

UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



LIMITED
A/C.1/PV.831
4 February 1957
ENGLISH

Eleventh Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHT HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIRST MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 4 February 1957, at 3 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. BELAUNDE

(Peru)

Question of Algeria [62] (continued)

Statements were made in the general debate on the item by:

Mr. Pineau

(France)

Mr. Zeineddine

(Syria)

Note:

The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol A/C.1/SR.831. Delegations may submit corrections to the summary record for incorporation in the final version which will appear in a printed volume.

57-04187

QUESTION OF ALGERIA (A/3197)/Agenda item 62/(continued)

Mr. PINEAU (France) (interpretation from French): In view of the impossibility, so far, of obtaining the "cease fire" which we have sought, and still seek, it has been necessary to face up to the situation created by the rebellion and to take the necessary military measures for the maintenance of order and the protection of persons and property. France could quickly have put an end to the conflict. The contention that France has not been able with 400,000 men to put an end to a rebellion conducted by a few thousand rebels lends support to the thesis of pacification. If we had wanted -- as some people accuse us of doing -- to destroy the Algerian population, to engage in out-and-out genocide, we should have needed far less than 400,000 men in Algeria; a few planes and some modern military equipment would have sufficed. But we wanted to use the opposite method, by coming to grips with the combattants alone and by ensuring the protection of the French Moslems who do not wish to take part in the conflict.

Our policy of pacification has been defined several times by the President of the Council and the Minister Residing in Algeria. What are the aims of that policy? They are, essentially, to free the Algerians from the terror to which they are subjected, to bring closer together two communities that are destined to live side by side, and to increase their common trust in metropolitan France. This action, consistent with French traditions, will prepare the concrete conditions for a political settlement.

I could not give the Committee any better proof of this than to cite the work accomplished by the special administrative sectors set up in the countryside. Under the command of officers devoted to their task, they are responsible, in the most remote regions, not only for maintaining order but also for providing education, combatting disease, improving a standard of living which is threatened by the rebellion, and in a general way co-operating in mutual trust with the populations which need help, protection and encouragement.

To demonstrate the frame of mind which inspired the French Government, I should like to give the Committee a few particulars on the directives the Government issued concerning the role of the army and its contacts with the Moslem population. I quote from a statement by the Minister Residing in Algeria:

(Mr. Pineau, France)

"Our mission is to re-establish order and peace, not against the Moslem population, but for and with it.

"What is the army's role in this policy of co-operation? I do not intend to repeat here the orders issued to you at my request by your commanding officers, but, there again, I consider your role of paramount importance, for you can advise and encourage these new institutions and give them the necessary protection.

"In the discussions to be opened with the local leaders, the army, because of the prestige it has succeeded in maintaining, must take its part alongside the administration and, when necessary, in its place. I shall outline, in the days to come, what specific measures I am planning to promote so that each man, within the limits of the responsibility I shall assign him, will know exactly what he has to do.

"I know that everything is asked of you today: to protect the people, to care for them, to teach them, to provide them with work, and at times to act as their administrators. I now urge you to help them in their local politics since, in this strange type of conflict, psychological and political action must go hand in hand with military action.

"Finally, it is advisable that there be no slackening of the effort made this year on behalf of agriculture. You must use every possible means of encouraging the planting of future crops."

(Mr. Pineau, France)

On the question of contacts with the Moslem population, I shall again quote, with apologies for such a lengthy quotation:

"The Moslem population, withdrawn and inaccessible in the cities, deeply hurt and unhappy in the countryside, terrorized everywhere, often find it impossible to take the first step toward a rapprochement with the community of French descent. The French population must therefore approach the Moslem.

"Henceforth, and wherever the Army is present, a systematic effort must be made to establish this contact at all echelons and by every possible means. Perhaps in certain regions it would even be advisable to make it a form of duty for the two French communities to meet.

"I should like -- wherever there is a regiment -- to see individual and human contact being sought with the French-Moslems, especially with war veterans."

Those are the texts. They show that it is indeed pacification which is our aim, and not a war of reconquest and extermination.

Although our adversaries cannot question the terms employed by the Minister Residing in Algeria in the instructions he issued, they accuse the French Army of not having applied these directives and of indulging in numerous excesses. The absolutely fantastic documents which have been published to that effect compel me to give the Committee a certain number of details.

The Minister Residing in Algeria ordered the troops to conduct themselves humanely and to avoid reprisals. A controlled body was set up, as well as mixed commissions of inquiry composed of high public officials and high-ranking officers. All guarantees were thus taken to avoid exactions similar to those practised on a wide scale by the rebels, on the orders of their local or foreign leaders.

It is obvious that the very excesses of the rebellion and the atrocious cruelty of certain methods, that the very circumstances of the battle fought by our troops were liable to entail a certain amount of undue repression. It is to France's honour that it has succeeded in avoiding this as much as possible.

(Mr. Pineau, France)

Let us look at some of the accusations. One concerns police brutalities, namely, the alleged mistreatment of Communists arrested at the end of September in Oran. Yet, after a thorough investigation, all the persons questioned denied having been tortured, as their defenders claimed. No suspicious marks were found on them; on the other hand, the prisoners incarcerated in other prisons and questioned at the same time as those in Oran all stated that they were being treated properly. Following this affair, a parliamentary commission of investigation went to Algeria, and we know that the report it will present will in no way contradict the findings of the administrative investigation.

We have also been criticized for the arbitrary arrest of Algerian labour unionists; yet none of them has ever been arrested for his labour union activities. Some, of course, may have been imprisoned for their overt participation in the rebellion.

But the major attacks are directed against the behaviour of our troops. Fantastic legends have been circulated on this subject, which the rebels sanction and which their accomplices readily repeat everywhere.

It is impossible for me to answer each of these fantastic stories one by one. Nevertheless, in order to give a specific example of the kind of lies being spread, I am going to analyze the memorandum recently filed by the National Algerian Movement, denouncing the crimes against Algeria and accusing France of genocide. Nine different affairs are mentioned in it.

(1) On 10 May 1956, in Rivet, we allegedly massacred Moslems. What exactly happened? A baker, Mr. Juan, had just been murdered and an attack had been made against the ambulance which was taking him to the hospital. The local territorial unit counter-attacked, killing seven of the assailants.

(2) In Constantine, during the night of 29-30 March, twenty hostages were supposedly killed following the murder of a police commissioner. Here is the truth. After the murder of the police commissioner, Mr. San Marcelli, a raid was organized. Five suspects summoned for questioning attempted to flee. They were killed by soldiers in charge of the security cordon. In addition, taking advantage of mechanical failure in the vehicle transporting them, eight suspects, bearing arms, tried to disarm their guards and flee. They were killed by the escort detachment. There were thirteen dead in all. In no cases were hostages involved.

(Mr. Pineau, France)

(3) An "affair" supposedly occurred in Toudja on 17 February 1956. Yet our inquiry shows that no operation was carried out on that date in that region.

(4) On 4 March 1956, 300 Moslems were allegedly massacred in Tébessa, if one believes the National Algerian Movement and Mr. Ferhat Abbas, who spread this legend during his lecture tour in South America. Here are the facts. On 4 March 1956, First Sergeant Walther was killed by two shots in the back fired by unknown assailants. A patrol then opened fire on two men who were fleeing and who, when challenged, did not answer the usual questions. The population was then panic-stricken, and overturned gas stoves caused a fire to break out in the covered market. There were three dead in all, one of whom was a Frenchman, and the other two, rebels. A few hundred had to be added solely for propaganda purposes.

It must be noted, in addition, that the French Administration investigated the complaints lodged by the shopkeepers who were victims of the fire, with a view to compensating them for their losses.

(Mr. Pineau, France)

(5) On 22 March 1956, still according to the memorandum of the MNA, Palestro was supposedly hit by napalm bombs. Now no operation was ever reported on that date and napalm has never been used during the operations. The only incident to be noted during that period is the arrest on 30 March 1956 for identification purposes of forty-seven persons, who were in no way mistreated. This story, therefore, is a pure figment of the imagination.

(6) During the night of 21-22 March, a hundred persons were allegedly massacred in Kroubs. The truth is as follows: the village in question was attacked on that day by rebels armed with automatic weapons. Following the intervention of our troops, forty-three rebels were killed and forty-three rifles recovered. But the civilian population was not harmed.

(7) On 28 March 1956, the bombing of the Collo region during a combined operation supposedly claimed 900 victims. The exact figures are fourteen rebels killed and sixty-five suspects arrested.

(8) On 30 March 1956, suspects were allegedly rounded up in the Lake Fetzara region and two villages destroyed. An operation actually was carried out in that region, but resulted only in the death of twenty-two rebels and the recovery of twenty-two rifles. You will notice that the number of dead and the number of weapons recovered are the same.

(9) From 8-11 April reprisals were allegedly practiced in Djorf -- supposedly with napalm bombing and a toll of 300 victims -- and in Nedromah, where the toll was put at 192 victims.

Napalm bombs were not used in Djorf any more than in Palestro and no incident was recorded in Djorf on the dates indicated. A skirmish took place on 6 April, however, after which the rebels left twenty dead and one prisoner on the field. On our side, we lost fifteen men. Nor was there any incident in Nedromah between 8 and 11 April. But on 6 April one of our patrols was ambushed; after a hard fight, seven of our legionnaires were killed and five wounded.

These specific answers show to what extent the MNA, just as the FLN, will fabricate stories.

(Mr. Pineau, France)

was attended by rather unfortunate publicity, which obliged the French Government to react; it did so by deciding to suspend the negotiations under way with Morocco.

This is the very moment the five rebel leaders chose to continue their journey to Tunis. What was the attitude of French military authorities at the time? The rebellion was raging in Algeria, where it was bringing death and destruction. Its leaders were conspiring abroad and most of them were being sought by French justice for crimes under the common law.

