

UNITED NATIONS

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



LIMITED

A/C.1/PV.834

6 February 1957

ENGLISH

Eleventh Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHT HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 6 February 1957, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. BELAUNDE

(Peru)

Question of Algeria /62/ (continued)

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

Mr. Noble	(United Kingdom)
Mr. Ben-Aboud	(Morocco)

Note:

The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol A/C.1/SR.834. Delegations may submit corrections to the summary record for incorporation in the final version which will appear in a printed volume.

57-04483

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

Mr. NOBLE (United Kingdom): On 4 February this Committee heard the Foreign Minister of France set out the position of the French Government in regard to Algeria. It was one of the most impressive testimonies that I have had the privilege of hearing. Certain criticisms have since been levelled at Mr. Pineau's speech, but they have not in any way affected the force or the truth of his arguments.

I do not intend to make a long speech today, but my Government shares to the full the position of the French Government in regard to the question of the competence of the United Nations in this matter. Under Article 2 (7) of its Charter, the United Nations is precluded from intervening in the domestic affairs of any Member State and the General Assembly has no right, under the Charter, to discuss any matter or adopt any resolution in that field. The question of Algeria is incontestably within the domestic jurisdiction of France and as such is outside the competence of the General Assembly.

The Committee will recall that this view was stated categorically by the French representative in the General Committee on 14 November last. While not admitting any right on the part of the United Nations to intervene in the internal affairs of Algeria, the French Government has nevertheless come to this Committee to state its position.

I do not propose to repeat what Mr. Pineau has said, but I would ask the members of this Committee to examine the facts and ask themselves whether they square with the lurid picture of French relationships with Algeria which the representative of Syria has painted for us. A great deal of attention has been paid in this debate to past history. To me at least, Mr. Pineau's version of Algerian history seems a great deal more accurate than that of the representative of Syria. But we are not here to discuss history; it is, after all, with the events of the present that this Committee must be principally concerned.

(Mr. Noble, United Kingdom)

Mr. Pineau made it clear that the French Government has a detailed policy for a political solution to the problem of Algeria on the most liberal terms. That it has been difficult for the French Government to carry out this programme is due in great part to the intervention of certain countries who make no secret of the fact that they are working to decide the future of Algeria on quite different lines; they even come here and say so. In Algeria itself they have done their best, with utter disregard for the real interests of the population, to fan the flames of unrest. There is no method, however unscrupulous or illegal, at which they will stop. The incident of the S.S. Athos is a case in point. They do not come here with clean hands, for it is part of their purpose to extend their own influence along the shores of the Mediterranean.

My Government has the fullest confidence in the desire and in the ability of the French Government to carry out the policy which it has set itself to follow in Algeria. It will be no new thing for France to develop a harmonious and mutually advantageous association with the people of Algeria and it is clearly in the best interests of all parties that such an association should come about.

(Mr. Noble, United Kingdom)

It is our duty here and the duty of the United Nations as a whole to do all that we can to help and assist such a process, rather than to hinder it. As the Committee is aware, the present situation in Algeria, thanks largely to unauthorized and unlawful outside interference, is difficult and dangerous. We should do nothing here to make it worse. If Algeria is to develop in freedom and prosperity, what is needed, above all, is peace. And peace, as Mr. Pineau has reminded us, is respect for the rights of others.

Finally, my delegation accordingly supports the plea made by the Foreign Minister of France that the Committee should not vote for any resolution on this issue.

Mr. BEN-ABOUD (Morocco)(interpretation from French): My delegation attaches to the question of Algeria which has been proposed for consideration in our Committee the greatest importance. From the point of view of the principle of the freedom of peoples, the right of peoples to self-determination, the security of North Africa, the historical progress towards liberation of the subject peoples, our ideological faith that spiritual values are higher than the material and occasionally illegitimate selfishness of the individual, for all these reasons, the Algerian question, in our eyes, assumes the greatest moral importance.

My delegation will state opinions and views which are advisedly of a general nature, which can therefore be applied to all questions similar to those of the Algerian national struggle. My delegation, however, reserves its right to speak again on clarifications or other considerations which may prove necessary. In order to orient our ideas, we would like to state briefly the attitude of the Moroccan Government with respect to this question. This is summed up in the following extract taken from a speech by His Majesty Sultan Mohammed V, the Chief of the Moroccan State:

"Humanity is suffering cruelly from the events of which Algeria is today the scene. The universal conscience and men of good will in France, Algeria and throughout the world launch an urgent appeal to those responsible so that they can put an end quickly to the bloodshed and so that they may devote themselves to establishing between the two peoples solid relationships in order that they might devote themselves to finding a solution which, while giving satisfaction to the aspirations of the Algerian people to freedom, will respect

(Mr. Ben-Aboud, Morocco)

the higher interests of France and will guarantee to safeguard the interests of the French who have chosen to settle in Algeria. The struggle which Tunisia and Morocco carried out for their liberation, the developing consciousness of the French people with respect to their legitimate aspirations, have led to the achievement of their independence.

"Thus, new relationships based on mutual respect, justice and co-operation have been established between these countries and France, relationships which have evoked the admiration of the peoples and international organizations which watch over the preservation of peace in the world. The French people, which have demonstrated understanding and liberalism with respect to the Tunisian and Moroccan problems, will, we are convinced, approach the Algerian problem with the same understanding and the same realism. North Africa forms a whole, from the geographical and ethnical point of view. Moreover, the three countries which make it up are closely connected by language, religion and traditions. Their future, like their past, is common. Everything which affects Algeria has great effects in Morocco, both because of the close links and the affinities which exist between the two peoples, as well as their geographical propinquity.

"This is why the return of peace in Algeria remains for us a capital concern. Our security is at stake. The security of the North African area is at stake and the relations of friendship which the three countries sincerely wish to maintain with France. For all these reasons, we implore those responsible to hasten a solution of this problem and thus bring an end to so much human suffering."

In the Mediterranean basin Morocco has neighbouring and friendly countries. France is one of those countries. In North Africa there are sister nations which have interrelationships and mutual effects one upon the other, in both peace and freedom. Algeria is one of those nations. The Franco-Algerian conflict falls within the moral domain and has to be placed among the great upheavals of our time. It is an international problem in which France and Morocco will benefit by finding a solution as a result of redoubling their efforts and availing themselves of the assistance of the United Nations. Already, resort to the United Nations is an encouraging demonstration of understanding and good will on the part of the Member States, and in particular France. This action itself proves the existence of a sincere desire for peace, of a firm will to defend national aspirations to freedom, and of a staunch determination to reduce the obstacles which arise in the normal course of the history of peoples. It is within this framework that we should place the irresistible movement of struggles for national liberation. It is in that framework also that the question of Algeria comes before us.

Any carte blanche given to a colonial country to dictate its will by administrative and military means can, in the light of experience, result only in exacerbation of the opposite reaction. Any peaceful contribution on the part of the United Nations hastens the development of a spirit of understanding in order to reach a solution which will be in the interests of all. This Organization is a school for the readjustment of minds to the spirit of the times. We have an impressive number of examples in favour of this thesis. But we have no example in support of the colonial thesis according to which military action can restore peace and discussion of these problems in the United Nations results in a recrudescence of insurrection. That thesis is, as it were, an optical error, often deliberate for want of better arguments. For, after all, the question of Algeria appears quite evidently as a new specific case of a general problem which has often been discussed -- the problem of colonialism.

Algeria was an independent State before the French landing on its territory. We shall demonstrate that in a moment. Later it was transformed into a colony. Finally, in accordance with a strange evolutionary progress which takes place within empires, that colony was purely and simply annexed as French territory,

the territory of its inhabitants being taken as a necessary means of exploiting the colony. Today, whatever may be the view of the European settlers, the Algerian people is demanding the return of its freedom. The whole problem, after careful scrutiny, may be summed up in the following conclusions: European colonialism is seeking to exclude and annihilate the national existence and legitimate aspirations of an entire people.

The parties involved in this problem are, of course, France and Algeria -- but they are in military conflict. Because of that fact, the question is fundamentally a multilateral one. France upholds the view that Algeria is a metropolitan territory. The Algerian people is defending the existence of its Algerian national identity, in the light of the factors which compose that nationality, such as its geographical location close to neighbouring and similar sister countries, its common history with the Arab and Moslem peoples, the Arab and Moslem language and civilization, the ethnical composition of the people, which is similar more or less throughout the whole of North Africa, devotion to its own motherland and its own social and legal institutions, and, finally and above all, the common will to have in the present its own identity which fiercely resists any attempt at assimilation and integration, and the will to have in the future also links of co-operation and brotherhood in equal justice for all, within the national framework as well as within the international framework.

