committee to pronounce itself on this motion, so that the Secretariat may be able to translate and circulate the draft resolution to all the delegations. This certainly will meet with the desire of the delegation of Argentina.

The Committee will now vote on the motion sponsored by the delegation of India to suspend the meeting until five o'clock.

The motion was adopted by 60 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The meeting was suspended at 4.35 p.m. and resumed at 5.10 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): The Committee will continue with the examination of the draft resolutions before it. I wish to announce that we have just received a draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Italy, Peru and Spain, which is contained in document A/C.1/L.195.

Mr. DRAGO (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): On behalf of my delegation and of the delegations of Brazil, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Italy, Peru and Spain, I have the honour to submit to you the following draft resolution:

Mr. Drago read document A/C.1/L.195.

I trust that the Committee will unanimously adopt the draft resolution that I have just read out. According to the views of the co-sponsors, it interprets the desire expressed in the Committee that a friendly solution be found to the question of Algeria.

Mr. de LEQUERICA (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): As the representative of Argentina has pointed out, this draft resolution is being submitted with the idea or the hope -- perhaps a little ambitious but nevertheless sincere -- that a unanimous vote will be achieved. When the time comes for a vote, we trust that it will be unanimously supported. Our confidence is based on the fact that, essentially speaking -- and I would say in all its wording -- this draft resolution is a reiteration of the resolution that the General Assembly unanimously adopted last year, with the additional advantage that it stresses certain satisfactory steps that have been taken following the unanimous adoption of that resolution. If we had a unanimous vote last year, why should we not have a unanimous vote this year? The truth of the matter is that that vote on this painful question of Algeria certainly got positive results. Of course, it has not solved the problem, but it has certainly been a progressive year as far as that is concerned. Two considerable steps have been put forward, and these steps are included in our draft resolution.

When I suggested this peaceful and amicable draft resolution to some friendly delegations without stressing the fact that I was going to put it forward as a draft resolution, I mentioned those steps forward in a vague way, and we merely wanted it to say, "Takes note of the steps taken". Now, however, we are stressing these two progressive steps forward. The first has been the intervention of two Heads of State, His Majesty the King of Morocco and the President of Tunisia. The second has been the loi-cadre adopted by the French parliament. I know that those who are studying this problem -- I shall not say from the extremist position, because it is not good to refer to them as extremists, as their positions are as respectable as any others -- from a different point of view from ours criticize both these steps and try to hamper this move. They say that this is limited mediation, and so on. After the statement that was made by the representative of France this morning, we realize that the French delegation wants a cease-fire agreed to first of all.

I am not going to discuss or criticize the loi-cadre which has been presented, but we are taking a completely different point of view. We are taking an independent point of view. We are only considering the good parts of these two steps. They have both been encouraging and both tend towards peace. Besides these

(Mr. de Lequerica, Spain)

two results, we do not neglect the competence of the United Nations, since we interpret the Charter taking full account of Article 2, paragraph 7, and we make good use of the second vital part of the suggestion made in last year's resolution, that is, to negotiate the matter, to bring it vitally to the United Nations.

Yesterday, in an excellent statement, the representative of Tunisia told us that the loi-cadre had been prepared because something in the nature of a draft law had to be presented to this Assembly. What greater tribute can any country pay the United Nations, even in the limited field in which the United Nations is obliged to act, than that a great Power which France truly is, prepares a law merely to put before us its legislative processes? Is this not a proof of the efficiency of the United Nations, rather than juridical agreements that are incomprehensible and definitely unacceptable? Is it not better to be seized here of practical results such as this loi-cadre, a complete legislation? Obviously this can lead to a higher solution, and it is towards that solution that we tend in our draft resolution.

We in this Committee are divided into groups. I do not know what the size of each group is, but some are in favour of the strict interpretation of the Charter whilst others do not interpret it so strictly. Some are in favour of one type of violent action on the part of the United Nations; others are in favour of greater prudence in the Assembly. But it would be most lamentable that, because we are divided on such a procedural matter, we would be unable to reap the advantages of what has occurred so far. Since we deem these advantages to be considerable, and since I personally have been most encouraged by the acute analysis made by the representative of Mexico this afternoon when he was stressing the advantages of this type of resolution, we offer a proposal for a peaceful solution; we do not oppose any other draft resolution that may be submitted. This is merely repeating the appeal that was made in the resolution last year, an appeal for co-operation, unity and a unanimous vote.

(Mr. de Lequerica, Spain)

Perhaps those who are in favour of an extreme position may not feel this way. They might prefer that a radical stand should be taken, thus satisfying the views of those who are fighting in Algeria -- a stand that will satisfy the impassioned as well as the tortured souls who are demanding immediate results. I do not think that would be the right thing to do.

In the period which has elapsed between the previous session and the present session, much has been accomplished, and I think that this should be recognized. We should do this in good faith without trying to oppose the views of anyone; we should base ourselves on the question of principle.