The military authorities quite naturally ordered the DC-3 which was taking the five rebel leaders to Tunis to land; the passengers were arrested and then imprisoned before being taken to France, where they are at the present time.

Since that incident, the Moroccan and French Governments have agreed to submit the matter to a commission of conciliation and inquiry which will decide whether a wrong was committed against the Sherifian Transportation Company, but which will obviously have no jurisdiction with regard to the fate of the five rebels, four of whom have been convicted for serious offenses.

Since the matter has been submitted to arbitration, the affair need not be discussed here, but I am anxious nevertheless to give you a few explanations.

Of course, there was never any question of derogating from the authority of the Sultan of Morocco. The matter concerned the military authorities and French justice, on one hand, and five French Moslems, on the other. The boarding of the airplane raised a question from the standpoint of international law. But it has been recognized that the plane was of French registry, belonged to a Sherifian company owned largely by French stockholders, and had a French crew on board. On the day it was boarded, it was operating under the jurisdiction of the civil aviation services of Morocco. These services had not been transferred, and the Protocol of 11 February 1956 reserved them expressly to the authority of the French Minister of Public Works. In addition, the five rebel leaders were carrying false identity papers as well as arms, which made them guilty of a violation of article 28 of the Civil and Commercial Aviation Code, and that alone justified diverting the plane from its course.

For these reasons, France had the right to order the plane to land in Algiers, and it was the duty of the French crew to obey the orders of the Power to which it was responsible. Finally, and I repeat this, four of the five rebels had been convicted of serious offenses. Mr. Ben Bella, in particular, had been condemned to forced labour for life by the "Cour d'Assises" in Oran for an armed attack on the Oran post office in 1949, an attack which was more an act of gangsterism than the act of a combatant.

In these circumstances, it is difficult to see how we could have failed to take the opportunity to apprehend persons under our jurisdiction sought or

condemned by our courts -- and, despite their crimes and offenses, we deal with these persons very humanely. This arrest, in fact, made it possible to seize important documents concerning the organization of the National Liberation-Front and the foreign aid from which the rebels are benefitting. We thus obtained additional proof of the veritable plot fomented from abroad against France.

Out of respect for the United Nations, I wanted to lay bare the tissue of lies and explain our attitudes and our reflexes. I must now compare our action with that which was being carried out at the very same time by the armed bands of the Algerian rebellion.

It will be interesting for the Members of the United Nations to compare the conduct of our troops with the criminal course of action systematically followed by the terrorist bands. Perhaps we have not, up until the present, sufficiently publicized this action; we ask you to understand the reason for our hesitation. In contrast to those on the opposite side, we do not wish, by divulging certain facts, to widen the breach which some are seeking to create between the French of European origin and the French of Moslem origin.

We are not among those who enjoy exploiting the dead. Nevertheless, we are now compelled to bring to light a few matters which unfortunately are very revealing. Ever since the beginning of the rebellion, crimes of abominable sadism have been perpetrated in the various regions of Algeria, in most cases against French Moslems. Now that the rebels have not the slightest hope of obtaining military success, they are adding to their previous odious acts the daily practice of terrorist attacks, to which, as I reminded you above, the Communists are giving such willing support.

Although the civilian population has most often been the victim of rebel fanaticism, many incidents may be cited of crimes committed against the military which are by no means consonant with the rules of fair play. The Army termed the "Army of National Liberation" thus received instructions not to take prisoners but to execute the men of the French Army who fell into their hands. Why should we be surprised, therefore, by the execution, on 18 April 1956, of six French soldiers led by Sergeant Dehemmia, who were shot near Tablat after being stripped of their arms and their clothing; or the assassination by throat-slitting, in the Palestro

military region, of nineteen soldiers; or the assassination, on 30 March 1956, of the military doctor of the Sidi-Djallali specialized administrative section; or the assassination, on 12 June 1956, of Lieutenant Geoffroy and his wife, at Ain-Rich?

In addition to these cruelly perpetrated crimes, there have been formal violations of universally recognized rules: attacks on ambulances of the military medical corps, illegal wearing of uniforms for the performance of heinous crimes. I do not know whether such methods are considered heroic in the so-called Army of National Liberation. For us, heroism cannot be conceived apart from honour.

But the principal victims of fanaticism have been and remain the Moslems who are loyal to France or who do not obey the rebel orders with sufficient alacrity. In this connexion, we have decisive proof: figures, photographic documents and inculpatory exhibits coming from the guilty themselves.

The White Book published in February 1956 has already given the testimony of a certain number of them and revealed the atrocity of the crimes committed. This book contains photographs of numerous Moslems, with their throats slashed, or others who have escaped death by a miracle but who carry on their faces forever the marks of the hideous mutilations they have undergone.

An issue of the Presse Medicale of 27 June 1956, devoted to the efforts of French science to give these victims of barbarity some semblance of a human face, is particularly instructive. It contains pictures of Moslems whose eyes have been gouged out, ears torn off, or noses severed, and who often had committed no crime other than smoking or drinking in violation of the orders of the rebellion.

Those who will defend the rebel cause here cannot deny the accuracy of our accusations, for the tracts of the National Liberation Front in themselves constitute exhibits which cannot be challenged. Here are a few samples:

(1) Communiqué of the Algerian Committee of Liberation of 1 March 1956:

"The Army of Liberation will no longer pay any attention to the laws of war in the all-out campaign against the French."

(2) Document seized in Tebessa:

"Never take prisoners, kill them on the spot."

(3) Tract of the Army of National Liberation:

"Follow the policy of scorched earth and bloodshed. Don't stop to pity or investigate. Slaughter those who have betrayed you. You are the

HA/gd

A/C.1/PV.831
14-15

(Mr. Pineau, France)

soldiers of the Merciful God. Do not act like the army of De Gaulle, Juin, Bourguiba or Salah Ben Youssef, nor of Messali Hadj, Allal el Fassi, nor of Mohammed V. On the contrary, be the Army of God for the unity of the Arabs."

As food for your thought, I also want to quote the judgements passed on the National Liberation Front by Benam Messaoud, called Si Antar, Political Commissar of the Aumale-Ghardaia zone, who voluntarily gave himself up to the French in November 1956. This is what he said:

"My men were not content with attacking the French troops. Their role also consisted in seeing that the orders of the National Liberation Front were respected and in punishing traitors.

"The orders of the National Liberation Front are categorical. They consist mainly in prohibiting smoking and drinking.

"An Algerian who is caught smoking has his nose cut off. If he is found drunk, his head is cut off. I know that my men often administer this summary justice

"With regard to the execution of traitors, I remember one day when I had given an order to have the village of Souk-Had searched for the custodian of the Town Hall and another individual... I had told my men that these two men were to die. But I thought they would bring them to me and that they would then be executed. But my men found only the custodian of the Town Hall, whose throat they cut at the side of the road; I was told that as they were having difficulty in accomplishing their purpose, they finally chopped off his head with a hatchet."

Finally, we must add to the crimes against the Army and the French Moslems, those which were committed against Europeans. I shall single out the day of 20 August 1955, during which 123 persons were massacred under atrocious circumstances. At El Halia, thirty-four Europeans were butchered and mutilated, ten of the victims being little boys and girls less than fifteen years old.

This is a perfect example of genocide -- is it not? -- for these murders were committed on the basis of the ethnic and religious groups to which the victims belonged.

Let us add to the assassination of the Cruet family on 16 June 1956, that of Mr. Sales, employed in the Ain-Barbar mines. Both of these crimes were carried out in a manner which respect for this Committee prevents me from describing in detail.

There are many other examples, but, for a number of months, as I have just pointed out, Communist influence has turned towards terrorism in the cities. Let me mention some of these attacks: those in the cafeteria on the Rue Michelet and in the milk bar, Place Bugeaud in Algiers, on 30 September 1956, which claimed

MW/grs

A/C.1/FV.831

19-20

(Mr. Pineau, France)

speculation, but it proves that the initial and basic factor which will decide the French to clear out is an atmosphere of constant terror... Kill them unmercifully! Wipe them all out! Kill them!"

In the same spirit, an Egyptian religious leader, Sheikh Bakouri, stated 22 November last over the "Voice of the Arabs":

"It is our duty to feel cruel hatred toward them -- "them" of course means us, the French -- "and to bequeath it to our descendents just as we bequeathed to them our property and our glories. Hate is the first feeling of nations and leads to the enlightenment of the peoples."

What are some countries, where irritation is at a peak, waiting for to ask that such a principle be inscribed in the Charter of the United Nations?

It is easy to imagine the influence exercised by such exhortations, tirelessly repeated over a period of years. The Cairo radio also issued communiqués -- inaccurate of course -- announcing the bombing of Algiers by the Air Force. It is true that at the same time it announced the torpedoing off Port Said of two units of the French fleet which, fortunately, are in excellent shape.

Egypt and those of the Arab States which follow its example are the instigators of the terrorist movement, and it is from Cairo that the rebellion was given impetus.

In February 1955 one Hamadi el Riffi, a second lieutenant who had graduated from the military school in Baghdad and who was sent by the special services of the Egyptian army, was taken prisoner in Algeria. A certain number of men on special missions of this kind have been captured since then.

The training of terrorist cadres began in 1953 in Egypt under the supervision of the Minister of Public Education, Major Hussein.

From that time on, all the young Algerians entering the University of El Azhar had to take military training courses. Their professors indoctrinated them to induce them to join the rebels. They were then sent for a few months to training camps where they were taught guerilla warfare, sabotage and the handling of explosives. When they completed this course, they were, and still are, sent to North Africa after being provided with forged French papers. Several hundred commandos are thought to have been trained in the camps of the Pyramides, Guiezeh, Inchass, Helouan, Ismailia, Zeitoun, Abbassiyé and Sidi Barrani on the Libyan border.