This problem -- although France and Algeria are more directly concerned in it than are other countries, especially in the armed struggle between the two adversaries -- is essentially of an international character. Morocco, Tunisia and Libya consider it as a dispute which is much more closely connected with their everyday existence than would be thought at first sight. North Africa is like a large house inhabited by the same family. A fire which breaks out in one corner of the house will quickly represent a common and immediate danger. But if North Africa wishes to be one big hospitable house, France can be today, and must remain tomorrow, one of the best friends of that family. Moreover, France and Morocco are already members of a much bigger family -- the United Nations -- and co-operate in a spirit of brotherhood which has always been our desire.

This Organization is a product of the wisdom of peoples accumulated throughout the centuries, harmoniously codified in the principles of the Charter. It is in the spirit of these principles and this Charter that the Moroccan delegation wishes to contribute, as far as it can, to the objective study of the Algerian question. Our constant concern in this connexion will be to seek the truth, to seek to narrow the differences between opposing parties and the defence of all the interests involved, and to act in moderation in order to promote a spirit of understanding and conciliation. In this respect our invariable guide will be the principles and the moral teachings of the Charter which are today implicit rules inscribed in the minds of men. Any discussion or decision outside the framework of the Charter would only lead to confusion and arbitrary action, which would result in the illogical spectacle of one of the parties to a dispute being at the same time the supreme judge of the arbitration of that dispute. This would be a transgression of the rules of reason and justice. On the one hand, there is France with its military power and political influence, its well-deserved reputation, its friends and its broad means of publicity; on the other hand, there is Algeria, which has lost everything, even the right to speak in its own name. That alone would be sufficient justification to make indispensable and legitimate the intervention of the United Nations.

This problem constitutes a part of the complexity and the trend in the history of colonialism. The world upheavals, which were a product of the last two wars, have made these difficulties more obvious, to such an extent that one of the most characteristic phenomenon of our time is the disappearance of colonialism, in the first place, as far as territorial occupation is concerned and, nearly always, as far as military occupation is concerned, followed by the philosophy of the colonial pact. In this sense, the Algerian problem is simply an example of the colonial phenomenon in general, well known to historians, socialists and moralists of our time; this problem has almost become a routine question in the field of diplomacy and politics. However, it will never cease to be of burning interest for the common man, and it is in this order of ideas that one may say it is a universal problem. Each particular man fervently wishes that justice may be done in order to stop the bloodshed and to satisfy the national aspirations and legitimate interests of the parties involved.

It is thus that the Algerian question may be considered both from the point of view of judgements of value and from the point of view of realistic judgements. The former poses questions of law and moral principles; the latter belongs in the field of necessity, in which we take into account material interests, historical and geographical circumstances, political motives, both national and international, often quite legitimate.

Since the United Nations does not claim to be a court of justice, with laws defining rights, obligations and sanctions, since it places itself above individual contingencies and particular orientations, since it appears, on the contrary, as a factor of progress and of union -- thanks to which the peoples of the earth are seeking a ground for common understanding and rapprochement, with the peaceful means appropriate to the spirit of conciliation and understanding -- we may say that both in spirit and in letter the United Nations is incontestably closer to the field of principles than to the field of material necessity and private interests. It is this higher morality which makes of our Organization the refuge of the small and weak, the factor of moderation and rapprochement and the hope of the great nations, guided by reason rather than misled by their power. It is the primacy of moral importance which gives to this Organization its character of universality and which justifies its activity in the direction of peace and brotherhood -- the only way open for the maintenance of civilization and the development of progress in all its forms and, above all, in the form of constructive achievements.

The countries which have just recovered their independence are the first to be convinced that peace is not a question of unreality, but a concrete means of reconstructing their countries.

In our view, the Algerian problem appears in its true light if it is studied in a strictly objective manner, almost an academic manner, for the purpose of drawing the indispensable elements from that study which would constitute a working basis to guide our reason and to reach conclusions which are, at the same time, logical, coherent and humane.

On the threshold of such a study, it is indispensable to fix our ideas according to certain considerations which may be regarded as the first truths. But before going any further, some clarifications are called for.

We are accustomed, in the course of the struggle for our independence, to draw a sharp distinction between a people and a system, between a country and a policy, between France and colonialism. A nation is the vehicle of a civilization; it is the positive sum of constructive and energetic efforts developed by the inhabitants in the different walks of life for the common good of humanity. France, in fact, is an example of that.

A political doctrine like colonialism is a completely circumstantial attitude, however long it may last. It changes with events; it disappears with the great transformations of history.

A people deserves our respect; and it has this respect. The problem of a policy in which the truth must be reached **must** be the subject of frank and detailed examination. This goal can be reached only if the premises of the problem are made completely clear. This line of demarcation between a nation and a group of people equipped with a specific political doctrine or attitude must be defined.

In support of this idea, I should like to quote extracts from the American book "Imperialism and World Politics", written in 1926 by Parker Thomas Moon of Columbia University. This text is of great significance in 1957:

"The language frequently obscures truth much more than is usually realized. Our eyes are blinded before the facts of international relations by the play of language. When we use the simple symbol, 'France', we think of France as a unity, as an entity. When, to avoid cumbrous repetition, we use the personal pronoun in speaking of a country, when, for example, we say that France sent its troops to conquer Tunisia, we attribute not only a unity but also a personality to the country. Words often conceal facts and make international relations a play in which nations play the role of actors, and we forget the men and women of flesh and blood who are the true actors. Things would be quite different if the word 'France' did not exist and if we were compelled to say 38 million men and women and children of very different beliefs and traditions, inhabiting a territory of 555,985 square kilometres, then we would have to describe the Tunisian expedition in a more accurate manner, such as this, 'A small number among the 38 million people sent 30,000 others to conquer Tunisia'. That way of describing things would involve a series of questions. Who were that small number? Why did they send these people to Tunisia? Why did these people obey them?"

The author continued in one of the chapters to give a detailed study of the activities of a small group, composed of importers, exporters, manufacturers, transportation and communications agents, shipbuilders, certain diplomats, officials, military people, and good young people misled by the idea of self-defence, popular ideas of national prestige -- which do so much harm -- a civilizing mission and so forth, theories which explain why they agree to let themselves be killed.

Therefore, we have every reason to put, on the one side, people as a factor of progress thanks to their numerous contributions to civilization, and, on the other side, a political doctrine with its representatives and its defenders.

This scholarly conclusion is a sound reason which should be added to the other reasons for maintaining and consolidating friendship between nations. Why are there national struggles, sometimes of an evolutionary and sometimes of a revolutionary nature? This goes back to the very nature and machinery of colonialism. The hand of the foreigner or the propaganda from outside is only the mask behind which colonialism hides. This is only a scapegoat for our own shortcomings. The experience of our own country and our observations from history, as well as the study of certain texts, have convinced our delegation of the truths which follow and which appear today as rules almost universally acknowledged in the former colonial countries and the countries which are still dependent. We shall state these in quite a general way, because they apply to all the territories which were included within the framework of the old empires. We shall only illustrate our opinions by citing the case of Algeria. We shall thus avoid repetition and overlapping with the statements of other representatives.

(1) National freedom is the essential condition of individual freedom. Colonialism is a contemporary version of the instinct of domination, and its first task is the exerting of all its efforts to do away with national freedom, represented by the existence of the State, the structure of the nation, and the exercise of power. Algeria was an independent nation with its own government. It was transformed into a colony, and then annexed in the form of a French Department. This unilateral measure was accompanied by an intense activity of "depersonalization", which is a very common word in Algeria, in order to absorb, materially and intellectually, the Algerian people within the entity of French territory. This effort met with resistance on the part of the Algerians, as we shall see. The two forces, domination and freedom, opposed each other and continue to oppose each other fiercely. The issue was the triumph or the disappearance of Algerian personality. Hence, there was a breach of the peace, and that is why it appears that peace is inseparable from freedom.

That is why, too, the central problem in the question of Algeria resides in agreement or disagreement concerning the aspirations of the Algerian people for freedom. A people which has lost its freedom never loses the memory of that national freedom, whatever may be the force or the stroke of the pen which made it

lose its freedom temporarily. The most simple solution, therefore, is the return to the natural order of things, the re-establishment of that freedom.

(2) In this permanent struggle between the conqueror and the conquered, the conqueror seeks to maintain his domination by more and more weakening the victim in all branches of life. That is why development and progress are incompatible with the colonial system, if one thinks of the people as a whole and not of those who exploit the colonies. That is why no colony has become a modern nation within the framework of and with the assistance of colonialism. Such a thing just does not exist. The territory is developed unilaterally for the benefit of the European element; the indigenous population is chained in poverty, ignorance and fear.

History shows that the opposite phenomenon is true, that after emancipation, all obstacles in the path of progress are removed, and the country, by its reforms and its initiatives which are in the interests of all the people, becomes a modern nation. The United States of America is the best illustration of this.