Despite the fact that we did not agree with the contents and interpretation of other proposals which have been submitted, we intended to limit ourselves to an abstention so as to show the objectivity of our purpose and our true desire to arrive at agreement. We are not discussing the substance of the question now; we did that in the general debate. We are soon about to vote. Let us therefore translate this desire for agreement and harmony into positive facts.

If we voted a draft resolution which was considered too extreme, there might be no solution at all. That would be extremely unfortunate. It would be regrettable and painful indeed if the United Nations were to prevent anyone from coming to an agreement on this question. We must make every effort to open the door for a settlement for a people who have been painfully living through the past few years.

Mr. LARAKI (Morocco) (interpretation from French): I should like to express my gratitude first for the welcome which has been extended to the offer of good offices extended by the King of Morocco and the President of the Republic of Tunisia. However, I should like to call the attention of the authors of the second draft resolution (A/C.1/L.195) to a flagrant contradiction in the third paragraph of its preamble, which reads: "Takes note of the attempts to settle the problem both through the good offices of Heads of State and French legislative measures, ..." His Majesty the King of Morocco and the President of the Republic of Tunisia, in extending their offer of good offices, had in mind good offices designed to assist in negotiations. I shall read out in this connexion the communiqué of Rabat:

(Mr. Laraki, Morocco)

"... in order that negotiations should be initiated which would lead to an equitable solution and which would assure the sovereignty of the Algerian people in conformity with the principles of the United Nations as well as safeguard the legitimate interests of France and her citizens."

The authors of the draft resolution, however, by connecting the good offices of Morocco and Tunisia and the French legislative measures, as a possible means of achieving a solution of the Algerian problem, completely distort the situation.

We have repeatedly explained -- and many delegations have done this -- why the loi-cadre cannot serve as a solution for the Algerian problem. This is a unilateral law which has been imposed by one party. Mediation presupposes, as I have already stated, the existence of two parties. However, the draft resolution, by placing the emphasis on the French legislative measures, makes mediation purposeless. That is why my delegation will be compelled to vote against the draft resolution presented by some Latin American countries, along with Italy and Spain.

Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria): The draft resolution which has just been presented has been under discussion by many delegations from various parts of the world. It has now found concrete form in the text which has been submitted. It is not, however, in our view, something new. This being the case and having considered the suggestions made in this draft, the Syrian delegation must certainly oppose it. In the prevailing circumstances, this draft would not be useful in arriving at a settlement of the Algerian question.

We greatly appreciate the spirit and effort which motivated the sponsors of this draft resolution in placing it before the Committee. However, in full knowledge of the situation in Algeria, in the light of the experience of many countries which have passed through similar conditions, and, even more, in the light of the statement made by the French delegation, it appears to us that this draft resolution clearly follows the thinking expressed mainly by the French delegation and some other delegations. Of course it is the right of any delegation to think in any manner which it sees fit. It is also the right, and it may be a service to the United Nations, of any delegation to try to present solutions to problems. This draft resolution, however, as it now stands -- and even if

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

its language is changed but its general view retained -- instead of facilitating a solution of the Algerian problem, might be harmful. That is our opinion.

Therefore, we should like to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that this draft resolution would not only not receive unanimous support, but would meet the objection of those who were convinced that it would not help us along the path of peace and liberty. Opinions may differ on this matter, but this is definitely the opinion that we hold.

There were some who felt that the seventeen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.194) could be replaced by another draft, along the lines of the second draft resolution which has been submitted, and receive some form of unanimous support. That point of view, unfortunately, does not conform to the realities of the position of the sponsors of the seventeen-Power draft resolution.

We hasten to express this point of view in order to be helpful so that the Committee may know the various points of view at the very beginning of the discussion. I should like, in addition, to support the statement just made by the representative of Morocco.

Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): After the brief but very substantive statement of the representative of Argentina and the explicit and more detailed observations of the representative of Spain on the purposes and scope of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.195) I should really find it unnecessary to speak. However, I do want to stress the motives which inspired us to submit this draft resolution.

We sincerely believe that the Assembly has tremendous moral authority, and we are convinced that in our exercise of that moral authority we should as far as possible avoid all controversial points regarding what the Assembly can legitimately and prudently do. Specific provisions that have to do with extremely complex and thorny juridical problems, such as those of the meaning and implementation of the principle of self-determination as an individual right applicable to specific collectivities of people; the point, dealing with negotiations, which presupposes the nomination of a negotiator and, therefore, the recognition of personality in a conflict, a point which is difficult to decide upon although it is legislated by a specific provision of international law codified by the International Institute of Law in its 1920 edition -- all this would give rise to endless and confusing debates. Not only would different points of view be expressed, but they obviously would be contradictory.

And, as the representative of Mexico said so eloquently this morning, we are not being called upon to solve juridical points on the basis of legalistic criteria, or to assume a function that is incumbent only upon States -- and only States, in the case of belligerency, can take such a stand in full knowledge of the facts.