DR/mlw

A/C.1/PV.831
24-25

(Mr. Pineau, France)

The inspection then conducted by experts disclosed that some of these weapons -- rifles and automatic rifles -- had been manufactured in India after 1953 and that others were of British origin.

The latter had probably either been turned over at one time to the Egyptian army by our British friends, or had been stolen from camps in the Suez Canal zone.

(Mr. Pineau, France)

As regards Egyptian participation in the supply, loading and dispatching of arms, there is no doubt whatsoever. El Noyal stated during his hearing that shortly before the beginning of the rebellion, that is, towards the end of 1954, Ali Sabri, Director of Nasser's political staff and Chief of his Intelligence Service, had entrusted to Mohammed Hussein Khairy the task of drawing up an over-all plan on the shipment of arms, ammunition and military equipment to the rebels. Khairy secured for this purpose the assistance of El Noyal who later on was introduced to Major el Dib.

On 20 February 1955, the future owner of the Athos was instructed by Major el Dib to go to Suez and to board the yacht Dina. On 1 and 2 April, the Dina secretly unloaded 300 cases at Capo de Agua in the former Spanish zone of Morocco. On 22 April of the same year, in Madrid, El Noyal met with el Naggar, military Attaché of the Egyptian Embassy. In July 1955, he took part in another operation on board the Intissar which carried close to 1,000 cases of arms and ammunition. Another shipment effected under the same circumstances supplied the rebels with 600 additional cases of matériel. In December 1955, El Noyal opened a bank account in his own name in Switzerland, which was immediately credited with 80 million French francs. This account made it possible to pay for an order of arms bought by Egypt, estimated at \$80,000, and to purchase in England, for £18,000 sterling, the vessel which subsequently became the Athos.

On 22 September, Fathi el Dib summoned El Noyal and entrusted him with the task which we intercepted.

On 3 October, the Athos was loaded in the military port of Alexandria, at pier 30, in the prohibited area, where it had been brought by a pilot of the Egyptian army. Seven railroad cars were lined up at the pier. For four hours, 150 Egyptian soldiers in uniform were busy loading the vessel. At 4.30 a.m. the Athos pulled out towards the outer harbour and at 9 a.m. put out to sea. On board were the six passengers whom I have mentioned.

These men disclosed that they had just completed a period of training, one in an Egyptian military school for radio operators, the five others at the camp of Inchass, where they took courses in sabotage. Moreover, Fathi el Dib had given El Noyal instructions as to the contacts to be established with the emissaries from the Moroccan coast.

(Mr. Pineau, France)

All the foregoing evidence was corroborated by the arrest of Ben Bella, since in the account book of the National Liberation Front leader we found a listing of the sums remitted to these persons on behalf of the Egyptian secret services.

This clearly demonstrates that the Athos -- acquired by the Egyptian intelligence services for an Egyptian company, with a Sudanese acting as figurehead, and fitted by an Egyptian -- has engaged in smuggling arms, not only with the knowledge but also with the assistance of the Egyptian Government. Is this not a gross violation of Article 2 of the United Nations Charter?

The principle of the independence of States has also been violated inasmuch as Egypt, in assisting the rebels, infringes the sovereignty of France.

These are the facts. They are overwhelming, and the United Nations, unless it wants to apply two different standards depending on the interests involved, must condemn them most severely.

I do not feel that the interference of other Powers, towards which France maintains a policy of friendship, should be placed on the same level. These countries -- I have in mind Morocco and Tunisia -- readily affirm their solidarity with the Algerian rebels and frequently intervene in their favour. France can understand that a certain solidarity should be asserted, but she cannot admit either non-compliance with the terms of diplomatic agreements that have been signed with Tunisia and Morocco, or violation of the most obvious international rules.

There is ample evidence of this interference in the internal affairs of France. Our friendship cannot prevent us from confronting these two countries once more with their responsibilities. It is indecent that a strong organization with headquarters in Tunis should be able to supply the bands in the Constantine region and in Kabylia, or that Morocco should so frequently have backed the National Liberation Front.

We hope that Tunisia and Morocco will understand that they are not helping to restore peace by rekindling a vacillating rebellion and unnecessarily prolonging cruel combats. I repeat: it is natural, as Premier Guy Mollet has said, for Tunisia and Morocco to be interested in a quick solution of the Algerian drama. But certain speeches, and direct aid to the rebellion are incompatible with the very letter of the Charter and with the promises of friendship and co-operation which these nations have undertaken with regard to France.

(Mr. Pineau, France)

Our grievances against the rebels and their supporters, which we have just recalled, in no way impede our determination to arrive at a liberal political solution in Algeria. But it must be clear that the type of solution adopted in the cases of Tunisia and Morocco is not possible in Algeria.

Some foreign statesmen, no doubt anxious to help us, have formulated a plan, which according to them would take into account the interests of France: Algeria would become an independent State, like its two neighbours, and the French would enjoy, within the framework of this State, the rights they have legitimately acquired. This proposal does not take the real facts of the situation into account. In Algeria, two large communities live together on the same soil. The presence of 1,200,000 persons of European origin who take an active part in the political and economic life of the country creates a very special problem. It is ridiculous to contend that all these Europeans are wealthy settlers or colonialists. The vast majority of them are simple folk who earn their living honestly by hard work.

Last year, I had occasion to ask Mr. Nehru, Prime Minister of India, the following question which remained unanswered: "Do you think that you would have come to terms so easily with the British on the solution of independence that you sought had there been 47 million Englishmen in India?" For, taking into account the respective population figures, that is the exact ratio of the French of European origin in Algeria.

In the two former protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia, the French were certainly numerous and it was difficult to solve the problem of their status and of guarantees for their persons and their property. But they always considered themselves as living in a foreign land. In Algeria, on the other hand, the French, Spanish, Italians, Maltese and others settled in a land they made their own country. Most of them could no longer, if Algeria were to become independent, adapt themselves to the life of metropolitan France which, up to now, they have never directly shared.

In Morocco and Tunisia, we were confronted by an established political structure. In Morocco, a legal sovereign, the Sultan, enjoyed undisputed religious and political authority. Two political parties, the Istiqlal and

(Mr. Pineau, France)

the PDI were able to furnish competent civil service cadres and ministers. Finally, long before the protectorate, there existed a national consciousness. In Tunisia, the same phenomenon. A legal sovereign, the Bey: a political party, the Neo-Destour, whose leader, Mr. Bourguiba, had great authority among the people.

How would it be possible, in Algeria, to promote the same type of solution as in Morocco and Tunisia, when, if France were compelled to leave, we would be faced with a sort of political vacuum?

At the time when he advocated integration, Mr. Ferhat Abbas asserted that there never had been an Algerian nation. It is an incontestable historical fact that before the presence of the French no State had imposed its law on Algerian soil. What was then called the kingdom of Algeria consisted of a diminutive strip of land around the city proper, but even this could not give one the right to say that there had been an Algeria.

(Mr. Pineau, France)

If France were today to hand over its powers to the rebels, the latter would not only be incapable of governing the country, but, in the growing anarchy which would ensue, would very soon render life intolerable for the minority of European origin.

There is another motive for our determination to make our presence in Algeria permanent. While there is a European community, there is also a Moslem community which, in the main, has put its trust in us. We cannot abandon our friends to the exactions to which they might be subjected by bands of fanatics whose methods we know only too well. We do not want to allow out-and-out massacre to be substituted for individual assassination. Our concern is dictated neither by egoism nor by a colonialist spirit, which would be out of date.

Independence pure and simple is not, in all cases, the only formula which meets the needs of a certain region of the world. Today, many States agree to strip themselves of part of their sovereignty in favour of supranational bodies capable of organizing new forms of co-operation.

An original solution, one not based on any of the outmoded principles so often evoked, is possible between France and Algeria. I add that, on the economic level, while France, if need be, could live without Algeria, Algeria could not live without France. Many of our Moslem friends are well aware that our departure would result in appalling poverty. A new community must therefore be organized, but in order to do so peace must be re-established. This is the first objective of the French Government. The guns must be silenced in order that the discussions pertaining to the political future of Algeria can begin in an atmosphere of calm and serenity.

France, I repeat, permanently maintains an unconditional offer of a "cease fire" -- that is to say, an offer that is not coupled with any political precondition. The French Government is ready, at any time, to enter into direct contact with the combatants so as to arrange with them the general conditions for a "cease fire." It has been contended that we want, in this way, to obtain an unconditional surrender on the part of the rebels. Our thought is absolutely different. We merely want the fighting to cease in order to arrive at a negotiated

Under the circumstances which I have just outlined to you, who could question the efforts which France is making to promote liberty, democracy and well-being wherever it goes? Our country is accomplishing an immense task on behalf of the territories for which it is responsible, along lines consonant ~~not~~ only with the French Constitution, but also with the Charter of the United Nations. Large-scale reforms are already changing the face of Black Africa, as Mr. Gaston Defferre and Mr. Houphouet-Boigny have already demonstrated before the Fourth Committee during the debate on Togoland.

Algeria is not left out of this great movement, and the fact that the Government has accepted, at the outset, the principle of the single electoral college for future Algerian elections makes the position of certain States rather ridiculous in our eyes, States which, knowing nothing of democracy, still do not hesitate to act as our censors. In order to condemn the Franco-Algerian community, they have availed themselves of a so-called right to independence which would authorize every act of violence and hatred and would lead to anarchy.

Now, while the right of peoples to self-determination is a respectable principle, a sort of mystic aim of the international Organization, it does not imply and cannot imply any sanction. Besides, how could it imply one? Is there ever a case in which we are faced with a people which represents an ethnic entity? How can we solve the problems raised by the existence of a majority and a minority? Must it be done by subjecting one of them to the other, or by separating them into two distinct States, which would end in multiplying the number of States at a time when, on the contrary, the peoples should be brought together in a common action?