(Mr. Ben-Aboud, Morocco)

(3) Democracy and colonialism are mutually exclusive. They are incompatible with each other and mutually exclusive because one kills the other. Democracy, which can be described as government by the consent of the people, presupposes the right to choose and decide. Conversely, colonialism can be described as a form of government whose origin is always foreign, a government which is imposed by force and based on domination and feudal authority. There can only be an alliance between that idea and one type of the local population, that is local feudalism. The only association possible between the two elements is association between colonialism and local feudalism, because they have a common interest and a common ideology. This is the essentially authoritarian nature of colonialism, which proves that in Algeria, as well as in other colonies, there is no democratic form of government; indeed, there can be no such form of government in any colony. There are some statuses of a fictional democracy, but if they are examined more closely their true nature can be seen.

(4) The attempt to stop intellectual development runs parallel with the attempt to stop the material progress of the population. This is true in Algeria, as well as in other countries, where one phenomenon is striking. It is not by chance that in all colonies, whatever be the duration of colonialism, whether two or three centuries in Asia or a century and a quarter or less in North Africa, the schools receive an average of only 10 to 20 per cent of the children of school age. In all colonies, 80 or 90 per cent of the remaining children pass their time in the streets and are compelled to earn their bread or beg for their bread while still very young. I believe that any tourist will be familiar with the sad spectacle of children in such conditions without, however, knowing the basic reasons for that situation. This curious phenomenon is easily explained.

The exploitation of the colony requires very low-rank employees for work in telephone offices, post offices and all the rest. The metropolitan country cannot supply these workers; they must be produced on the spot as a working tool. The colonial Power is very careful, however, not to exceed the number of schools or even the quality of instruction beyond that necessity. However, a small number of students escape from this systematic blocking of their education, a blocking which is designed to avoid the danger of what might result from higher education.

(Mr. Ben-Aboud, Morocco)

As in the material field, which is subject to rigid control, intellectual education is subject to rigid control. This can explain to some of our French friends who say, "We have educated them in our schools and they are nationalists against us", that they escaped from that control and therefore they understood.

(5) The exercise of various freedoms is incompatible with the existence of the colonialist system. Human rights are lacking and the means of expression are suppressed. This is why we have had recourse recently to the only remaining means, namely, insurrection. If the pressure of circumstances impose their provisional use, especially for reasons of publicity, the authorities have employed seizures, arrests, concentration camps, summary executions, and so forth.

But the comedy of democracy and justice is clearly revealed in the staging of elections. There we see the conflict between colonialism and democracy, the eternal game of the cat and the mouse, which can only end in the disappearance of freedom or of colonialism.

(6) The form of domination is total in a colonialist system. It includes everything. It includes political domination, cultural domination, social domination -- it even includes domination in religious matters, where control is extended to religion and religious instruction. The indigenous population, wounded in their relations with God, resist sporadically and, from time to time, win brief victories.

The purpose of this total domination is to neutralize Algerian resistance to colonialism so as to annex the territory and assimilate the population. It is done to block all efforts towards national independence.

(7) Colonialism appears as the modern version of the instinct for domination. If we look at it more closely, it is nothing more than prolonged occupation, which begins, as with every occupation, with an armed invasion. A military government is set up by a police state in order to impose complete control over the country. A propaganda system is put into force and patriots are described as outlaws. It is the expression which is used today -- they are ambitious people who form a minority and who do not represent the country. If they offer armed resistance, they are called terrorists. In the United States and in the United Nations they are called Communists.

(Mr. Ben-Aboud, Morocco)

This accusation of communism reminds me of the charges levelled against the Moroccan and Tunisian nationalists in recent years, at a time when Mussolini was in power and stated, "I am the sword of Islam". We were then accused of being in the pay of Mussolini. Later, it was said that we passed into the service of Hitler. After that, during the American landing in North Africa, suspicions were transferred to the United States Army, and Mr. Robert Murphy was the subject of attacks in some local French newspapers. Then Stalin became the scarecrow, and we were accused of being the servants of communism under the direction of Stalin. We noticed in yesterday's New York Times a new accusation, namely ARAMCO, the famous oil company, which was accused of supporting or even maintaining the Algerian rebellion.

Only God can tell the future, and I cannot think of the scarecrow which will next be used in the coming years.

(8) The game which colonialism plays with freedom is carried out through a reform policy. This serves the purposes of publicity abroad and as a pretext for delaying any improvements within the colony. In fact, there is a perpetual blocking of progress so as to make the argument of a civilizing mission perpetual -- it is used to justify perpetual colonialization.

(9) It appears from these general considerations that colonialism, whether it assumes the form of mandate, protectorate, colony or any other, is everywhere the same.

(Mr. Ben-Aboud, Morocco)

Moreover, it is said that in protectorates there is an interlocutor in the form of the Head of the State. In Algeria this is not so. At the time of its independence, as we shall see in a moment, Algeria had a government directed by a Head of State. The Algerian Government was simply done away with, and the Head of the State as well.

Not very long ago there was a protectorate with the attributes of autonomy, at least nominally. With a stroke of the pen, that protectorate was transformed into a colony, and the Head of the State was exiled. In our times, the country has become a colony. I am speaking of Madagascar. In Morocco for some time the valid spokesman was eliminated by exiling the Sultan to Madagascar. In Tunisia, the Bey died in exile. In Indo-China, three kings were exiled.

What is lacking is not valid spokesmen. They are much closer to the French Government than they are to us at the present time. They are in Paris, five of them. What is lacking is the consent of France to open the dialogue of freedom with Algeria.

We have deliberately kept to these generalities, in order to demonstrate that the struggle of Algeria for freedom is to be placed within the general framework of struggles for liberation and emancipation which characterize the modern period and that it is not foreign intervention that is the basic element. In fact, the most striking feature of the post-war period, as we said a while ago, is the disappearance of colonialism and its replacement by frank and sincere co-operation on a footing of equality.

The efforts to annex Algeria as a French department are described correctly as a fiction. In our view, they are in vain and do not deserve our attention any longer. The stroke of a pen is powerless to upset the natural order, to change the souls of peoples and to wipe out the languages and civilizations of nations. Algeria is a nation; France is another. Colonialism does not accept that truth. Algeria can never forget that it is a nation, different from France, conquered for a time and returning periodically to armed resistance and revolutionary resistance.

General Cavaignac, one of the conquerors of Algeria, described the national feeling of the people in these terms as early as that time:

(Mr. Ben-Aboud, Morocco)

"A nation never loses its independence without regret. Resistance is in its mind. What it accepts it does not allow, it tolerates."

To tell all the history of the colonization of Algeria is rather to tell the true history of the Algerian resistance to a foreign army preceding and following an army of colonists and exploiters. Besides the legend of the civilizing mission, there is another legend that we would be tempted to call the legend of spontaneous generation, by virtue of which Algeria, thanks to the French, by a Walt Disney trick, changed from nothing into a flowering, burgeoning territory developing in a completely unsuspected manner, no mention being made of the fact that the development of the country was directed for the exclusive profit of the settlers.

Algeria was an independent nation. At the time of the invasion of that country, the French Government assumed the task of proving and defending the existence of the independence of Algeria. Official declarations maintained that the Regency of Algiers was an independent State. I can do no better than to let Frenchmen answer other Frenchmen. A few days after the taking of Algiers, Turkey protested to the French Government. General Guilleminot, who was then Ambassador of France at Constantinople, set forth in a memorandum to the Sublime Port, at the time of the Conference of 14 August 1830, the position of Algeria in the following terms:

"The Regency of Algiers is an independent State, appointing its Heads, declaring war, engaging in treaties."

Further on he says:

"Does not the Sublime Port recognize the political independence of Algiers when it offered mediation between the King of France and the Bey?"

That is a quotation from the book "Turkish Policy in North Africa", by Serras, pages 55-56, quoted in the newspaper Istiqlal on 27 July 1956 by Mr. Archaoui.

It is not always easy to change history. In 1830 the Algerian State existed. It would be exaggerating to say, with the Foreign Minister of France, Mr. Pineau, that the authority of the Bey did not extend beyond the city of Algiers. In fact, Algeria was divided into three provinces, Médéa, Oran and Constantine. . At the

(Mr. Ben-Aboud, Morocco)

head of each province there was what was then called a Bey, who was dependent on the central Government's power under the direction of the Head of the State, the Bey. The geographical limits of the Algerian State were exactly the same as Algeria today. As proof of this I shall cite only the two following facts. When it wished to build the fort at La Calle, France addressed itself to the Bey, and it was with his consent that that fort was constructed. As for the Western frontier, this is the one that Emir Abdel-Kader, the head of the Algerian resistance at the time, crossed when escaping from the French and taking refuge in Morocco.