We have to place ourselves in a general position of proving our good will in order to see whether, on that basis, we can achieve a unanimous resolution. That is why, although we studied the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.194 with great sympathy, and wish to pay tribute to the work of the seventeen Powers which co-sponsored it, we cannot entirely go along with it because it includes points which are bones of contention -- certain "unknowns" that might make it difficult if not impossible for us to accept it. That type of "unknown" does not exist in the seven-Power draft resolution which, as the Committee has been told, is based upon the same desires.

(Mr. Belaunde, Peru)

The first of these desires is to state that we believe in the moral competence of the Assembly to deal with matters bearing on human rights.

We declare in our draft resolution that we have heard the statements made by various delegations -- and we have. We declare that we have discussed the question of Algeria -- and we have, with the most eloquent co-operation and collaboration of the representative of France. Then we take up the seventeen-Power draft resolution because we, too, have regard for the fact that the situation in Algeria is still causing much suffering and loss of human life. The seventeen-Power draft resolution also contains that. It says, "Noting that the situation in Algeria continues to cause much suffering and loss of human life". Thus, on that point our draft resolutions are practically identical.

I shall skip the new part of our draft resolution and revert to it later. But what do we say in our last paragraph? We express again

"the hope that, in a spirit of co-operation, a peaceful, democratic and just solution will be found, through appropriate means, in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations".

There may be discrepancies regarding certain sectors of the interpretation, but we all recognize that in any kind of conflict the Charter must prevail. This, too, coincides with the seventeen-Power draft resolution.

This identity is a reaffirmation of something that was said last year -- and not only said but included in a resolution that was unanimously adopted. Therefore, we can say that many of the elements in our draft resolution which we consider to be important coincide with those of the seventeen-Power text. As for the others, they are already covered by the authority of the General Assembly which unanimously adopted the previous resolution.

Now what is the new part of our draft resolution, and what prompted us to include its third paragraph? We included that paragraph because we felt that the Assembly must not overlook something that is of great importance, namely, the offer of good offices made by Morocco and Tunisia. I must say, as has been said by some of my colleagues already, that we cannot adopt a resolution which ignores something that has taken place. That would be not only most discourteous but also a most cavalier fashion of dealing with an offer made by two heads of State. Therefore, we have alluded to that offer of good offices -- without

(Mr. Belaunde, Peru)

qualifying it or pointing out what its aims are. We have done that in order to pay tribute to the good will and the desire for co-operation shown by Powers which I shall describe not only as friends but, in the deepest meaning of the word, as sister-nations.

In our draft resolution we "take note" of certain facts -- not in the paragraphs of the preamble but in the operative part. And there is a difference. There is a great difference, in fact, between using the gerund -- saying "taking note" and then going on to the important points -- and saying "takes note". This is the operative part of the draft resolution, and the third paragraph is an important one. In it we pay tribute to this offer of good offices. We do not say "taking note"; we say that the General Assembly "takes note" of the offer of good offices.

(Mr. Belaunde, Peru)

Having taken note of the noble attempt by the Tunisian and Moroccan Heads of State, we cannot fail to take note of the French attempt. Each of us may have a different opinion about these French legislative measures; each of us may judge those measures as he deems fit. But, as Mr. de Lequerica of Spain has said, the fact is that these attempts have been made by France; these legislative measures have been reported to the General Assembly. It does not matter whether we regard the legislation as right or wrong, effective or ineffective. The facts will answer that question. The spirit of the loi-cadre -- more than the letter -- will tell us whether or not it is a good piece of legislation. The good will with which the loi-cadre is applied will tell us whether or not it is a good measure. But the fact is, I repeat, that the French Parliament adopted the loi-cadre and that the Government of France has reported on the loi-cadre to this Assembly, demonstrating a desire to inform the Assembly that France is concerned over this problem and wishes to solve it. We may be told that the loi-cadre is not a good solution or a satisfactory solution. As I have said, each one of us is free to make the judgement of the loi-cadre which he deems it fit to make. The fact still is that the French nation has demonstrated its desire to find a solution to this problem and, in reporting on the measures it has taken, the Government of France has paid a tribute to the United Nations.

Hence, speaking quite frankly, I can see no objection to paragraph 1 of the operative part of the seven-Power draft resolution. It would be discourteous to Morocco and Tunisia if this draft resolution did not mention the offer of good offices. By mentioning that offer, furthermore, we recognize the good will that motivated these two countries. Their attitude, too, is a tribute to the United Nations, and we must respond by taking note of the offer in our resolution.

With all the respect and affection that I have for the representative of Morocco, I must say that I cannot agree that there is any contradiction between taking note of the offer of good offices and taking note of the French legislative measures. There is no such contradiction. We have laid no greater stress on one than on the other. Indeed, if we are to bring up the question of emphasis, it can be contended that we have stressed the good offices, since usually one mentions first what one considers most important -- and the good offices of the Heads of State are mentioned first in this paragraph.