Thirty years ago, the great philosopher, Alain, made certain observations on "the right of peoples to self-determination", which are more timely than ever today. He said:

"A people exercises its right of self-determination in proportion to the degree of law which prevails there. This internal law applies, as always, to the individual. In other words, if a people is to possess the right of self-determination, each of the individuals who constitute it must live according to the law.

(Mr. Pineau, France)

"The first condition is that the public powers should be elected and properly controlled, therefore that a system of universal and secret suffrage should operate. Thus, majority opinion establishes and maintains an order which must be consistent with the right of all. The majority must not exercise tyranny over the minority, but, on the contrary, it must ensure to all the same system of law."

After having asserted that "a people's unlimited right of self-determination is as chimerical and dangerous as that abstract and formless right invoked by the victorious anarchists", Allain wrote this paragraph, which is literally prophetic:

"I see something even worse, when in an unorganized people, which still has no system of law of its own, affirmative action is left to a few enterprising individuals, in the face of a mass of others who see their work interrupted, their crops burned, and, in short, who, as soon as this happens, lose the effective rights that they enjoyed."

Furthermore, "we refuse to subscribe to the thesis, according to which the fact that the population of a particular region belongs to such and such a religion, automatically raises a political problem". I beg your pardon, I forget to tell the Political Committee, before reading this last sentence, that it came, not from Allain, but from Mr. Krishna Menon.

In reality, as the French President of the Council has said, many other countries have their Algerias and they, too, have had to settle serious internal difficulties resulting from the conflicts which opposed the inhabitants of one territory, or an ethnic or religious minority, to the rest of the nation.

We are thinking not only of India, but of the Soviet Union, of South Africa, and of yet others which are solving as best they can the difficulties that are presented to them. We are thinking of Cyprus, of former colonies such as Malaya, Singapore and Rhodesia which, after having relaxed their ties with Great Britain, are encountering difficulties within their own frontiers which arise from the multiplicity of races.

(Mr. Pineau, France)

We are thinking of countries, such as Canada long ago, or Lebanon more recently, which have been able to solve the tensions existing between the two communities through the harmonious operation of an original political system. We are thinking of a young country like Indonesia, where factors making for secession are already at work, and we should like to stress, furthermore, that no one has proposed that the United Nations should meddle in the domestic question which is thus raised.

The problem which all must solve is that of coexistence, and it is impossible, unless we admit that the world is progressing towards greater and greater fragmentation, to solve it otherwise than by solutions of interdependence and co-operation.

During a debate recently held in Paris before the Diplomatic Academy, the representative of Indonesia in France -- who is a very distinguished person in his own right -- took the floor and asserted that nationalism today was the opposite of imperialism and that the problem was to find out which of the two principles would one day triumph in the world. As an historian, I was frightened by such a statement, which proves that certain countries have failed to understand the lessons of the nineteenth century and are, in their turn, permitting the very errors which the Western countries have made in the past.

Nationalism, whatever some of you may think of it, is no longer a sign of progress. It is, furthermore, most often confused with imperialism, for too often the peoples that are especially sensitive where the liberty of others is concerned are much less sensitive when problems affecting their own territory or their neighbours are concerned.

Certain peoples, we are told, prefer poverty in liberty to a comfortable living in what they believe to be slavery, as though peoples could ever be truly free below a certain level of poverty.

The best proof that nationalism, an inconsiderate form of pride, has no future is that almost all the countries of the world -- and the Arab nations are not exempt from this rule -- are at the present time seeking ways of becoming integrated within larger communities,

(Mr. Pineau, France)

Allow me to cite that admirable definition of nationalisms given by the former President of the Algerian Assembly, Mr. Farès, at a time when the rebels regarded him less as an authority:

"The nationalisms which were factors of human progress as they broke the too narrow frames of the province or the duchy, necessarily become factors of regression when they tend to narrow existing frameworks."

Naturally, the rejection of nationalism as a guiding principle of our international action must not be a sort of bonus granted to a new form of economic colonialism. The most important thing is to promote throughout the world an accessible standard of living which would enable men of all countries to enjoy true liberty and enable the nations to become something other than States.

(Mr. Pineau, France)

The plan of assistance to the under-developed countries that I have introduced before the United Nations, on behalf of France, is an answer to this concern, and I hope that we shall succeed in finding an effective system which will make possible, through international co-operation, a real improvement in the living standard of the populations.

This is the spirit which underlies France's policy toward the territories that are associated with her by various juridical forms.

She is preparing to erect a large France-African whole, based on a community of cultural, economic and strategic interests. She cordially invites Tunisia and Morocco freely to associate themselves with her in this effort in order to benefit from the advantages of common work as well as from the resources of a territory still almost devoid of population, the Sahara desert.

She has yet vaster plans. On the day when a large common market -- in which the overseas territories will be associated -- has been created, she would like to promote the formation of a Eurafrikan whole. Europe in its entirety, bringing to Africa its capital and its techniques, should enable the immense African continent to become an essential factor in world politics.

I cannot resist the temptation to quote once more from President Farès, who said in the same speech to which I have already referred:

"In the name of what exceptional virtues, in terms of what decisive claims, by the example of what real necessity, would our populations turn their backs, I ask you, on the great European unit which is being formed and of which they are an integral part, in order to give their strength to movements, whose knell is being rung, more or less, each day by economics, science, philosophy and ethics."

What would remain of the prospects thus offered to Algeria if it were to become a foreign land pledged to fanaticism and, by its very poverty, open to communism? On the other hand, its participation in Eurafrikan would mean for Algeria comfort, riches; in other words, the true conditions of independence.

Once again, most nations can no longer keep pace with the world. They must enter into partnership, co-operate with each other, or give themselves up to the worst forms of ideological or economic bondage.

(Mr. Pineau, France)

I should like to apologize to the members of the First Committee for the length of this speech, intended, in the thinking of the French Government, to answer a whole body of objections and criticisms to which our country has been subjected for several years.

The members of the Committee have now been informed. This does not mean, however, that we ask them to make their views known to us. I repeat, we are dealing with an internal problem of France, in which the Assembly of the United Nations may not interfere any more than the First Committee.

We have recognized your right to be informed. We now ask you, by not voting for a draft resolution which would be contrary to the principles of the United Nations Charter, to recognize our own rights. May I end by recalling the fundamental principle of the doctrine of Juarez, well known to our Latin-American friends:

"Respect for the rights of others, that is peace."

Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria): The representative of France needed no excuse whatsoever for the length of his statement. I for one have listened to it very attentively. That statement of the French representative, to which we were treated this morning as well as this afternoon, did indeed give us the touch of his eloquence, of his sagacity and the supreme effort with which he tried to defend the French position in Algeria. The more he spoke, the more we wished he would continue to speak, not only because of his beautiful eloquence but more for a practical reason, namely to be able in our turn to elucidate some of the views on which the representative of France touched in his statement, views which are constantly being circulated to the members of the Committee and far beyond to the Press of the world. We should like also, in our turn, to be able to call the attention of the Committee to many points and issues which the representative of France felt obliged to omit.

Therefore, may we now be given the opportunity to state the stern realities of the Algerian situation and the stubborn facts concerning it which the representative of France avoided mentioning. In doing so, we certainly shall avoid any acrimony. We dislike acrimony. We do not like some of the things which the representative of France has just said, but we shall try to avoid a course in this debate which he has started in some of the statements that he has made concerning Syria, Egypt and other countries.

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

We seek objectivity; we seek also to avoid any tinge of partiality. For that reason, we shall depend primarily in our statement on French official documents and reports, including a report of a committee of which Mr. Pineau, the Foreign Minister of France, was a member. We shall rely upon authoritative French sources, upon French professors at the Sorbonne in Paris and at other universities, and upon non-controversial and well-established facts. When we depend upon such official reports and authoritative sources, we cannot then be accused of being partial.

First, let us try to examine one aspect of the Algerian problem to which the representative of France has referred. I shall deal with this aspect and perhaps with another aspect this afternoon, and I shall seek the courtesy and indulgence of the Committee to continue tomorrow. The aspect with which I should like to begin is the one on which, more than any other, the representative of France has dwelt, that is the Algerian problem as an international problem, a problem which is of significance in the perspective of the affairs of the world today. It is an aspect which should interest not only the French and not only the Arabs, but every member of this Committee, which represents the nations of the world.

A century and a quarter ago, France invaded Algeria. That is a fact. France deprived Algerians of their independence. That is a fact. France did so by war and then declared Algeria a French possession. That invasion created a problem for France from which France has to the present day never ceased to suffer. The Algerian problem remained with France just as the Polish problem and the Irish problem remained with those who at one time committed aggression in partitioning Poland or in invading Ireland.

However, the French invasion of Algeria served France in a different manner. It gave France the claim to keep the ever-existing Algerian problem away from the concern of the world community. Indeed, it has served as a basis for the legalistic fiction to the effect that Algeria is France and Algerians are Frenchmen, a fiction which served France in wrapping the Algerian problem in it and in shelving it away from the international field. Today, the Algerian problem has again been

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

internationalized. The curtain of French domestic jurisdiction, which previously covered the questions of Tunisia, Morocco and Algeria, has been lifted. The Algerian problem is now before the Assembly of the United Nations. The rule of international law is to govern the Algerian question rather than the unilateral and legalistic formulas or fictions that have been made by France for the purposes of France itself, which were repeated so often this morning and this afternoon.

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

Then the Charter of the United Nations is here going to be the guide to our future actions. The United Nations is duly called upon to assume its full competence and responsibility as a "centre for harmonizing the actions of nations". Indeed, the help of the United Nations in solving the problem is necessary and inevitable both for the Algerians and the French.