At that period, because of the political identity of Algeria, France did not know whether or not it should establish a protectorate or a colony or restore the independence of Algeria, so well anchored was the idea of Algeria as a separate State in people's minds. A long and costly struggle was foreseen. England was a disturbing antagonist at that time. Public opinion in England was described in an article in the newspaper Courrier and transmitted to the French Foreign Minister by the French Embassy in London on 13 April 1830. This is an extract from the same source as I referred to a moment ago:

"By what right would France attempt to impose its yoke on another country?" They did not say "Republics" at that time. "Would it not be in greater conformity with its honour and interests to allow the Algerians to choose their own Government and at the same time give themselves institutions which the humanity and generosity of France might prescribe, rather than retain Algiers as a French possession?"

In this small quotation we see that the words "Algiers" and "Algeria" were used as synonyms. I go on with the quotation:

"And is it not thought that a liberal and national Government under the protection of France and Europe would be more profitable for the inhabitants than having a French General as their Governor?"

(Mr. Ben-Aboud, Morocco)

It appears from the above -- that is, it appears from official testimony as well as from international public opinion -- that Algeria was not a chaotic mixture of Kabyle republics and Arab kingdoms, as was recently stated by Prime Minister Guy Mollet. The French Government of that time said that Algeria was an independent State. The French Government today tells us that there was no Algeria at all. The excuse generally given to the public as the reason for the conquest of Algiers was the celebrated incident involving the striking of the Consul with a fan. In 1955, a magazine mentioned the basic reasons for that conquest in an article by a professor at the University of Algiers. He mentions "the temptation constituted, for a French Government with its finances in a bad way -- since the autumn of 1829 -- by the treasures which had been accumulated in the castle of the Bey of Algiers, treasures estimated at more than 150 million francs at that time".

Algeria was also desired as a market, a source of raw materials and labour, and a source of military manpower for the French army.

This wealth of the Algerian Government proves that Algeria, an independent country, was moreover a prosperous one. There is much evidence to this effect. But what was even more important was the Algerian national consciousness at that time. General Bugeaud, one of the first conquerors and theoreticians of the total colonization of Algeria, sent a letter, eleven years after the invasion of Algeria, that is, in 1841, to the supporters of the head of the Algerian resistance, Abdul Qader, asking them to abandon that leader. He received a reply brought back by General Daumas. This is an extract from it:

"You tell us that you are a strong and powerful nation and that we cannot fight against you. The powerful and the strong are just. However, you wish to seize a country which does not belong to you. And, if you are rich, what business have you among a people that has only powder to give you? You threaten us and say that you will burn our harvests and feed them to your horses and your beasts of burden. We shall never submit to you."

(Mr. Ben-Aboud, Morocco)

Another ultimatum by the same person, in 1844, received a similar reply, from which I shall quote an extract:

"If your formal intention is to possess all of Algeria, we shall tell you that the hand of God is higher than yours. Neither should you think that the loss of our crops or our trees can put us at your mercy."

Thus, from 1830 until 1871, a fierce struggle was unleashed between the few colonizers and Algerian patriotism. That struggle was fierce, bitter and often inhuman. The news of the ravages of war and the massacres which were provoked spread concurrently in France and Europe and awakened the authentic conscience of France, that is to say, its human conscience. Public opinion became disturbed. The public conscience of France was revolted. The French Government, faithful to moral principles, decided to send a commission of enquiry, called the Commission for Africa. The investigation was carried out over a period of only three months -- from September to November 1833. The balance-sheet of this short period describes what happened:

"We appropriated for the national domain the property of the charitable foundations. We seized the property of a class of inhabitants that we had promised to respect. We began the exercise of our power with a forced loan of 100,000 francs. We seized private property without compensation and, more often than not, we went so far as to compel owners expropriated in that way to pay for the expenses of the demolition of their houses and even of a mosque. We rented buildings of the domain to third parties. We profaned temples, graves and places sacred to the Moslems. It is known that the necessities of war are sometimes irresistible, but one can find, in the application of extreme measures, delicate and even just methods which hide the odious nature of these measures. We massacred people carrying safe-conducts and we slaughtered whole groups of people who were then found to be innocent. We tried men who had good reputations in the country, men who were venerated because they had enough courage to expose themselves to our fury in order to intercede in behalf of their unfortunate countrymen. Judges were found to condemn them and civilized men to have them executed. We exceeded in barbarity the barbarians whom we came to civilize."

In spite of the massive destruction of the population and its property, the national consciousness became stronger and stronger. The first leader of Algerian resistance, Abdul Qader, waged war against the invasion forces until 1847. More than 40,000 soldiers and 500 million francs of that period were required to win victory over him. But, in 1859, there was a new rising which demonstrated once again the will of the Algerians to live as free men in their own country.

Another uprising in 1864, followed in 1871 by a general insurrection, left no doubt concerning the firm determination of the Algerians to fight the occupation of their country. Revolts and repressions and provocations were then multiplied. They took place in 1881, in 1904, in 1916 and, finally, in 1945, before reaching the present time. To bring about final submission, the forces of conquest resorted to all means, without distinction. Marshal de Saint-Arnaud recognized, in his correspondence, the following facts:

"The country of Beni Menasser is superb and among the richest I have seen in Africa. The villages are very close together. We burned everything, destroyed everything. The beautiful orange trees that I am going to destroy! Today I am burning the property and the villages of Ben Salem and of Bel-Cassem or Kassi."

At the same time as the military offensive, an offensive of economic destruction was launched. A vast movement of confiscation and expropriation of land was carried out. Marshal Bugeaud declared, on 14 May 1840: "Wherever there is good and fertile land, that is where settlers must be placed, without bothering to find out to whom the land belongs."

(Mr. Ben-Aboud, Morocco)

The result, after more than a century of land alienation, is that 25,000 Europeans possess about 2,720,000 hectares of good land, without counting State lands. Three-fourths of the settlers possess an average land area of twenty-eight hectares. The less productive land, 7,672,000 hectares, are shared by 532,000 Algerian land owners, three-quarters of them possessing an average area of only five hectares.

This economic deterioration has become a system. Government aid to agriculture is one of the gravest aspects of the discrimination between Europeans and Algerians. Maurice Viollette, a Radical Deputy in the National Assembly pointed out on 12 October 1955 that "agricultural appropriations were to the benefit of Europeans to the extent of 99 per cent and to the Algerians 1 per cent.

The same applies to education and was described in 1864 by General Ducros who drafted for Napoleon III a report entitled, "Report on the Means Used for the Pacification of Algeria". The spirit of colonialism in those times was described concisely. I shall quote an extract:

"Let us limit as much as possible the development of Moslem schools.

In a word, let us attempt to bring about the moral and material disarmament of the indigenous people."

Further on he says:

"On the contrary, let us act in the contrary sense on the European element. Let us create and develop by all means available the minds and the military organization of our settlers."

As a matter of fact, all European children now attend school, while less than 20 per cent of the Algerian children do so.

This is not the time or the place which would allow us to carry out a study of all the details of the colonization of Algeria. Our intention is simply to bring out the elements of the problem, which, in our view, amount to two principal elements: on the one hand, the legitimate aspirations of the Algerian people to freedom; and, on the other hand, the colonial opposition to those aspirations.

(Mr. Ben-Aboud, Morocco)

We have just reviewed some aspects of the struggle between these two adversaries. We have also just mentioned some of the means used by both. On one side, colonialism forms an element of extraordinary power. The defenders of this system -- in company or individually -- exercise such a great pressure on events that they constitute an insurmountable dam against the national aspirations of the Algerian people. This group has been called "the masters of North Africa" by some authors. This group is small in number. Its wealth is inversely proportional to its numbers. It is indeed negligible in comparison with the people of all classes and all intellectual backgrounds, although, occasionally, misled by history textbooks, and will not tolerate the idea of a reconquest by Algeria. This small group lays claim to patriotic and national feelings in France when it needs the French Army. Its most genuine spirit consists much more in the instinct of domination to protect profits than the protection of moral values which it disfigures in the letter and the spirit.

The psychology of these people is characterized by confusion between force and justice. This engenders and explains a superiority complex transformed immediately into racialism whose daily language gives an exact picture of that mentality. It is commonly heard in Algeria: "He was an Arab, but he was dressed like a person".

This danger of racism would be negligible if it were limited to that small group. But, on the one hand, the falsification of history in the textbooks justify the conquest through references to the civilizing mission, and it creates a feeling of superiority which is somewhat more extensive; but, on the other hand, those who exploit the colony are opposed to raising the intellectual level, to raising salaries and improving social conditions. This is done in order to have cheap labour and to reduce their expenses. Their opposition requires propaganda saying that the Arabs can get along with very little and that to open schools for the Arabs is, to use their own expression, to throw money out of the window, and that the Arabs are well off when they are huddled together in shanty-towns.