It was on the basis of the above-mentioned considerations that we drew up the present draft resolution. Have we acted correctly or incorrectly? Well, I prefer to think in an objective way and in a generous way. I prefer to think that we have acted correctly.

The question of Algeria is close to all of us. There is no human suffering that does not find its reflection in this Assembly. If we do not find a remedy for human suffering anywhere, and if we do not find a remedy quickly, that suffering increases and touches the hearts and souls of all of us.

I therefore make an appeal to all representatives here to think quietly and calmly about the reasons for submitting this draft resolution. The world situation is extremely grave. There are so many threats weighing on the shoulders of humanity. The elements of total destruction seem to be looming overhead; in fact, as the Americans say, they seem to be just around the corner. We all have ever with us this fear that an imprudent word, an unnecessary move, may produce the chain reaction that will cause the catastrophe. At this very moment, there is in all of us a kind of terror which demands prudence, peace, understanding and harmony.

The effectiveness of the United Nations does not lie in stressing little details, technicalities, specific words, and so forth. The effectiveness of the United Nations lies in its moral authority -- that invisible, intangible moral authority that must underlie each one of our resolutions.

Surely, the road to new hope must lie in adopting unanimously at this session a resolution paying a tribute to Morocco and Tunisia and encouraging France to apply its legislative measures more generously, with more understanding and with more latitude. Let us not throw away the possibilities for the future. If we do our duty here, we shall be assisted by Providence in the fulfilment of our task. In all humility, we think that in presenting this draft resolution we are doing our duty, and we place the draft resolution before the Assembly, asking it, in turn, to do its duty.

Mr. DRAGO (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of Morocco said that the third paragraph -- that is, paragraph 1 of the operative part -- of our draft resolution contained a contradiction in terms. I would submit that that paragraph is drafted very clearly and does not contain any contradiction. What does the paragraph say? It says:

"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".

In other words, this paragraph merely takes note of two new elements which have come into the picture since the Assembly adopted its resolution on this question at the last session.

The General Assembly cannot pass judgement on French legislative measures. The General Assembly is not a super-state. It cannot revise legislation adopted by its Members. The General Assembly can only, in this respect, take note of these legislative measures as faits accomplis.

The third paragraph of our draft resolution merely reflects the efforts made by France, among others, to solve the Algerian question peacefully. In the same paragraph and in the same sense, the General Assembly is asked to take note of another attempt: the offer of good offices made by two Heads of State. And, as the representative of Peru has just said, in taking note of this offer of good offices, the Assembly would be paying a tribute to those two Heads of State, whose good intentions are honoured and appreciated by all of us.

Therefore, I cannot see in this paragraph -- nor does there exist in it -- the contradiction which the representative of Morocco thinks he sees. If his only reason for voting against the seven-Power draft resolution would be this so-called contradiction in the third paragraph, I can only come to the conclusion that it is he who must change his vote.

Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Two draft resolutions have been submitted to the Committee. One of the draft resolutions is sponsored by a group of Arab and Asian countries, and the other by a group of Latin American countries and by some Western European countries. We have just heard a very eloquent defence of the latest draft resolution sponsored by Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Italy, Peru and Spain. This high-sounding introduction was particularly eloquent as it fell from the lips of Mr. Belaunde, but I fear that his eloquence was designed to sustain a wrong and that it followed an erroneous course.

As we compare the two draft resolutions and try to ascertain the difference between them, we come to the conclusion that in the draft resolution sponsored by Afghanistan, Burma and other Asian and Arab countries there is a recognition of the principle of self-determination as applicable to the Algerian people. But do we find an analogous point in the draft resolution sponsored by the Latin American and Western European countries? We do not. This point is absent, and this is not accidental, for therein lies the radical difference between the two draft resolutions.

Why has this paragraph been omitted? I put this question to the authors of the seven-Power draft resolution. Why do they feel that the principle of self-determination of peoples, which is enshrined in the United Nations Charter, is not applicable to the Algerian people? We have not heard any clear statement about this. I am afraid that what it really boils down to is that the sponsors of the seven-Power draft resolution are championing a wrong cause. Instead of supporting the implementation of the principles of the Charter, they defend the old, obsolete cause of colonialism.

Mr. Belaunde has often made eloquent speeches in defence of the various principles of the Charter. Today, however, his voice was silent on that score. On the contrary, he spoke in defence of an omission of a fundamental principle of the Charter. He has squandered his eloquence in this cause, and we would be more glad to hear him defend the principles of the Charter and, more particularly, the application of the principle of the right of self-determination to the Algerian people.

(Mr. Sobolev, USSR)

The fundamental difference between the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.195 and the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.194 is the omission in the former of the principle of the right of self-determination as applicable to the Algerian people. Let us record, therefore, that Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Italy, Peru and Spain consider that the principle of self-determination is not applicable to the Algerian people.