The internationalization of the Algerian question was not a sudden development, nor was it an act arising from nowhere. It is the result of a general evolution in international affairs as well as the result of the actions of the Algerian liberation movement, which now renders the French position in Algerian practically untenable. I shall speak about the liberation movement in Algeria at a later stage, particularly in view of the fact that the French representative has dwelt upon it at such length and referred to my country in dealing with it. But, for the time being, it is well to see the Algerian question only in the perspective of world affairs of today, as a question which is the result of a general international evolution.

During the last decade, 700 million people in Asia and Africa have emerged from the status of colonial domination by Western Powers to the status of national liberation and the exercise of their national sovereignty. These nations, such as Algeria, were suffering from colonialism, from domination, from economic exploitation and from cultural frustrations.

We may be asked: What, then, about the civilizing mission of colonialism? That civilizing mission of the Western world in the colonial era was able to render the colonized countries of today -- countries with old civilizations and cultures -- among the underdeveloped areas of the world. Colonialism was a retrogression in world development, inasmuch as it has suppressed the growth of the colonized people politically as well as economically, culturally, socially and otherwise. Colonialism, however, was not able to destroy the soul of these peoples. These peoples survived, to become liberated. Algeria is one of these peoples. It is now, like the others, taking the path of the same evolution toward national liberty and growth. Whether some of us would like to see that happen or not, it is the result of an evolution, a current of history.

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

The generalization and magnitude of the liberating evolutionary process in the world, covering about half the human race, its underlying reasons and far-reaching effects and its rapidity are all factors which contribute to making of national liberation in the world an irreversible tide -- a tide whose mounting waves are striking mightily upon the Algerian shores of North Africa. National liberation, more than anything else, is a sign of our time, for all eyes in the East or West to see. It, rather than the incidents of the cold war, is of far greater effect and enduring effect in international affairs.

With liberation, the vast potentialities of Asia and Africa are rapidly turning into active national capabilities. More and more, these nations are assuming and discharging their international responsibilities in the United Nations and beyond.

Sixteen nations, therefore, feeling with Algeria a community of experience and of aspirations, have joined together to bring the Algerian question to the United Nations. These nations stand behind Algerian liberation and independence. Algeria is not alone as it faces France. It has the support of many other nations. Furthermore, it enjoys the support of the vast majority of mankind.

The Algerian problem is no longer a French-Algerian problem. It is causing wide international concern and friction. It was, in fact, international in character before it was brought to the United Nations. Thus, the United Nations took up an already internationalized problem, of the same nature as some other questions of colonialism and liberation.

There is one development, however, which merits special attention in this general process of world evolution towards liberation. The voice of Asia and Africa was hardly heard in world councils a few years ago. It was at best a whisper. Even now, colonial Powers such as France -- and other Powers which, although not colonial Powers, support the colonial Powers -- continue to think of Asia and Africa in terms of "areas" rather than peoples. They deal with strategic areas -- with areas for exploitation. To them, there is a Middle East, a Far East, and there are other areas -- as if they were mere geographic expressions and not peoples who have their aspirations and their will to survive and to grow. But, a little over a year ago, the voice of Asia and Africa issued from the Bandung Conference. And it came not as a whisper; this time it was clear

and emphatic. It has to be heard. More than half the human race was represented at Bandung, and they declared the following in respect to Algeria:

"In view of the unsettled situation in North Africa and the persisting denial to the peoples of North Africa of their rights to self-determination, the Asian-African Conference declared its support of the rights of the people of Algeria... to self-determination and urged the French Government to bring about a peaceful settlement of the issue without delay."

Such a declaration has its value for those who really appreciate the decent opinion of mankind.

It was often repeated by colonial Powers that colonialism was something of the past and that it was no longer an actual issue. Today, the representative of France described colonialism as a process to bring pacification and development to Algeria. Yet, colonialism is by no means dead. It is a reality which continues to sway the destinies of many people in the colonizing and colonized countries. Right now, there are three colonial problems on the agenda of this Committee: Algeria, Cyprus, and West Irian.

Colonialism in the Arab homeland, including Algeria, continues to manifest itself in various forms today. One of them is sheer foreign domination, as in the case of Algeria. Another is the policy of the colonial Powers and their supporters to try to continue the separation and dismemberment of the Arab nation into a multiplicity of States, territories and spheres of influence, in order to serve the purposes of colonialism and the colonial-Zionist front.

There is another way also in which old colonialism reveals itself in the Arab East. It is that of helping to institute a pattern of aggravating grievances within some Arab countries, a pattern woven of local, sectarian and foreign interests, a pattern designed to serve foreign influences to the detriment of national interests. But there is more than that. There is also a new western policy concerning the Middle East, a policy which consists of undue and uncalled for leadership and foreign interference in the affairs of the Middle East, a policy said to protect the Middle East against aggression; and indeed, a good part of that protection is protection of foreign and non-Middle-Eastern interests and an effort to impose on the countries of the Middle East a foreign line of policy instead of dealing with them as free nations and by means of co-operation. The peoples of the Middle East, however, are sufficiently educated by age and experience to be able to see through the new doctrines.

When we speak about colonialism in any of its forms -- domination or undue leadership, or preponderance -- when we speak about foreign interference in the internal affairs of other countries through the so-called leadership or by other means, we do not express our opposition to it out of animosity towards any people, nor do we do so out of spite. We oppose colonial imperialism because we see it for what it is -- a malady, a sickness, from which the colonizing and the colonized peoples, as well as the world community, suffer. In respect to France as far as Algeria is concerned, imperialism is taking away its precious blood. Day in and day out -- and the Foreign Minister of France knows that better than anyone else -- the colonial policy of France is depleting the creativeness of France and the treasures resulting from the toil of its people. In Algeria alone France spends every day more than \$3 million, an amount which, in a few days, would exceed the amount which France spends in a whole year on scientific research and development of art. Hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent in war in Algeria. Perhaps millions of dollars are spent behind the scenes in order to ensure the continuation of the war. The same colonial policy is creating within France grave dissension and lack of stability -- and I would say again that the Foreign Minister of France knows that better than anyone else. We all feel that the international reputation of France is being affected nefariously, and it must be admitted that the reputation of France, at the present time, is at its lowest ebb.

To whom does any profit from Algeria go? Economic profit goes primarily to some privileged French individuals with concessions and interests in Algeria, rather than to the French nation. France, as such, continues to pay the cost of colonialism, and to pay it in blood, treasure and reputation. We realize, of course, that there are considerations other than the economic ones. There is the "glory of colonialism", the mistaken belief that colonialism, in the case of France and the United Kingdom, is the main reason left for them to be considered as great Powers.

There are also NATO interests in Algeria. There is a fear that if Algeria is left to the Algerians, a vacuum of power, so to speak, would be created. This theory of power vacuums has wide circulation in the era of the cold war. We read about it in the United States press and in the British press, and we hear it spoken of by responsible statesmen. It is nevertheless an imaginary theory, devoid of any real foundation and having no purpose beyond that of power politics. If there were a vacuum to be filled by the return of Algeria to the Algerians, that vacuum would be filled by the Algerians themselves. It cannot be properly filled from the outside.

Yet, the Powers **which** imagine the Middle East to be an area of vacuums to be filled are defeating their very purposes of power, as well as the purposes of normal international relations. The real vacuum of power is not in Algeria; the vacuum of power is being created in France and the rest of Europe. Half a million troops -- NATO forces -- are stranded in Algeria to fight liberty and to make the so-called free world go in search of liberty in its own midst. To quench the Algerian revolt, NATO arms manufactured in France, helicopters and arms manufactured in the United States or elsewhere, are being used to destroy a people whose only crime is to strike for freedom. At best such arms may produce destruction, but if they ever produce anything it will only be a temporary lull in the ever-growing movement of Algerian independence. They can make peace in the graves, but such arms will not make peace for the living. The current of national liberation is already the mounting current of history. If we had it in mind to give advice, it would be this: do not swim against that current, for you will never reach the shore.

Colonial imperialism as practised has always imagined the existence of vacuums of power for it to fill. It has proved its worth in that it has been, more than any other ideology, the cause of war. Small colonial wars led to bigger ones until the whole world was embroiled in two world wars.

Today, imperialism is by no means ended. It is only in retreat and, in its desperate retreat, colonialism is fighting some of its hardest and most dangerous battles. It appears today to be prepared, through alliances, unilateral actions and support of aggression, to plunge the whole world again into war. In fact, the Algerian issue was a basic factor in bringing French forces to Cyprus to act together with the United Kingdom and Zionist forces in the most recent and one of the ugliest acts of aggression that the modern world has experienced. French soldiers were told that they were going to fight in Egypt in order to regain Algeria; and this can be proved by documents. We have no doubt in our mind that the principal purpose of the French-United Kingdom-Zionist allies in attacking Egypt was to try to stem the tide of Arab nationalism whether in Algeria, in Egypt, in Syria, or elsewhere.

As long as colonialism takes power as its guiding star, there can be no peace in the world. Indeed the existence of power politics is the very negation of peace. That Faustian spirit seeking power, and nothing but power, is the one that has been experienced across the shores of North Africa, in Western Asia and in many other areas, and has proved what it means: war, destruction, repression and oppression.

Colonialism as a malady does not attack the colonizing nations only. The principle attack of colonialism is on the colonized peoples themselves. It is to these peoples a source of oppression which endangers the very existence of them as a people. To the colonized peoples, colonialism puts squarely to them the question of to be or not to be; the choice to exist or not to exist. The choice of these people has already been made. They want to exist. Such nations are vitally affected, and they react with all the power they can muster in a supreme effort of self-conservation and survival.

Let us look deeply into the profound meaning of the liberation movements in order to understand the terrible sacrifices that the Algerian people, like other peoples, have been obliged to make. As in Algeria these people cease to take account of the enormous sacrifices which the quest of liberty calls for, and when their martyrs fall, they fall calling for others to follow them.