This propaganda aggravates racism and it is spread throughout European circles in Algeria. When the pressure of necessity leads the national movement to make even very timid claims, repression follows from the European circles concerned, even including some innocent minds which are misled by falsifications of history which are taught in school or by verbal offensives launched in the local European newspapers.

(Mr. Ben-Aboud, Morocco)

Such a psychological attitude is incapable of accepting the idea of freedom for Algeria. Public opinion thus believes in the superior race of the conqueror and in the inferior race of the conquered, in the terminology of the colonialists themselves.

A visitor to Algeria before the present insurrection felt heartsick at the picture of the Algerians who were humiliated. The native population was conscious of the fact that it had been free in history, that it was a specific people, that it had been dispossessed by force, that it had been removed from the exercise of power and from participation in the administration of the country, that it was limited in its intellectual, scientific and technical development and that every day, from morning to night, it was the object of arbitrary, discriminatory and humiliating measures at every moment. Their hurt look became even more sadder at the idea that, moreover, the Algerian men and women did not even have the right to defend themselves. An army of spies added to the police terror the feeling of insecurity and daily suspicion. This sad look can be called by one name only: moral misery, the feeling of being dominated in their own country without having the right to move or to change their condition.

But if public opinion is misled by the falsification of the truth in books and in newspapers, the agents of colonization, as well as their servants, know very well that they are defending material interests by means of their domination in the Government.

The most striking illustration of this fact is given by the fixing of the elections. I mention this electoral trickery to defend the alarm felt by the Algerians when they hear the word election, mainly in the future.

The magazine Esprit of 10 October 1951 published an article called "Unanimous Algeria", dealing with these elections which are unique. Here are some extracts:

"The Moslem voters were quickly enlightened. These men, to whom it had been repeated that liberty had finally returned, had frequently travelled, often on foot, for tens of kilometres. Humiliated, pushed around, sometimes beaten, they went back sadly to find their chains."

It is said further on:

"From the morning, delegates -- even candidates -- were expelled from the polling places. Those among them who, in conformity with the law, had succeeded the day before -- in the communes which had not yet received the latest instructions -- in getting receipts authorizing them to check on all the voting operations, were treated brutally. Attempts were made to take these receipts away from them, a flagrant proof of the legitimacy of their rights. And when they tried to oppose this, as in the commune of Constantine, they were thrown into gaol from seven o'clock in the morning with a charge which is amusing: public distribution of ballots on the day of the vote."

Further on the article says:

"The assessors are chosen in advance by the chefs de communes. The polling places are presided over by agents of the public authority."

Further on the article continues:

"The vote is taken with an open ballot. At the door a person distributes to all voters the ballots of the Ben Djeloul list. The voters enter, present that ballot at the same time as their card, receive an envelope, put this ballot in the envelope and throw it in the box without going into a closed voting booth.

"In the Lamy (Constantine) ward, the polling place is open at 9.35 a.m. The ballots of Dr. Ben Djeloul are submitted in closed envelopes.

"In another ward of Constantine, armed guards are inside and at the doors of the polling places.

"In Affreville, Algiers, ten mandatories of the candidates are removed and returned to their families only the next day. The procedure is simple but of incontestable effectiveness."

This is another example of the experience of the Algerian nationalists who submitted candidates in the sixty electoral districts for the Algerian Assembly set up under the statute of 1947. Mr. Naegelen, the Governor-General -- a socialist too -- was entrusted with the organization of these elections. From the first phase of the electoral campaign, thirty-nine of the nationalist candidates were arrested. One of them, Mr. Yazid, who was abundantly quoted by Mr. Pineau in his speech and who was at the time Secretary-General of the

Association of North African Students was not able to start his electoral campaign. He was kidnapped when he got off the plane which brought him from Paris to Algiers and received a sentence of two years in which he can meditate on the meaning of democracy.

This electoral system is carried on in broad daylight without any concealment. On the contrary it is used as a reply, as a warning to the Central Government by the local settlers. A colon made the following statement on 7 March 1947 to a special correspondent of Paris-Presse:

"We are tired of this ridiculous business of native elections. If we had succeeded once in getting them going in the right direction we would not always have to begin again. We must get through with them. We do not want any more governments distinguished by obsolete sentimentality, but we want strong men who know how to respect our rights by showing force and possibly by using it. In 1936 I sabotaged the Blum-Viollette project and the Government surrendered to me. Why did General de Gaulle have to get mixed up in this business again? I know how to handle them."

This statement is quoted by Jeanson in his "Algeria outside the law" on page 88.

Another colon, Mr. Borgeot, says the same thing in another form:

"Sympathy for our overseas populations is one of our most incontestable collective shortcomings. We are the most sentimental of the great imperialist races."

In another statement, the same Borgeot says:

"Fraternity is in the republican motto. It activates, it ennobles. Its dignity and beauty are, however, forgotten. Let us see that it is not offered to races which are indifferent or hostile as a gift."

Alongside these obvious confessions, testimony of great value is in our possession. I will limit myself to two quotations from this. The first was written by Mr. Jacques Fonlupt-Esperaber, then a member of the National Assembly and an influential member of the Mouvement Republicain Populaire, on 14 April 1949:

"It is not the voters who have chosen those who were elected. The Administration designated them by using a tested method which regrettable experience in Algeria had taught it how to use. The facts are not only indisputable; they are avowed facts. None of the officials whom I saw had any idea of disputing the fact that in Algeria elections are the work of the Administration. Everybody told me that more or less clearly. One of them told me explicitly, in the presence of our colleague Mr. Pierre-Henri Teitgen, that he was carrying out the orders that he had received, that he was carrying out the elections in accordance with instructions."

The second piece of testimony is to be found in a report of Mr. Jacques Soustelle, who is present in this room, on 1 June 1955, a report to the Government of Mr. Faure and the contents of which have been divulged by Mr. Mendès-France's weekly L'Express. This report of Mr. Soustelle, who was then Governor-General of Algeria, was kept secret. L'Express emphasized that Mr. Soustelle himself seems to have forgotten it. He confirms the stacking of the elections; he shows the quality of those elected and he helps us to understand why any idea of elections in a country which is not free is a trap to gain time and a means of dominating the Government by "pre-fabricated" elections designed to have the sound of freedom, by propaganda about reforms which are rather deformations than reforms:

"The pseudo-elections, generally termed 'pre-fabricated' elections installed by means of electoral frauds individuals who were often illiterate and frequently dishonest. They represent nothing and no one, they are capable of exerting no influence in their constituencies and render no service to the Administration which manufactured them. Few errors are more tragic than that which consisted of evading our own laws to set up persons who are discredited and have no intellectual or moral value."

The most ridiculous part was that at the head of the Commission of National Education of that Algerian Assembly was a man who did not know how to read or write. Mr. François Mauriac, speaking of the Algerians, said:

"After having finally given them the right to vote we openly made the election fraudulent." That is in L'Express of 7 September 1956.

EIG/an

A/C.1/PV.834
49-50

(Mr. Ben-Aboud, Morocco)

The avowed purpose of removing the Algerians from public affairs, was the monopoly of the Government and the Administration, of those who exploit Algeria. To do this, it is inevitable that the Algerians must be treated with harshness. I shall not dwell on the daily humiliations.

What is much more important is to understand this colonialist opposition, this colonialist adversary, which is very easy to analyse. He defends an authoritarian, feudal and essentially discriminatory system in order to protect his individual interests. As there is no justice in domination, it is inevitable that force must be used.

Then recourse is had to the police State and there is resort to the armed forces of the Metropolitan country. We understand the term "colonialist adversary" as being a small number of virulent colons and not the entire population of European origin in Algeria. Yesterday, Mr. Pineau told us that there are 1,200,000 Europeans, or French -- we do not know exactly -- in Algeria. This element constitutes an argument rather than a difficulty. This argument is well known in connexion with the study of the Moroccan and Tunisian question and it is advanced today to oppose the solution to be given in Algeria.

But these statistics deserve reconsideration. Among these statistics we find the number of French living in Algeria. We are really not too sure of that number. Out of 10 million inhabitants, we are told that there are 1,200,000 Frenchmen, who are sometimes called Frenchmen and sometimes called Europeans. In fact they include Frenchmen, Italians, Spaniards, Maltese and others, as was acknowledged by Mr. Pineau the day before yesterday. We must add to these the 135,000 Jewish Algerians who were naturalized by France. This number of Europeans varies depending on the political temperature of the moment. It goes from 750,000 to 1,200,000. It expands and contracts depending on the circumstances. In any case, the percentage of Europeans to the population is exactly the same in Algeria as in Tunisia.