The second difference between the two draft resolutions is that the draft resolution sponsored by the seventeen Powers contains a paragraph calling for negotiations for the purpose of arriving a solution in accordance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter. What wrong can be seen in that? What can be unacceptable in such a paragraph? Is it at variance with the principles of the Charter? It is not. It goes without saying that any peaceful solution of any dispute or of any situation can be found only through negotiations. How else could it be found? If there are no negotiations, then there is force.

The authors of the seven-Power draft resolution do not include negotiations as one of the possible methods for the solution of the Algerian question. Since they do not include negotiations, they must be opposed to negotiations as a means of settling the Algerian question. Therefore, they are in favour of settling the Algerian question by means of force, and this seems to follow quite clearly from one of the points of the draft resolution, which states that French legislative measures will form one of the means of solving this problem. In other words, the Algerian people are to be handed over to the French colonial armed forces.

Thus, the principle of negotiations is not accepted by the authors of the draft resolution. One may ask why. Mr. Belaunde told us that it was difficult to imagine another party to the possible negotiations, but I would say that that is rather a peculiar argument when war is being waged, when guns and cannons are being fired. It is easy in such a case to ascertain who are the two parties. On the one hand, there is the French authority, on the other hand, the Algerian people. Thus, in the case of war, the two parties are clearly represented, but when it comes to the question of negotiations,

(Mr. Sobolev, USSR)

Mr. Belaunde declares that it is rather difficult to find out who would be the second party. This is not so, the party to the negotiations would be the people of Algeria who have arisen in arms against France. The second party to the negotiations is very easily found, indeed, it would be very difficult not to find them. The fact that the principle of negotiations is omitted in the seven-Power draft resolution means that the sponsors reject the principle of negotiations for a solution of the Algerian question.

I presume that the First Committee will draw the correct conclusions from this comparison of the two draft resolutions. The adoption of the draft resolution sponsored by Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Italy, Peru and Spain would be a betrayal of the Algerian people. Its adoption would be tantamount to handing them over to the French armed forces, and this handing over would be carried out with the connivance of the General Assembly, a course of action on which the General Assembly cannot and must not embark. The only way for the General Assembly is to reject the seven-Power draft resolution.

Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): I did not believe that I would see myself forced to reply to the statement directly made against me by the Soviet representative, but I must answer him and tell that I have not used an eloquence, of which I am not master, but I have used an honest and sincere emotion in my defence of the draft resolution. When it is a question of bringing together differing points of view, of trying to find a common denominator, and of trying to find common ground acceptable to all parties, it is obvious that we must try to avoid those terms upon which different interpretations can be placed. We must mention the general principles that we know commit us all.

(Mr. BELaunde, Peru)

I have defended and shall always defend the Charter. Without being vainglorious, I can say that within the limited possibilities of my powers, in the ten years that I have been in the United Nations, I have endeavoured closely and profoundly to study the Charter and defend its application. In point of fact -- and the representative of the Soviet Union must be aware of this -- the resolution submitted to the General Assembly last year was lucky enough to gather the unanimity of the Assembly because we included the words "in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations". All the principles. We singled out none. All the principles, as applied by the United Nations. All the principles, as studied in the different analyses made of the Charter. All the principles, as they fall within the purview of the United Nations -- especially in the resolutions of the General Assembly.

But if we are to draft a resolution that is to offend no one, if we are to draft a resolution that will awaken doubts and reservations on the part of no one, then we could not include the principle of self-determination -- despite the fact that we firmly adhere to that principle -- because there are different interpretations of it.

Mr. Sobolev, I appreciate and admire your intelligence and your courtesy. But do not force me to make a lengthy statement on what self-determination means.

Self-determination is useful for the integration of a State. Can it serve to disintegrate a constituted State? Oh, no -- too much of a problem for international law for us to do here. Is self-determination to be applied in the Newtonian way to all individuals, or is it to be applied to the ideological collectivity set up by history, to those human groups consolidated by geography and by tradition? No -- too big a problem for us to solve here.

Does Mr. Sobolev want us, here and now, to give up our positions as representatives -- in my case, as representative of Peru -- to turn back and become the old and tired teacher of international culture, and that I subject this Assembly, already over-tired from too much meditation and from listening to too many speeches, and now start to develop the tremendous item of the contradictory problems and principles of Suarez and Rousseau, the contradiction of the plebiscites and the tremendous number of interpretations given the plebiscites when applied to different populations and humanity?

(Mr. Belaunde, Peru)

I cannot abuse the tolerance, or even the patience, of this Assembly. No, we would be going into too dangerous a field. We know that there is a principle of self-determination. We know that in that principle of self-determination there are certain scales, certain stages, certain steps, that begin by the small entities, that conglomerate gradually and then become greater and greater and then become the crown of self-determination.

But am I to draw a historical recital here? Mr. Sobolev, please -- I cannot change the channel of the United Nations. It has a certain path along which it has to go. I am not going to turn it into an agitated academy on public law.