That same malady of colonialism also attacks the very principles of the Charter based upon the equality of nations, big and small, and the right of each people to exercise self-determination. If we do not keep these principles on which the United Nations is built, if we do not keep them sound and effective, the very future of the world community will become dark and one inviting disaster. The Algerian problem is already causing such friction that, as Mr. Pineau has reminded us, some aspects of the problem are before the Security Council of the United Nations.

When we oppose colonialism in its traditional or modern forms, when it appears as foreign domination or as undue leadership, we do so because colonialism is a malady that endangers the world community. We oppose it in order to give a future and an opportunity to suppressed peoples and to do our duty under the Charter of the United Nations for the future good of the world community, so that more real friendship and better co-operation will exist among peoples. We do so in order to be able freely to co-operate with all other nations, including France.

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

We all know, and the Algerians know too well, that their salvation depends upon their own actions. Independence has never been granted to a people. Independence has always been taken. The Algerians are now taking it in the same way as the Americans took it under Washington and Simon Bolívar, in the same way as the Asian peoples have taken it in later years.

The United Nations, however, was instituted as a means of facilitating the orderly evolution of dependent peoples towards emancipation and independence. That part of the Charter is one of the basic elements of the mission of the United Nations. The greatest practical value of the United Nations is to save both the colonizing and the colonized peoples from the upheavals and from the bloodshed which, in the past, necessarily attended the birth of national liberty in America, in Asia and elsewhere.

As the Algerian question comes up for consideration before the United Nations, it brings with it to us an initial and actual question. It is this: Will the United Nations be earnestly bent upon fulfilling its mission effectively in respect of Algeria, or will it be disposed only to discuss the Algerian problem and let events in Algeria take their ominous course without finding a solution to this problem in the United Nations? If the United Nations is disposed only to discuss and to avoid resolutions and solutions, then cannons and bombs may continue to thunder in Algeria as if they go unheard by the ears of the representatives present here, then the forces of oppression and resistance to oppression may tread across Algeria back and forth, charting a course of blood and then the clamour of a whole nation seeking liberty may be of little significance in the world of the Charter. In the humble view of my delegation, the United Nations is duty bound to act effectively. To allow some of its leading Members to pay lip service to liberty, while preventing the United Nations from taking action, is definitely inadmissible. If that, however, happens we, among others, would have to touch our heads to feel from that touch the blood of both the Algerians and the Frenchmen on them.

We firmly hope that principles rather than power politics and alliances of the cold war will serve us as a good guide in our present deliberations.

DR/grs

A/C.1/FV.831

58-60

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

My delegation, in dealing with the Algerian problem, is moved by international considerations. It is solely in the light of such international considerations that we shall in due course try to formulate and present proposals, jointly with other delegations, in order to deal with the Algerian problem. I should like, however, candidly and frankly, to confess that my country is legitimately and gravely concerned with the Algerian issue because Algeria, like Syria, is an Arab country. Syria is an integral part of Arabdom. Arab lands may be numerous and far-flung, but the Arab nation is one and the same. For me, therefore, as the representative of Syria and as an Arab, the Algerian problem is my own. Legalistic fictions that Algerians are Frenchmen will neither change the Arab nature of the Algerians or the Syrians nor alter their common Arab culture, their history, their language, nor will it still the cry of their blood. Such fictions made in Paris may be good as modes of Paris, but we will not wear such modes. We will not render ourselves to such fictions because fictions do not fit any objective vision. The French forces may be in Cyprus threatening Syria from across a narrow sea. They may be throwing bombs on Port Said or Cairo or Algeria. Such forces come, such forces go. We have seen them come to Syria, we have seen them go. France will remain French, Syria Syrian, and Algeria Algerian.

It is time -- and here I am addressing my words to the representative of France -- that the French learned to like and to coexist with the Arabs. We should like, in reciprocity, to learn the same concerning the French. But if coexistence is bombs over Cairo, troop concentrations in Cyprus, repression in Algeria and massacres, it would be a strange kind of coexistence. Let us learn to know the real meaning of coexistence as being a real friendship in mutual respect -- one which would make one side like the other and admire it.

I intend to deal in this statement with some matters part of which will be covered this afternoon and most of which will be covered tomorrow. They are the following:

First, the status of France in Algeria and the status of Algeria, past and present;

Second, the prevailing conditions in Algeria as the result of French policies in the political, military, economic, cultural and social fields;

Third, the French residents in Algeria and their power there and in France, and how to safeguard their legitimate interests and contain their wanton ambitions;

Fourth, the Algerian liberation movement, its objectives, and its organization as a movement which now exists with its civil administration, with its army and fighting forces, and with its well planned and organized activity;

Fifth, I would like to discuss at some length the way to a solution of the Algerian problem; and

Sixth, the action which the United Nations would be well advised to take, within the limits of the Charter, in order to bring about a peaceful solution rather than a French solution by war.

At a later stage in the debate we intend to present, as I have said, jointly with some other delegations, draft resolutions for the Committee's consideration.

As the fascinating story of Algeria unfolds itself before our eyes, many delegations would do well to stop and ponder. Some delegations will be reminded of similar episodes in the history of their own people, when their peoples also passed through phases of occupation, domination and liberation. Such delegations here can look back to dark days in their own history when brutal forces occupied their own territory as they occupied Algeria, under the guise of a civilizing

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

mission -- possessed their countries and used their peoples as serfs in a colonial order. Those delegations can well look back from this debate to other days in their history -- to glorious days when their peoples, through struggle and sacrifice, emerged ultimately from the scourge of foreign domination to the bounty and pride of freedom, when, through freedom, the creative forces of those nations were released and their national growth ensured. Such delegations do well to draw upon the experience of their own peoples in order to comprehend the Algerian question and comprehend it profoundly and sympathetically as a human as well as a national issue.

Representatives from the Americas, you would duly think of the national revolutionary convulsions in the Western hemisphere which preceded the birth of your nations at the hands of Washington, Bolivar and San Martin, and brought forth nations dedicated to the traditions of liberty and to the principle that all men are created equal.

And you, representatives from Asia and Africa, need only to look back a few years to the time when your peoples were achieving liberty as the Algerians are doing now. To you the Algerian experience is almost a vivid part of the actual life of your own peoples.

Representatives from Europe, such as those from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Ireland and other countries, may well think of the days when, as in the case of Algeria, their respective States were suppressed; but their peoples, like the Algerians, remained peoples to reinstitute their statehood and regain their national life.

And Italians, you can well understand Arab nationalism better than any other nation, because today we Arabs want to realize our collective national Arab existence for a purpose very similar to that for which Garibaldi, Mazzini and Cavour gave their lives so that Italy might become really free and united.

The union of the Arab countries is not an imperial trend. We seek no territory which is not Arab. We seek the union of one nation, so that that nation can determine its future and exercise its full right to self-determination -- so that the weakness and the backwardness which result from dismemberment can be done away with once and for all.

There was a time when the United States of America was striving for its liberty under Washington; there was another time when, under Lincoln, that same United States was striving to safeguard and to remake its union, as the Arab States now tend to do.

The Algerian case comes before us, therefore, with many similar precedents, and these precedents do help us in its solution. But the Algerian case is one which is probably unequalled anywhere -- not even in Ireland or Poland -- either for the repressive actions and horrors of foreign domination, or for the stern resistance of the people to foreign rule and their determination to become free.

One hundred and twenty-six years ago, in the early summer of 1830, French forces were massed in southern France awaiting a fair wind to take them to Algeria. They appeared suddenly in front of the city of Algiers, as if coming from the dark. They disembarked and they attacked. The Bey, sovereign of Algeria, taken by surprise, was surrounded. He surrendered, but the Algerian people did not surrender. The Algerian people continued the resistance to the French invasion. The war of occupation went on from 1830 to 1848. For eighteen long years that war went on -- and only to result in the occupation of a part of Algeria, for all Algeria was not occupied by France until 1910. But the war of occupation was only a prelude to a series of French wars in Algeria which are called, as we heard today, wars of pacification.

The last and greatest one is today upon the hands of France. The French occupied Algeria, but they were unable to kill the spirit of the Algerians. The Algerians were capable of patience, but they proved incapable of submission. Today most of Algeria is in fact liberated. Algeria is upholding its honour by its own blood: it is realizing its freedom by its own generous sacrifices

But before we move on to consider the prevailing conditions in Algeria, the war that is going on and a solution to the problem, let us devote a few minutes to discussing this question of status, to which the representative of France referred so often in his statement. The question of status -- what does it imply? The question is often asked, "What is the status of Algeria?" "Is it a colony?" "No", the French tell us. "Is it a protectorate?" "No", the French tell us. "Is it a Trust Territory?" "No". "Is it a part of France?" "No, it is not". "Is it a member of the French Union: what is it?" The status of France in Algeria is really a puzzle.

In fact, there are two related questions.

The initial and basic question is this: What is France's status in Algeria? By virtue of what right does France claim to exercise sovereignty over Algeria, except the right of conquest?

The second question is: What is the status of Algeria, past and present? And, the matter of Algeria's present status is the more important.

The first question is the difficult one for France to answer, and that difficulty is reflected in the second question. Let us, therefore, examine this question of status from all its angles. It appears that some delegations attach some importance to that question, although we do not believe that it is so important.

Until the French invasion, Algeria was a national political entity, with State institutions exercising all the attributes of sovereignty. Like France in 1830, Algeria had a monarchical regime. France was ruled by a king, and Algeria by the Dey. Algeria was ruled by the Dey in accordance with Moslem law and Algerian constitutional customs. The Dey was not an absolute ruler; he was subject to the concept of law and Algerian customs. Writing about Algeria in 1826 -- four years before the French invasion -- the United States Consul General at Algiers, Mr. Shaler, had this to say in his book, "Sketches of Algeria":

"The Dey assumes and exercises all the rights of sovereignty immediately upon his election".