This argument is a deception, like so many others. The same language was used in connexion with the Moroccan problem to exaggerate their difficulties, which are more fictitious than real. The other element in this Franco-Algerian conflict is that the Algerian people are fighting for freedom. It wants finally to introduce justice into its country, to put an end to exploitation, to end daily injustices and to eliminate humiliation. Its programme is thus a reaction against the attitude of the element which is exploiting its country. This programme can be summed up in its national aspirations.

If a demand is made for freedom, it is in order to obtain the surest safeguard of human treatment for all Algerian citizens, whatever be their origin. The people want technical and social progress to be carried out in equity, that justice be equal for all, that there be an equal distribution of the fruits of civilization. They are fighting so that people and property may enjoy the same protection before the law. The people spare no effort in order that human dignity may be respected. In a word, the Algerians are consenting to the greatest sacrifices in order to defend the highest moral values, such as equity, justice, dignity of the human person, and so on.

The method of carrying out raids, of filling concentration camps, and the treatment given to prisoners, indicate that they are treated as cattle. The leit-motif of all the plans of reform, which are only means of gaining time, shall consist of saying: let us improve the economic and social situation and everything will be all right. Which amounts to saying that by giving food to people they will shut up. First, the colonialists will never agree to those improvements, those reforms, because of the danger of reduction in their own profits. Then this notion of man does not do honour to the intellectual value of the brain which produced it. The human being is reduced merely to a digestive tract.

The Algerians are convinced, after long, bitter and vain experience, that the only effective way of securing and protecting the moral values which assure their dignity resides only in freedom. They have understood, like all the other recently liberated nations, that freedom in its most general sense is both an end and a means. As a means, in the form of national freedom, it raises the obstacles put on the path of progress by colonialism. A reform movement makes sense and is justified only to the extent that these reforms are proposed and implemented by the people concerned themselves, and that is what we are doing today in my country.

Our experience has shown us that the reform movement consists -- that is, unilaterally proposed -- of taking with the left hand what it gives with the right. Such a policy is designed merely to maintain its unilateral paternalist nature, which must precisely be changed by converting the institutions, by bringing the Algerian people back to freedom and satisfying its national aspirations. The Algerians state on every occasion that they want democracy with executive power.

The presence of a Governor-General is the very antithesis of these aspirations. Thus, national freedom is the way of freeing the individual. The freedom of the individual is an end in itself. It alone allows the liberation of the human person by protecting him against infringements on his dignity. It provides freedom from fear, ignorance and hunger and it ensures us against illness and abuses. It allows the human being to carry on a life in accordance with the greatest spiritual significance of man.

The second element of the Franco-Algerian conflict, the indigenous element, expresses itself through the activity of the Algerian patriots. This political expression assumed three successive forms. In the last forty years of the conquest, it took advantage of the most natural way, the one which we described, and that is the armed resistance to an armed invasion. Later on it resorted to a peaceful political movement, but which was interlarded with revolt. Then the true nature of colonialism appeared. Any claim or demand for reforms was repressed by violence. The camp of colonization, in accordance with its habit, sometimes went even further. It provoked discontent and revolt in order then to rip the movement in the bud, thus assuring a long period of calm.

The national struggle then reached its third phase, the phase of the present insurrection, which has lasted more than two years. It assumed the name of the National Liberation Front. On the French side there are two groups as regards public opinion. The first wishes to turn history backwards. It refuses to have any change in structure; it is conservative. It opposes recognizing the right of the people of Algeria to self-determination. It requires a military prerequisite, that is, a cease-fire.

(Mr. Ben-Aboud, Morocco)

Since experience has filled the colonial peoples with mistrust, the Algerian people fears to lay down its arms. It is afraid of seeing the leaders of the national struggle exterminated after the cease fire in order to leave the field free for the French Army to occupy the whole territory and thus wipe out Algerian opposition. Indonesia once accepted a cease fire during its national struggle. The Netherlands took advantage of that moment of peace to reorganize its forces and launch an attack against the Indonesians. The Algerians, then, ask themselves this question: "Who can tell us that the camp of colonialism will not do the same, and that a cease fire will not be followed by an attack to liquidate the nationalists?"

A second body of opinion, on the French side, is that of persons of good faith and goodwill. They are very numerous in France and in Algeria, and sometimes they join the Algerians in the same prisons. They understand that reason, experience and justice recommend, first of all, a political prerequisite, namely, the recognition of the national aspirations of Algeria to freedom. They realize the trap into which the colonialists wish to draw simultaneously the Algerian nationalists, people of good faith and goodwill in France, and even the United Nations itself by proclaiming this trilogy: "A cease fire, elections, and discussion" -- but not negotiation. They know very well that Mr. Mollet's plan means the acceptance in principle of that cease fire; then there would be no delay before the Government would demand the disarming of the Algerians, which would be a logical consequence, and as was the case in the Tunisian question. Then, in addition, there would be control of all the strategic points of the liberated zone in Algeria. Finally, there would be fraudulent elections in which those elected would, as usual, be prefabricated illiterates, which would make it possible for us to say that through them France would be negotiating with France itself. An army of inspectors would be needed. There would have to be as many groups of from five to ten persons as there were polling places -- something which no one could supply -- in order to dispel the misgivings of the Algerians.

Those among the French intellectuals who know the Algerian problem well, and those, like us, who have had the experience of living under a colonial regime, see only one solution to the Algerian problem. It is the most natural solution; it is in conformity with history; it reflects international public opinion; it is in the conscience of every individual; it is the only valid solution; and to stifle it or to ignore it is merely to postpone it. Then it would come back repeatedly

(Mr. Ben-Aboud, Morocco)

to the General Assembly, posing itself in a more imperious way because it would be surrounded by more tragic and serious events. That solution is to recognize national aspirations to freedom. It is simple. The Moroccan Government has taken a clear stand on this point. The Foreign Minister of the Government of His Majesty Sultan Mohammed V, Mr. Ahmed Balafrej, during the general debate at this eleventh session of the General Assembly, stated the following:

"Our love of peace and freedom has led us to seek the means of securing a peaceful settlement of this painful dispute. The stability, the security and the peace of North Africa depend upon the outcome, and in application of the principle of the right of peoples to self-determination laid down in the Charter of the United Nations, we urge most strongly that the bloodshed be stopped. No problem has ever been solved by recourse to force and violence, and unilateral decisions cannot bring about sound or lasting settlements. ... The honest efforts of His Majesty the Sultan, in our relations with France, to find some common ground between the two parties and to bring about a peaceful solution of the Algerian problem, have been misconstrued and coolly received by the French Government. ...

"The fact that there is an Algerian nation and an Algerian character cannot be validly denied, and there is no need to delve into history or sociology to prove it. The claim that Algeria forms part of French territory is a fiction which will not bear scrutiny. Algeria lies across the Mediterranean from France and has its own frontiers and institutions. Politically, as well as economically and socially, the laws applied in Algeria were never identical to those applied in French territory. The system of government established in Algeria is basically different from the French system, not to speak of ethnic factors of civilization and culture. The occupation of Algerian territory for almost 130 years would alone have been sufficient to strengthen the Algerian character and to prove, if proof were needed, that Algeria is not France. Admittedly, there is in Algeria a strong minority of Europeans, especially Frenchmen or foreigners who have acquired French nationality; but the existence of this minority must not prevent the search for a peaceful, just and equitable solution of the Algerian problem. As the representatives of

(Mr. Ben-Aboud, Morocco)

the Algerian people have themselves stressed, any solution which would give satisfaction to Algeria's national aspirations would safeguard the legitimate interests of this minority. It could continue, in peace and security, with equal rights and obligations and in a spirit of fruitful co-operation, the work in which it has participated. But the legitimate rights of the Algerian people cannot be sacrificed to the goodwill of the minority and to the preservation of its interest alone. World progress can no longer tolerate privilege or the exploitation by force of an entire people which demands freedom and respect of its dignity.

"Morocco, now renascent after its struggle against colonialism, would, like all countries which have undergone the same ordeal, place great value on a resolution of this Assembly urging the parties concerned to apply the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, so that wisdom and reason may prevail and an end be made of the bloodshed and violence which an uncomprehending policy has brought about in this part of the world."

The Moroccan Government, conscious of the importance and the dangers of the Algerian question, had decided to contribute its help to this people. It was surprised and disappointed by the interception of the Moroccan aeroplane carrying the Algerian nationalists. These efforts exerted by the Moroccan Government consisted of talks between the French and Moroccan Governments, through the intermediary of His Highness Prince Moulay Hassan, and then a meeting of Algerian leaders with Moroccan authorities to prepare for a conference which was to be held in Tunisia.

In this connexion, Mr. Pineau made the following statement:

"...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 offences. 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..." (A/C.1/PV.831, page 11)

Mr. Pineau added:

"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..." (Ibid, pages 11-12)

This argument appears to us, to say the least, surprising and calls for clarification.