If this term is used in a different way by different persons, how, then, are we to use it in a resolution, in a resolution that we want to see adopted unanimously? We want everyone to be in favour of it, because there is a moment when neither the left nor the right can stand here. There can be no geographical difference -- no dissidence. We are human beings here. We have a human attitude. We have a desire, a hunger, for justice; we have an avidity for concord, for understanding. Because of that hunger, that avidity, that thirst, we must leave aside those terms that can give rise to different and difficult interpretations.

Do we exclude negotiations? No, we do not exclude them. We do not mention them, because to mention them at this moment would give rise to another controversy.

Immediately we are going to be asked: Who is the valid, acceptable, accredited negotiator? Negotiation implies the recognition of a personality. Recognition of a personality presupposes the recognition of belligerency. The recognition of belligerency requires three preconditions in accordance with international law, which has been legislated, which has been codified, by the Institute of International Law -- and then we go into a long and very serious discussion, once again, of public law.

No, we do not exclude them. Simply because we do not mention self-determination, are we excluding it? Not at all, not at all. Self-determination, in due course will rise. Negotiations, in due course, will occur. But let us

(Mr. Belaunde, Peru)

not put in these two words which, at this moment, can give rise to contradictory interpretations. That was the spirit which prompted us not to put these in. Our silence, our omission, is not exclusion.

These are expressions of a dogmatic point of view, a narrow-minded attitude. What we want to do is to bring people together. What we want to do is to link people. What we want is a unanimous vote on the part of the Assembly.

I know full well, Mr. Sobolev, that you feel as I do -- that you want peace, as I want peace. You, Mr. Sobolev, know -- as I do -- that peace is not an ideal. It is a vital need, an urgent requirement, that can no longer be postponed. A solution of hope is required now on the question of Algeria. That can be the principle upon which peace for humanity can be built.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Before calling on the next speaker, I should like to point out that it is worthwhile to remember from time to time that we are discussing the draft resolutions which are before the Committee. I would therefore urge my colleagues, with all due respect, to confine themselves to the draft resolutions and not to dwell at too great length on the other very important aspects of the question which -- although I grant that they are important -- have already been discussed at length during the general debate. In other words, the discussion of the draft resolutions should not lead to a repetition of the general debate.

Mr. de LEQUERICA (Spain)(interpretation from Spanish): I have an extremely brief observation to make. The representative of the Soviet Union has just said that to vote in favour of the seven-Power draft resolution which my delegation has had the honour to co-sponsor would be tantamount to voting to incite the French troops to continue killing people in Algeria. The draft resolution that we have submitted is identical, in its operative part, with that adopted last year by the General Assembly. Among those voting for that resolution last year, I believe, was the Soviet Union. I should merely like to ask: Did the Soviet Union vote that way, knowing something that we did not know, or was it voting to incite and encourage the French troops to kill the nationalists of Algeria? We were not voting for that.

Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I only wish to give one brief word of explanation. The Soviet delegation did vote in favour of the resolution which was adopted unanimously by the Assembly last year. This is quite correct. But I should like to recall that in that resolution there was no paragraph similar to that contained in the present text of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.195), which "Takes note of the attempts to settle the problem both through the good offices of Heads of State and French legislative measures".

The method of mediation, of recourse to the good offices of Heads of State, is one which I welcome. It is a normal method for negotiation. Unfortunately, the method of negotiating is absent from the draft resolution altogether. Therefore, I assume that this clause is merely a smokescreen. Since there are no negotiations contemplated, there can be no mediation. The reference to the possible mediation through the good offices of Heads of State is merely a camouflage.

Then we find the nucleus of the proposal: the attempts to settle the problem through French legislative measures. What does this mean? It means a continuation of the situation which at present obtains in Algeria. This phrase was absent from the resolution of last year, Mr. de Lequerica. On the contrary, we voted in favour of the expression of hope by the General Assembly that a peaceful, democratic and just solution would be found in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

I take it that it is no secret that we are facing at this session of the Assembly the same situation which prevailed before last year's resolution was adopted. We again express the hope that a just solution will be found. The difference between us, however, is that we believe that this just solution can be found through negotiations. You do not believe this, and therein lies our difference.

Mr. de MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation, which co-sponsored the draft resolution before the Committee, would like to reserve its right to speak tomorrow in order to express then the reason why we decided to co-sponsor this draft. But I should like to anticipate some of the principle aspects of the debate, especially taking into account some of the arguments adduced, in particular those of the representative of the Soviet Union, for whom I have the greatest respect.

(Mr. de Marchena, Dominican Republic)

I shall stress these arguments now so that other delegations which more or less share the views so brilliantly expressed by the representatives of Argentina and Peru can be given a chance to ponder not only the arguments raised against this draft resolution, but the precise accusations, as well as the veiled accusations which have been levelled against it and the motives of its co-sponsors.