That is the report of the United States Consul General at Algiers in 1826.

As a corollary to its statehood, Algeria had entered into a number of international treaties with many countries of the East and the West. It had, for example, treaty relationships with Holland, Denmark, Morocco, Spain, and many other States.

Algeria's relations with England and the United States of America call for special mention.

The first treaty between Algeria and England dates back to 1683. Shortly before the French invasion, the relations between Algeria and England developed -- despite some incidental difficulties -- to the point where they reached virtually a state of alliance. It is interesting to note in this respect a letter addressed

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

by His Highness, the Prince Regent of England, on behalf of his father, King George III, to His Highness, the Dey of Algeria -- a letter in which the British Government made no secret of French designs upon Algeria and French aggressive preparations. I quote from this letter:

"The Prince Regent, in the name of his father, George III, states that the long continued illness of the King has prevented him from answering the letter of the Dey, which had been carried to England by his Ambassador, Hadji Hassan; expresses the strongest friendship for the Dey, founded on their treaties; assures the Dey that he will protect his capital with his fleet, so long as the present friendship shall subsist between the two nations; declares that the British fleet are masters of every sea, and are the terror of all maritime States, and that whoever attempts to oppose them" --

and that refers to France --

"will be subdued; begs the Dey not to permit those who are enemies of Great Britain to lessen the harmony now subsisting between the two nations, and that he will not hearken to their evil sayings; says that his Ambassador will inform him how well he was received and treated in England, and that he sent by him some of the manufactures of his Kingdom, as presents".

Let us hope that the United Kingdom delegation here remembers this part of the United Kingdom's history.

Algeria was among the first States to recognize the United States of America and to establish relations with it. Algeria entered into treaty relationships with the United States in 1795. Let us hope that the United States delegation will remember, in connexion with the present Algerian crisis, that Algeria was one of the very few Powers which extended recognition to the United States at that time. Algeria was then a friend to the United States -- and a friend in need.

It is not surprising to find that, in the conditions which prevailed in the early nineteenth century, so many Powers entertained international relations with Algeria and concluded with it treaties of various kinds. Indeed, the economic importance of Algeria, its naval power at the time, its geographical position necessitated the wide international relations which Algeria entertained.

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

It is, however, surprising to hear the French today imply or say -- as the representative of France has said today -- that, before the French occupation, Algeria was a kind of vacuum to be filled, a kind of no-man's land to be occupied, a territory devoid of constituted authority, a country without a past -- "un pays sans passé". These French assertions are queer. They were developed in later years, to serve as a belated excuse for the French invasion of Algeria.

It would, however, be more difficult for the French to say today that Algeria is a country without a present or a future, when, after a century and a quarter of French occupation, the sturdy Algerian people remain alive, nationally conscious, and capable of the kind of organization and planning necessary to handle a French army of over half a million men, equipped with such modern weapons as the ingenuity of French, American and other manufacturers are able to produce; when that people is able to handle such a French army successfully; and when Algeria is able to bring its case to the United Nations to be solved peacefully, instead of by war.

The fact is that the present Algeria is a nation conscious of its national existence, a nation acting today in full response to its past and in full expectation of its future as a State Member of this community of nations.

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

Algeria has been for ages past, and is today, a part of that Arab Algharb -- west -- where Arab culture bore some of its best fruits. That national culture of Algeria, which the representative of France referred to today as being almost non-existent, does not make of Algeria a country without a past, but a country with a great past. France should know that Arab culture, because the origins and roots of western culture strike deep into our Arab soil. The people of the Middle East know that culture because it is largely their own. Spain and Latin America know that culture well, and, indeed, continue to interpret many of its aspects, although in the beautiful Spanish tongue.

Algeria in its long past has contributed heavily to the building up of human culture and civilization. In legal theory, philosophy, medicine, mathematics, botany, chemistry, engineering, literature and music, the contributions of Algeria were enormous. I wish the time was available to detail these contributions, which were the products of culture and civilization in Algeria. Algeria has turned its lights on many a dark corner during the dark ages of France. There is hardly any people in the world who have contributed more to the formation of the scientific method of thinking, through observation, verification and the establishment of general laws, than the philosophers of that Arab Algharb, of which Algeria is an important part. Many Europeans, among them Pope Sylvester II, were educated in North African institutions of learning. Many learned Arabs from North Africa frequented European courts carrying a torch of light. They did not carry torches in order to set fire to homes, as is now being done in Algeria. To assert that Algeria is a nation without a past is a falsification of history, but when such an assertion comes from the French, it carries with it a sense of ingratitude, because the North African contributions in the Middle Ages for a long time were fundamental in the development of the French Renaissance and the French culture.

When the French invasion came, the Dey of Algiers surrendered in the field. He refused, however, to act in any way to alienate or to transfer the sovereignty over Algeria to France. He could not alienate that sovereignty, even had he wanted to, because such a transfer of sovereignty was forbidden to him under Moslem law and Algerian custom. The act of surrender itself is a witness of the fact that there was no transfer of sovereignty to France. Allow me to read some of the articles of that act of surrender:

"1. At ten o'clock in the morning of 5 July 1830, the Kasbah citadel and all other fortifications belonging to Algiers, and the port of the city, shall be delivered to the French army.

"2. The Commandant General of the French army undertakes to leave His Highness the Dey of Algiers in enjoyment of his liberty and all his personal wealth.

"3. The Dey has full freedom to travel with his family and possessions to the place he chooses. So long as he resides in Algiers he shall be under the protection of the Commandant General of the French army, and a detachment of the French army shall act as guards for him and his family.

"4. All of the troops of the odiak (militia) of Algiers shall enjoy the same rights as stipulated in the foregoing sections.

"5. There shall be free exercise of the Mohammedan religious rites and there shall be no interference with the freedom of the inhabitants of the different social levels or with their religion, property, trade or industry. Their women shall be respected. The Commandant General makes an engagement of honour to this effect.

"6. The exchange of this document, duly signed, shall occur on the fifty day of July before the hour of ten in the morning, and the French troops shall thereupon take possession of the Kasbah and other strongholds.

"At the camp in front of Algiers, 5 July 1830."

This was signed by the Dey Hussein and by the Commandant, Count de Bourmont.

What has to be noted is that the act of surrender of the Dey was a military, non-political act. It did not include any transfer of sovereignty or the establishment of any protectorate. It did not give the French the right to interfere in any manner whatsoever in the affairs of Algiers. Even at that, the act of surrender applied only to the city of Algiers and its immediate suburbs. The remainder of Algeria and the Algerian forces did not surrender with the Dey, nor were they ordered by him to do so.

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

The surrender of the Dey was a successful military beginning for the French, but it was by no means a successful ending. The Algerian forces continued the war. In 1834, France occupied some Algerian centres. In 1848 it occupied some more, but it was not until 1910 that all of Algeria was really occupied. But that occupation was only temporary, as most of Algeria today is unoccupied. A country with a past like Algeria cherishes its liberty. History has hardly recorded any more determined and long drawn-out resistance to occupation and domination than that which the armies of France had to meet in Algeria, and only to begin occupation again, because that is what they have to do at the present moment.

One basic fact concerning the status of France in Algeria singles itself out. It is this. At no time, either in the past or at present, did France acquire any legal or legitimate right to exercise French sovereignty over Algeria, either in full or in part. At no time was the exercise of the attributes of sovereignty transferred to France, either explicitly or implicitly, by any constituted or non-constituted authority in Algeria. The status of France, therefore, continues to be that of an occupier who, through invasion and conquest, is exercising the right of might in Algeria.

In this respect, the Algerian case is somewhat different from the Tunisian or Moroccan cases, both of which were dealt with by the General Assembly. France, through the protectorate treaties of Tunisia and Morocco, acquired a semblance of legality for its undue interference in Morocco and Tunisia and for the exercise by France of some of the attributes of Tunisian or Moroccan sovereignty. France did not, in the case of Algeria, acquire even a similar semblance of right. It continues to be an occupier with no title of any kind. Juridically speaking, to say the least, Algeria's case against France is more clearly established than the case of Tunisia and Morocco.

The sovereignty of Algeria as a right, therefore, continues. The exercise of that right by Algeria was suppressed by sheer force. The French authority in Algeria fails to have any juridical basis. The United Nations, therefore, is free to deal with the Algerian problem as the United Nations and the Algerians see fit, according to the Charter. As for the French delegation, who lack any juridical basis for the French presence in Algeria, that delegation cannot be

RSH/bs

A/C.1/PV.831
74-75

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

expected to indulge in the juridical aspects of the debate in the future. The French delegation can tell us clearly on what basis it wants to base its rule over Algeria. Even its conquest is not real any more, and that conquest in no way conferred a valid right.

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

As a result of this situation, France was constantly perplexed about its status in Algeria.

France, having been unable to assess its authority in Algeria on any known basis of international law, unless it be conquest, or to obtain a transfer of sovereignty over Algeria in full or in part, proceeded to act unilaterally in establishing for itself a kind of legalistic status in Algeria. Upon analysis, that question of French status remained unsolved even in the view of France itself. France has been constantly perplexed about this status. It would be fit, therefore, to recall some relevant French legal acts in order to elucidate my point.

In 1834, France declared Algeria a part of French possessions. According to this, France "possessed" Algeria.

In 1848, France enacted a French law claiming that Algeria was "an integral part of France". According to that, Algeria was integrated into France. We shall see, in a moment, how France itself negated its own claims and assertions.

Though Algeria, according to that French law, was said to be "integrated," Algerians were not Frenchmen. They were therefore repeatedly but fictitiously made Frenchmen at a later date, and repeatedly denied the rights and duties of Frenchmen by France itself.

In 1865, France declared that Algerians were Frenchmen.