Did Mr. Pineau intend, when he spoke as he did, to submit that the police rights of a State are not an integral part of the exclusive sovereignty of that State? Did Mr. Pineau intend to claim that a foreign State has the right to exercise police rights over persons who come under the police of an independent and fully sovereign State? Did Mr. Pineau intend to maintain that France, in this particular case, had the right to arrest persons who were under Moroccan protection? This is an argument which, to say the least, is truly original and, in any case, dangerous.

The question which comes up in the legal sense is the following: By what right did France seize these people when they were under Moroccan protection, coming under the exclusive sovereignty of Morocco, under the rights of the Moroccan police? If these people who had been sentenced could be seized, why did France not request extradition in proper form, according to custom from the diplomatic point of view and from the point of view of international law? France did not do so; it confined itself to violating both moral and international law; it acted without law; and, what is more serious, at a time when it was speaking of respecting the principles of the Charter and of international law, of respect for Moroccan sovereignty, it was attempting to infringe on an inherent part of that sovereignty -- that is, the right of the Moroccan police to protect people under its authority.

(Mr. Ben-Aboud, Morocco)

To justify and legalize this reasoning, Mr. Pineau presented a surprising argument. He said that the plane "belonged to a Sherifian company owned largely by French stockholders". (Ibid., page 11) We do not argue this, but the question is whether this company was of French nationality. Of course, in some exceptional circumstances, particularly in time of war, account is taken of the origin of capital to determine the nationality of companies; hence the theory of control known to all lawyers. But it does not remain less true that, in normal times, the rule accepted by most legislation, and by Moroccan legislation, is that a company comes under the authority of the country where it has its headquarters. Therefore, in the case of the Sherifian company, it is incontestably Moroccan.

Secondly, Mr. Pineau considers that the plane which was carrying the Algerian leaders came under the Moroccan civil aviation services, which services, according to the protocol of 11 February 1956, fall under the French Ministry of Public Works. Such an assertion is completely unfounded. Mr. Pineau forgets that the protocol of 11 February 1956 preceded the declaration of independence of Morocco of 2 March 1956, after which declaration all the reserved services were transferred to Moroccan authority. That is why the civil aviation of Morocco now falls under the Moroccan Ministry of Public Works; and this is also the reason why Morocco is henceforth a member of the International Civil Aviation Organization, and has been for two months.

Thirdly, Mr. Pineau considers that the French crew of the aircraft had the right to disobey the orders of the military authorities of Algiers. Coming from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of France, this is a serious affirmation; in any case, it contradicts the repeated assurances of responsible French authorities, according to which an improvement in French-Moroccan relations is possible and desirable. How can one imagine the existence of such relations when the principal person responsible for French diplomacy, in speaking of French officials placed at the disposal of the Moroccan Government, tries to find excuses for their lack of discipline and their disobedience? In these circumstances one may wonder what prospects open up to us in the Technical and Administrative Assistance Convention which the French and Moroccan Governments have just completed.

(Mr. Ben-Aboud, Morocco)

The Moroccan position as set forth by His Majesty Mohammed V, and defined by Mr. Balafrej, Minister of Foreign Affairs, in the General Assembly, is quite clear. It is inspired by the most recent events; it is based on a genuine effort of good will, as was proved by the Head of the State on several occasions; it is based on a spirit of brotherhood, moderation and freedom, which form the framework of the United Nations Charter and which will be our eternal inspiration; it is designed to strengthen the links between France and North Africa in friendship, liberty and equality, links which are more than ever necessary.

The dispute between Algeria and France is made up of political factors: in the first place the recognition of the right of people to self-determination; ideological factors, relative to the just redistribution of freedom in a free world; economic factors, to safeguard and defend the legitimate interests without selfishness or domination; historic factors, in following the evolution of history developing in the direction of replacing colonial domination by freedom and co-operation; social factors, by the protection of democracy, respect for minorities and individuals; and finally, international factors, by the maintenance of peace and security. Thus, the complexity of the problem justifies recourse to the United Nations.

In addition to the reasons enumerated in the preceding references, we recall that it would be illogical to leave the camp of colonization as both judge and party. Moreover, the breach of peace in one region would not be delayed in spreading to its neighbours. The problem thus raised ceases automatically to be an internal problem. It was never an internal problem and it cannot be such.

(Mr. Ben-Aboud, Morocco)

The United Nations is morally obliged to consider this problem and to devote to it the efforts that it deserves. Only freedom can maintain peace. As we have said, the role of the United Nations is an urgent one at the present time, and it is of considerable importance for the future. The brief history of colonialism in Algeria, as we have indicated, has shown that those who dominate Algeria have acquired authoritarian habits which are all the more difficult to eradicate since they are old and rigid habits. The contribution of the United Nations to a solution of the Algerian problem would consist of re-education in the direction of freedom.

This Organization is the only political quarter which can defend the right of peoples to self-determination, since it is an international body in which the voice of Algeria may be heard indirectly through the countries which sympathize with it. This is the only political advantage which a weak country, dominated by and subjected to the military operations of a strong country, can derive from the moral progress inscribed in the Charter. Otherwise, there would be no reason to resort to our Organization. The only remaining alternative would be to abandon the weak to the mercy of the strong, as in the colonialist period of the nineteenth century. The United Nations, in the normal rate of progress towards the disappearance of colonialism, is in a position to expedite the coming of the era of freedom. This would be a considerable gain for the small countries, for the time which would otherwise be lost in a struggle, described as an imbecile struggle in the election speech of Mr. Guy Mollet, could be devoted to the reconstruction of the liberated country.

The labyrinth of reformism without issue would produce nothing but another insurrection which would be an aggravation of the present insurrection. From the occupation of 1830 to the attempt to drive the native people towards the south, through the periods of militarism, paternalism, neo-colonialism or assimilation, French colonialism has never thought of granting national freedom. There is not a single example of a part of the French Empire being liberated without violence. The United Nations, which is the instrument of peace, is just the body to put an end to or to shorten the bloody struggles of countries which are meant to be friendly and in need of each other. The assistance requested of this Organization is imperious because it is in the interest of all today.

The life and property of all the inhabitants of Algeria, without distinction, is insecure. There is a threat to world peace. It is no secret, as was mentioned yesterday, that the recent aggression by France in Egypt was motivated by the illusion that the Algerian insurrection was originated by Egypt, as though this insurrection was the first such insurrection in the history of Algerian nationalism. The help of this Organization is needed in order to get Algeria out of what has been called the Indo-Chinese rut. If the Algerians fight today, it is in order that the past humiliations, degradations, depersonalizations and discriminatory experiences shall not be renewed. They want to get to work in order to develop their own country without obstacles.

The official declarations of the French are based on the declarations made during the Indo-Chinese war and on the statements which preceded the happy solution of the Moroccan and Tunisian questions. At that time, a rapid solution was also refused. We asked for elections in Indo-China and we asked for valid spokesmen in North Africa. What actually happened was the monstrosity of a country divided into two in Indo-China. The spirit of all or nothing has proved harmful in practice. The North African solution was in the interests of all in the case of Morocco and Tunisia, and this throws a great light on the role which must be played by our Organization. Moreover, negotiations have been undertaken between Algerians and Frenchmen. This has been taken as a sign of good faith and of hope for the future. Morocco and Tunisia have been encouraged by this to offer their good offices.

The bad intentions of the colonialist group have not been tardy in reappearing and in interfering with our efforts and the efforts of their own Government. However, since it is the nature of an error to engender an even greater error, followed by a multiplicity of errors, colonialism not only failed to keep its word, but contravened a valid international law by intercepting a Moroccan plane. They went even further, they imprisoned the Algerian negotiators.

In the case of Algeria, colonialism understands its political actions either in the form of diplomacy or local reforms only in order to absorb the colony. I repeat this because it is a fundamental idea. The victim places all its hopes in the United Nations, which thus acquires a vital importance for all small countries. We expect that this Organization will not abandon its role and leave the prey in the mouth of the wolf. By protecting the weak, the United Nations itself will become strong.

The question of the competence of the United Nations to deal with the Algerian question was the subject of positive contributions last year, and these led to the inclusion of the item on the agenda of the last session of the General Assembly. These contributions will probably be repeated by many speakers at this Assembly. There is no longer any doubt about the competence of our Organization to deal with an armed conflict in which, on the French side, more than half a million soldiers with modern equipment are waging a war of conquest or reconquest against a people which is shedding its blood to defend the ideals of freedom and democracy on which the French democracy itself was built. We shall confine ourselves merely to associating ourselves with all those representatives who, last year and this year, defended the principle of the competence of our Organization in this bloody Algerian affair.