We are told that we are distorting the situation in Algeria. We are told that the co-sponsors think exactly as the French delegation. We have been told that our words and our terms are not conducive to an easy solution to the problem, but rather to the worsening of the situation. It has been prophesied that there will be no chance of a unanimous vote on the draft resolution. Furthermore, we are accused of supporting the cause of colonialism. We are accused of not deferring to the principle of self-determination because the latter is not included in our draft in any aspect. We are accused further of being partisans of the use of force in Algeria, with the tragic results which the representative of the Soviet Union so brilliantly outlined. We are accused of camouflaging the principle of negotiation and of being traitors to the United Nations and its principles.

With all the fervor which habitually supports the sincerity of our statements, I can say that the delegation of the Dominican Republic is completely and categorically against the ideas that have been put forward regarding our draft resolution, and we hope that the Chairman will allow us tomorrow to rebut each and every one of those arguments adduced against it.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I take note of the last statement of the representative of the Dominican Republic, and I avail myself of this opportunity to note also that he seems to agree with me as to the advisability of holding a meeting tomorrow morning. I believe that there will be a sufficient number of speakers on our list tomorrow morning before a vote is taken, which will probably be in the afternoon.

Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran) (interpretation from French): I realize that after this flood of eloquence, my sober statement may strike but a poor note, but I should like to say a few words regarding the draft resolution of what I might call the Latin Powers.

If I make a suggestion now it is in order to give them time to reflect upon it. I speak, of course, first of all, to the authors of the draft resolution.

First, I should like to pay tribute to the intentions which impelled them to submit this draft. I am sure that what they seek is a unanimous agreement. I wonder, then, whether it will not be wiser on their part either to withdraw their draft resolution or not to press it to a vote, but to keep it in reserve for the plenary session if need arises. I shall explain why I make this suggestion.

We often have in mind matters which we do not venture to bring up openly before the Committee, but I shall speak frankly. If the authors press their draft resolution to a vote in the present situation they will compel those who have sponsored another draft to vote against theirs. On the other hand, if a vote were taken on the first draft, and if the draft of the seven Powers were submitted to the plenary session rather than to the First Committee, it might perhaps command a wider measure of support, provided it is somewhat amended, and might even command unanimity.

I have taken the liberty of making this suggestion. I do not expect a reply at once, but I should like to give the authors time to reflect upon my proposal.

Mr. ST. LOT (Haiti) (interpretation from French): What I was about to say is on the lines of the suggestion made by the representative of Iran.

We have two draft resolutions before us. Discussion of the substance of these texts has been deferred until tomorrow, but the delegation of Haiti, which would have liked to proceed hand in hand with its Latin American brothers, wishes to call the attention of the sponsors of their draft resolution to a contradiction which has been stressed already by the representative of Morocco and which, apparently, did not come to the minds of the authors.

The draft resolution as it stands does not make for any progress in this question. It merely reaffirms the antagonism and opposition which we are facing and which are tantamount to an actual deadlock since, when the draft resolution speaks of taking note of the attempts to settle the problem both through the good offices

(Mr. St. Lot, Haiti)

of Heads of State and French legislative measures, it is only reaffirming the contradiction which we have to cope with. There have been offers of good offices, but they have not been accepted by the French Government. There have been French legislative measures, but they are not accepted by the other party. Therefore, these seven Powers are stressing an antagonism by this clause and, should this draft resolution be adopted, the question, I think, would not have progressed at all. What we seem to lose sight of is the scope and significance of the statements made here in this Committee.

The delegation of Haiti believes that there might be an inceptive agreement here; for France -- and we must pay tribute to this position of France -- did not question the right of self-determination as some of its friends attempted to do.

(Mr. St. Lot, Haiti)

We have heard the strangest views about this principle of self-determination. Some people want to present it as an innovation of the San Francisco Charter; actually it is a principle which Wilson formulated in 1917 which was embodied in the Versailles Treaty and later in the San Francisco Charter. This principle of self-determination in the minds of those who formulated it was a condemnation of the policy of the fifteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries based on brutal annexation. Experience has shown that it is this policy of annexation -- which reached its climax in the Berlin Congress of 1872 -- that led to the brutal seizure of Bosnia and Herzegovina from which the Sarajevo tragedy sprung which was the cause of the War of 1914. Experience had shown to statesmen that this policy of annexation which was a premium on the use of brutal force should be replaced by a concept more in harmony with the principles of justice.

Thus the principle of self-determination was formulated in the Versailles Treaty, first in 1917, when Wilson proclaimed his fourteen points; in other words, the people should be consulted and not only in order to determine their internal organization, a point to which my colleague from Argentina would like to limit the right to self-determination; however, if the right of self-determination only applies to the internal organization, it would duplicate a principle of public law that we all know: national sovereignty is based on the universality of the citizens. This principle confirms the right of a country to choose its own form of government but not self-determination. Self-determination, as proclaimed in the Versailles Treaty, and as repeated in the San Francisco Charter, aimed at condemning the brutal annexation practised by all Powers from the beginning of the fifteenth century through which colonialism was established, and to recognize the right of human communities to decide their own destinies.