In 1944, Algerians, not being Frenchmen, had to be declared Frenchmen again by French legislation. Yet they continued not to be Frenchmen according to France itself.

In 1946, a French law allegedly granted French citizenship to all inhabitants of overseas French territories, including Algeria. Yet this assertion too was belied by French official acts.

Back in 1860, Napoleon III thought that he had solved the dilemma of the French status in Algeria, as the representative of France, Mr. Pineau, thought he solved it today. In an official document the Emperor of the French had this to state officially:

"Algeria is not properly called a colony, but rather an Arab Kingdom. The natives have, like the colonists, an equal right to my protection. I am Emperor of the Arabs as well as Emperor of the French."

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

Algeria, according to this French Imperial document, was not a colony, but an Arab country, or kingdom, to use the French Imperial words.

The contradictions in the status of France in Algeria, according to the various positions taken by France, were already enormous before the present French Constitution came into effect. The present French Constitution, however, aggravated these contradictions.

The present French Constitution provides that "France forms with the peoples of its overseas territories a union, based on equality of rights and duties without distinction of race or religion".

France promulgated its present Constitution without any participation of Algeria. Algeria, therefore, is a member of a union without any consideration of Algeria's wishes or of the fact that Algeria is not France. Is that union a voluntary one? Certainly not. If it were voluntary, why did not France ask the Algerians to express their will on it. Why does not France proceed to hold a plebiscite in Algeria to see whether the Algerians want to continue that union? But that union is not a voluntary one -- it is a forced one. If it were based, as the French Constitution provides, upon equality of rights and duties, would not Algeria just as France be able to end this state of union? If that is not the case, where is the equality?

Suppose, however, that the union is non-voluntary, non-breakable and has to endure. How would this be reconciled with the fact that there is at present no equality of rights between Algerians and Frenchmen and no equality of duties without distinction of race or religion, as the Constitution provides? Even as it stands, the so-called union is almost meaningless because of the fact that the union concept is full of contradictions which destroy one another. After 126 years, France does not yet know what the status of France is in Algeria.

This French union is one of the queerest things in the world. It is no more than a legalistic fiction, added to previous fictions, by which France has been seeking throughout unilaterally to create for itself some kind of admissible status in Algeria.

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

The representative of France reminded us today that every nation should heed its constitution and should try to abide by it. The present French Constitution states that France, with Algeria and other overseas territories, forms a union. But the representative of France told us today that Algeria is a part of France, and that any interference in Algeria by trying to change anything would be interference beyond the frontiers of his country. Even today there is a fundamental contradiction between the statement of the French delegation and the Constitution of France, which the representative of France stated should be respected.

Though French acts declared Algeria a part of France, France has never integrated Algeria into France even in the French legal system. French laws applicable in France did not generally apply to the Algerians. The Algerian budget is not the French budget. Algerians do not have the rights or duties of French citizens. It is true that Algerians for a long time had a longer period of military service than the French in order to defend la patrie commune -- the common country. It is true that Algerians were very helpful in liberating France from the Nazis, but the Algerians were not treated as Frenchmen. France only imported from Algeria cannon fodder for its wars in Europe, in Indo-China, in Syria and elsewhere. The services of education, hygiene and the social services were not extended to the Algerians as to Frenchmen. Frenchmen are taxed but through representation. Algerians are heavily taxed, it is true, but with no real representation and the taxes mainly are not used for Algerian welfare. Apparently France needed more tax money for its interminable wars, such as those to which I have just referred. French customs are separate from Algerian customs and there is no customs union between the two countries. At no time did France really integrate Algeria into France.

The reasons for the French dilemma and perplexity are not difficult to see. Among other things, if Algeria were really integrated into France, then Algerians would have the same rights and obligations as the French and would be able to share in the rule of France, and then the privileges of French individuals in Algeria who now exploit Algeria would have no legal basis. The exploitation of

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

Algeria by French individuals and interests would be difficult under such an integration and the backwardness of Algeria could not be ensured under integration to the extent that that backwardness could be ensured for the purposes of colonization under the present regime. The most important reason, however, was that France was not ever able to make the Algerians willing subjects of France. Algerians have always wanted to be free.

On 9 January, Mr. Mollet, the Prime Minister of France, made a declaration of policy concerning Algeria. In that statement the French Prime Minister incorporated, in one way or another and repeated in substance, all previous French claims and legal fictions concerning Algeria. Neither the French Prime Minister nor the French Foreign Minister, in his statement today, added anything.

We shall try to analyse the declaration of policy made by Mr. Mollet, at a later stage. May we state now that as shown by that Statement France has forgot nothing and has learned nothing from the Algerian experience. That statement is a repetition of previous French policies which have been repeated to no avail.

I should like to take a few minutes time to try to sum up and conclude on the question of status, so that we might leave the meeting until tomorrow.

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

The real question is not what the status of Algeria is. The real and initial question is what the status of France in Algeria is. The status of France, as I have tried to show, is an enigma -- a kind of jigsaw puzzle the pieces of which do not fit together.

However, bringing all these questions together into one whole, we may try to state the following basic facts:

(1) Algeria enjoyed full statehood before French occupation. It enjoyed the right of full sovereignty as well as the exercise of that right. To that extent, the Algerian, Tunisian and Moroccan questions are almost identical.

(2) In the case of Algeria, there was no transfer of the right of sovereignty to France at all. France has constantly acted unilaterally, either to invade Algeria or to suppress Algerian independence and deny the Algerians the possibility of exercising their inherent and unmitigated right of sovereignty.

(3) In fact and in law, Algeria is not integrated into France, nor did Algerians become French citizens like other citizens of France. The French Union, according to the present French Constitution, is not integration, nor is it a union, as has been explained. The situation is the situation of a Power trying to colonize another country.

(4) The status of France in Algeria is based solely upon conquest and unilateral legalistic fictions which are contradictory and which France uses in order to allay its perplexities concerning its status in Algeria.

(5) Algeria is neither a colony nor a trust territory nor a part of France nor an international mandate nor a protectorate nor really a member of a union. What the status of France is in Algeria therefore remains a question mark. But the status of Algeria does not raise any question in our minds. As things stand today, France has ceased to occupy or to govern most of Algeria. Further details about this factual and juridical point will be given later. As to the right of the Algerian people to self-determination, that right is inalienable, and it is accorded to them, as to any other people, in the Charter of the United Nations.

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

(6) Algeria remained an entity, and the Algerian people remained a people conscious of their national existence. They always kept and defended their right to their sovereignty and are now actually being reintegrated in the exercise of that right of sovereignty, which exercise was suppressed by France for a long period.

What we seek is to see France admit that the right of sovereignty should be transferred gradually to the Algerians, with the help of the United Nations, in an evolution whereby an independent Algeria can, if it so desires, entertain relationships with France based upon international co-operation, a co-operation to which the Algerians and the French would mutually and freely agree.

Liberty, not oppression -- co-operation, not imposed domination -- these form the basis for the solution of the present problem, as they have formed the basis for the solution of similar problems in Latin America, in Europe, in Indonesia, in India, in Tunisia, in Morocco, and in other cases in which a people was dominated but continued to exist as a people and ultimately broke its chains. Indeed, the Algerian problem comes to us attended by a large number of precedents.

The French status in Algeria is one which is supported by force -- not only on the part of France, but with support from various international quarters.

But the situation of status in Algeria is not the important question for us, for it is being established by the Algerians beyond any further doubt. Of greater importance are the prevailing conditions in Algeria, with which the United Nations should be called to deal. But, before I deal with the prevailing conditions, as I intend to do tomorrow, may I be permitted to try to answer some of the points which the representative of France mentioned this afternoon.

When the problems of Tunisia and Morocco were discussed, and when the problem of Algeria was discussed last year, France preferred to turn its back on this Assembly. Why did France leave its seat and turn its back on the Assembly? Was it in order to avoid discussion? Was it in order to express its lack of regard for the United Nations? Was it a matter of satisfying some internal political factions in France? Maybe it was for one of these reasons, maybe for all of them. However, there was an empty French seat -- a seat which was empty but which was not surrounded by any sympathy.

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

Today, the French delegation was present here, and we were happy to see them. But we were very unhappy indeed to hear the French delegation say, when it turned its face to the United Nations: "You, United Nations, have nothing to do with the Algerian problem. We want to continue to deal with Algeria unilaterally, to practice the rule of might, and to impose upon Algeria the kind of solution which France wants."

May I say, with all due respect to the Foreign Minister of France, that his attitude was indeed a kind of affront to the United Nations.

From union to integration to colony to protectorate -- that French status goes all around, without ever being settled. But one thing is certain and is real: The Foreign Minister of France himself has had to go to Karachi, to New Delhi, to Cairo, where he arranged for the mediation of Egypt in some respects, to Moscow, to Washington, to the NATO Council; he had to discuss this matter when President Tito came to France; and then he had to go back to Washington again. Why? In order to discuss the Algerian problem. Why did the French Foreign Minister go to all these capitals to discuss the problem, if that problem is strictly internal to France? It is a negation of reality to say, in present world conditions, that this problem is an internal problem -- when France itself expresses so much international concern about it, as a result of the real international concern which exists in regard to the problem.

But, from that, France goes to the point of telling the United Nations that this is a matter with which the United Nations should not deal. The French delegation has come here to inform us of that. We are very thankful for the information; we shall take that information and use it, and we shall try to express our views about it. But what we aspire to is to see France, when it turns its face to the United Nations, establish a real change from the attitude that it has taken in the last several years; we want to see it adopt an attitude of really being ready to sit down and negotiate peacefully, with the good offices of the United Nations, in order to find a just and peaceful solution to the Algerian problem.

With the permission of the Chairman, I should like to continue tomorrow. I thank the Committee for its courtesy in hearing me for so long a time today.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of Syria will continue tomorrow morning.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.