However, it should be recalled that resort to paragraph 7 of Article 2 has become frequent and somewhat arbitrary. It was invoked in the Tunisian and Moroccan questions, in spite of the illusions we had that they were autonomous States. Paragraph 7 of Article 2 has become almost a part of modern language; it is used merely to say "No". It is a kind of a small, disguised and shy veto. Even without a knowledge of the circumstances which gave rise to the drafting of the United Nations Charter, pure and simple common sense would lead one to understand that paragraph 7 of Article 2 was designed to protect the domestic freedom of countries against any possible infringement from outside which might interfere with that freedom. What strikes us most is that the old imperialist countries interfered in the internal and external affairs of countries, such as in North Africa, yet they are the first to come here and talk about paragraph 7 of Article 2. In all logic, it is the opposite which should occur. This amounts to saying simply that by respect for the United Nations, this paragraph should be used and understood according to its proper significance.

(Mr. Ben-Aboud, Morocco)

Freedom is the same for everyone; it is indivisible. If as was said formerly crimes could be committed in the name of freedom, today in a world which has become smaller and more unified the meaning of the universality of moral values is demonstrated more clearly. The spirit of laws is their moral core. Analysis reveals that every revolution begins with a rejection of the pseudo-legal measures which have been imposed and which are usually called national or governmental laws. The Algerian people are demonstrating their common will to achieve their national freedom.

In addition to the French argument of the lack of jurisdiction of the United Nations, France claims that Algeria is not a State, as Morocco and Tunisia are States. We have demonstrated that this claim is completely unfounded with respect to the past and the present. Even if we assumed that Algeria never constituted a State, according to that false claim, it would still follow the same course as that followed by other countries which were formed without having had the structure of a state or a government before their liberation. As a matter of fact, there was no State in North America, but this did not prevent the United States of America from being constituted. There were no States in South America, there was no Canadian State, no Irish State, no Czechoslovak State and no Polish State. The most recent example which is closest to the Algerian case is that of Indonesia. There was no Indonesian State, there was no Indian State, there was no Syrian State, there was no Moroccan State, there was no Tunisian State, and so forth, before their independence.

We believe that spiritual factors should determine material factors. The soul of the people, their common will, their aspirations and their hopes -- all these should be most important to us and should be taken into account in the first instance. Our concept of Algeria is that of a specific and separate entity, which is different from the French ambition of annexation of the territory and absorption of its people.

The Algerian problem is essentially an international one. Algeria has relations with all of North Africa. This problem is also related to the Middle East. The recent and most curious expedition into Egypt clearly demonstrates this truth. It draws the attention of all of Africa, where the various populations attempt to read their future in terms of the triumph of freedom or the triumph

(Mr. Ben-Aboud, Morocco)

of colonialism. It is to be found in the Bandung Conference, in the expressions of the realization of their own freedom and the barring of all roads in the future to colonial reconquests.

This serves as a basis of comparison and as a test of the international conscience. Is the value which is attached to a human life in Europe the same everywhere? We have the massacre in Algeria and we have references to inferior beings who do not deserve the same attention and defence of an international body. The Algerian question has assumed greater importance in international relations, in talks between France and the representatives of certain States in Asia, in Europe, in the Middle East, in North Africa and in America. This has given a definite international stamp to this question. This is all the more true if we take account of the official negotiations which have taken place between the representatives of the French Government and the representatives of the National Liberation Movement of Algeria.

It appears from the brief study we have just made of colonialism in Algeria that the Franco-Algerian conflict is essentially a conflict of emancipation. It is a conflict between the forces of colonialism and the forces of national liberation. We thus have the two principal elements of the question which is now before us: the free will of Algeria, which is directed towards a return to its original and natural state before the French conquest, and the determined will for colonialist exploitation. The free will of Algeria is inspired by the spirit of sacrifice of a reborn nation. In using the language of some French thinkers, it might be called an open will. The closed will, or the will subjected to a kind of fatalism, leads to domination and is caught in its own trap of authoritarian government.

Colonial expansion in the nineteenth century was designed to obtain markets, raw materials, cheap or free labour and vast areas of land, which were expropriated or confiscated. The profits of these acquisitions were obtained through injustice, and, it would be inevitable, therefore, for any Government that would be set up to be based on injustice. In recalling all of this, it will be clearly seen how obstinate these people are who are responsible for the present situation in Algeria, a situation which maintains at any cost their special privileges.

(Mr. Ben-Aboud, Morocco)

Time will show that the legends and fictions which they spread are completely unfounded.

Everyone knows of the statute which France imposed unilaterally on Algeria in 1947. Last year some representatives presented an excellent study of that aspect of the question. It may be condensed to two principal ideas. The first is that the vote of a Frenchman is equal to the vote of more than one Algerian. The second is that, under article 39, a two-thirds majority is required at the request of the Governor-General or the Finance Committee. These might be called laws and reforms of a pseudo-democratic nature which are more fictitious than real.

The essential factor for colonialism is the control which it inevitably seeks in order to dominate. The idea is spread abroad of a single electoral college. The idea is also spread abroad of foreign intervention. These ideas, which have been worked out by Mr. Soustelle, are to be advanced pending a military victory. Mr. Soustelle, according to this article, has drawn up a list of four points, including those which I have just mentioned.

France has already encountered many problems of the same nature as those concerned with the Algerian question. France met them in the Middle East with Syria and Lebanon, and in Asia and Africa. The arguments and the delays in satisfying the national aspirations of peoples to freedom are known to all. To avoid granting freedom, they delay the opening of talks with those who demand their freedom. That is why they have presented the tempting formula of holding elections, a formula which can be more dangerous than useful in a country which is not free.

The Algerians have expressed their national aspirations very simply: they ask France to recognize the right of Algeria to freedom and self-government; they want to know their destiny; they want to know where their present sacrifices will lead them.

A decision by our Committee accepting the French position would implicitly put the stamp of approval on the status quo; a decision based on the right of peoples to self-determination would protect the Charter of the United Nations against any possible undesirable precedent and would be in keeping with the trend of history.

(Mr. Ben-Aboud, Morocco)

For public opinion it would be the mirror of the international conscience represented actively within the United Nations. It would bring help to the weak by furnishing, to those who shed their blood for freedom, at least a guarantee of principle for that freedom. In North Africa it would fill with hope those consciences that are disturbed over the possibility of maintaining that freedom. His Majesty Mohammed V stated to Mr. Dillon, United States Ambassador in Paris, during a trip to Morocco: "Peace is indivisible in North Africa."

This decision will demonstrate that we are not turning the clock of history backwards. The North Africans were sure that the freedom of their respective countries was going to disappear through the conquest of Algeria. They are now convinced that the freedom and individual security of each of their countries depends on the freedom and security of the whole.

An atmosphere of confidence must replace the mistrust caused by the imprisoning of the five Algerian leaders. The release of the political prisoners would make that atmosphere of confidence more healthy.

A statement of intentions in conformity with the national aspirations to freedom would be an unambiguous point of departure which would allow the talks to get going in clarity. The legitimate interests of France as an individual nation would receive the highest guarantees based on co-operative relations.

We conclude with these words of His Majesty Mohammed V:

"We hope with all our hearts that reason and wisdom will triumph and that understanding will triumph in Algeria. We do not think that force is the way to settle problems. The only way to settle political problems is the dialogue between men in all sincerity and all good faith."

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Yesterday I had the honour to ask those representatives wishing to participate in the debate to add their names to the list of speakers. I am happy to say that we have sufficient speakers for today, and even some for tomorrow. I wish to remind the Committee that the closing of the list of speakers does not mean the ending of the debate nor a threat of the ending of the debate. It is merely an effort on my part to stimulate you to take part in this debate and, in order to do so, to inscribe your names on the list of speakers as soon as possible. After all, we all realize that we must finish as

(The Chairman)

soon as possible our work on the various items on the agenda without, of course, in any way prejudicing the depth of the discussion and the profoundness of our study.

Unless there is an objection, I would suggest that we close the list of speakers at 6 o'clock this afternoon, it being understood that this is merely an invitation to you to include your names on this list. By this afternoon the debate will have gone on for three days, and I am sure that this will have given all the representatives sufficient opportunity to decide whether or not they wish to include their names on the list. If there are no objections, the list of speakers will be closed at 6 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. DEJANY (Saudi Arabia): I think that every representative in the Committee realizes the importance of this item and the background and history of it. In the light of that history, I think that three days are not a long time for the debate to proceed before starting on the closure of the list of speakers, in spite of the fact, as you have stated, that that means that it is only to stimulate speakers to list their names. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I beg that you will delay the closing of the list at least until tomorrow afternoon, so that some delegations may decide how to approach the problem and when to participate.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to be as pleasant toward all of you as possible and I think we might come to an agreement on this. Let us say that we shall close the list of speakers tomorrow at 1 o'clock. Does the representative of Saudi Arabia agree to that?

Mr. DEJANY (Saudi Arabia): Yes.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Then we agree that the list of speakers will be closed at 1 o'clock tomorrow.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.