You know that this principle in being implemented went so far when the United States delegation advocated that Alsace-Lorraine should hold a plebiscite before returning to France. It was only at the last moment that France was able to return the status of Alsace-Lorraine to its former position. This principle was also employed in determining the fate of the Saar.

We have heard many attempts at giving juridical interpretations. We have even heard discussions of philosophy but what we did not hear was a study of the historical background of this principle of self-determination in the general flow of history. This would have shown how important an initiative it was, how great

(Mr. St. Lot, Haiti)

a departure it was in international moral law. This international moral law is changed not only by such great physical events as the discovery of America, and the two world wars which broke out in the world through the constant change of religions. But this system of international morals changes. Let us recall, for instance, the difficulties of the Japanese delegation when it tried to include, in the preamble to the Versailles Treaty a mere reference to equality of races. You see now in every international treaty recently signed a recognition of that principle of equality of all human races. This is a new conquest of universal morals, of universal history.

What we charge this draft resolution with is not making the question advance at all. The draft resolution of the seven Powers merely reaffirms the position which the Assembly took in February last. By proclaiming the principle of self-determination, on the other hand, the General Assembly would officially proclaim its collective will to call a halt to the bloody war waging in Algeria between two peoples which have many links connecting them, people who are still killing each other in a stupid conflict. Furthermore, the French delegation accepts the principle of self-determination, and it says that it should apply in a democratic manner. In other words, the Algerian people should be consulted with all the guarantees for necessary independence, without the pressure of any terroristic threat. The Algerians, for their part, ask for the elimination of any threat which might be inherent in the presence of the French army.

Since the two schools of thought are so close to each other, I do not know whether I misconstrue the views of the representative of France, the Minister for Foreign Affairs. I listened to his statement in French, and I believe I am right in my interpretation. But it seemed to me that he said that France merely asks, for a full and unconditional application of the principle of self-determination. If France accepts this view and if the Algerians and those who represent them merely ask for the application of this same principle, why then should the First Committee not establish a committee of good offices? Why should we reject the tender of good offices of His Majesty, the King of Morocco and His Excellency, the President of Tunisia? We have been told that they might not be neutral enough, but we might find within our Organization countries which would offer the necessary guarantees of impartiality and neutrality. This committee of good offices of the United Nations would then attempt to find the necessary moral and physical

(Mr. St. Low, Haiti)

prerequisites for a free expression of the will of the Algerian people. They will take a stand either in favour of maintaining the present status of Algeria or in favour of full and total independence or in favour of self-government within the framework of the French Union. Thus, we would have complied with the most sacred foundations of our Charter. We would have respected the right of self-determination. We would have also shown respect for the desires of the French people and Government. We would have respected the will and desires of the Algerian people also since we would have told the Algerian people that the source of the authority of our Organization lies in the Charter and that we could not do anything which would be at variance with it.

Here is the idea which I put forward so that larger and more powerful countries than mine may consider it and sleep on it; then they can come back tomorrow with a truly concrete solution, a constructive proposal which would take the question forward and which would not condemn us to this immobility which is about to cast a shadow on the prestige of our Organization by adopting resolutions lacking in resolve. These spineless resolutions command unanimity because they satisfy everybody except the imperatives of our Charter.

Mr. NAJIB-ULLAH (Afghanistan): With all respect to the views which were expressed by my colleagues who supported our draft resolution and who supported the seven-Power draft resolution, I take the liberty of clarifying the points contained in our draft resolution and to clarify it from our understanding of them. We have noted the discussions of the Algerian problem in this Committee and it is a fact.

(Mr. Najib-Ullah,
Afghanistan)

We recalled the resolution of 15 February 1957, and I do not think there is any harm in recalling that resolution. I regretted that the hope expressed in that resolution has not yet been realized. We did not condemn any side in the text of our draft resolution, or mention why that hope has not yet been realized.

We recognized that the principle of self-determination is applicable to the Algerian people. This recognition is on the basis of the Charter and all the democratic principles which France also recognizes. We noted the situation in Algeria which continues to cause suffering and loss of human life. This condition has been repeatedly described by the French representatives, as well as by Arab representatives.

The only thing which we proposed, for the sake of arriving at a solution, is negotiation. We specified, in that case also, that we expect a solution in accordance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter, and as we understand it, the Charter is respected as much by France as by the Arab States.

After these clarifications of the seventeen-Power draft resolution, I am wondering why the sense of moderation and conciliation in this draft has not been fully appreciated by some of our fellow representatives. As my delegation is one of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution, I would like to explain clearly that our aim in joining our other friends is nothing but conciliation and a just settlement of the problem between our French and Algerian friends. There is nothing extremist in this draft resolution and we expect the resolution to be adopted by this Assembly.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.