



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



LIMITED

A/C.1/PV.842
11 February 1957

ENGLISH

Eleventh Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHT HUNDRED AND FORTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 11 February 1957, at 3 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. BELAUNDE

(Peru)

Question of Algeria [62] (continued)

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

Mr. Shaha	(Nepal)
Mr. Kiselev	(Byelorussian SSR)
Mr. Chavez Ortiz	(Bolivia)
Mr. Rifai	(Jordan)
Mr. Nase	(Albania)
Mr. Petren	(Sweden)
Mr. Ullrich	(Czechoslovakia)
Mr. Cañas	(Costa Rica)
Mr. Belovski	(Yugoslavia)

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol A/C.1/SR.842. Delegations may submit corrections to the summary record for incorporation in the final version which will appear in a printed volume.

57-04914

QUESTION OF ALGERIA (A/3197; A/C.1/L.165) [Agenda item 62] (continued)

Mr. SHAHA (Nepal): My Government was a party to the Bandung Declaration which supported the right of self-determination for the people of Algeria. Let me, at the very outset, make clear my Government's stand with regard to the basic principle involved in the question of Algeria. We have always stood for the right of self-determination for all peoples, the recognition of which is one of the basic objects of the United Nations Charter itself as laid down in Article 1 (2). To the nations of Asia and Africa that have just emerged from foreign rule to independent nationhood or statehood, the problem of Algeria is one which evokes deep-felt emotions and sympathies because they can but view the struggle of the Algerian people as a part of their common struggle for national independence and freedom, characterized by the common background of the general awakening in the continents of Asia and Africa in the years immediately following the Second World War.

It can be easily understood how sensitive public opinion is in the countries of this entire region to the question of colonial suppression of national freedom and independence. Nationalism may have become an outmoded slogan for the countries of Europe at the present level of their development, but it should not be forgotten that their present achievements in various fields of progress were largely a direct result of the maturing and ripening of the spirit of nationalism. To the nations of Asia that have only recently won their national and political freedoms nationalism still continues to be a living force with immense possibilities for both the present and the future. These nations realize as much as any other nation that the road to various developed and advanced forms of international co-operation and activity lies in their national independence and in the free expression of their national will.

(Mr. Shaha, Nepal)

The Foreign Minister of France seemed to visualize for France a permanent form of association with Algeria, but the prospect for the realization of such an association -- such an international association on a firm and stable basis -- can only be marred by the kind of stubborn attitude which France is showing at the moment as regards the question of self-determination for the Algerian people. By denying the right of self-determination to the people of Algeria the French Government cannot create an atmosphere and a prospect for better relationships with that country at present or in the future because such an association between France and her erstwhile colonies can have a permanent basis only through the freely expressed will of the latter, as has been the case with the members of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

The French Foreign Minister has eloquently argued that as Algeria is an integral part of metropolitan France, the situation there is entirely within the domestic jurisdiction of France and that the United Nations cannot and must not intervene in that situation in accordance with Article 2 (7) of the Charter. Quite a number of other representatives in this Committee have also sought in their own way to uphold France's stand in the matter. As far as we are concerned, we cannot support France's plea for domestic jurisdiction with regard to Algeria mainly on the following grounds:

First, Algeria was an independent country having treaties and diplomatic relations with other countries of the world until 1830 when it was conquered and occupied by France.

Secondly, Algeria cannot become a part of France as a result of the latter's unilateral decision with regard to integration inasmuch as the people of Algeria have had no opportunity so far to express their will on the question.

Thirdly, geographically, ethnically, religiously and culturally Algeria seems to be a distinct national and political entity from France.

(Mr. Shaha, Nepal)

Fourthly, there are precedents in which a plea of domestic jurisdiction has not been recognized by the United Nations in regard to questions of human rights having repercussions on international peace and security. This was the view accepted by the United Nations when it took up the questions of the treatment of people of Indian origin in South Africa and the policy of apartheid followed by the Union of South Africa. In the opinion of my delegation, the question of Algeria is also a question of fundamental human rights and freedom, as is the right of self-determination in itself a fundamental human right. Furthermore, the denial of this right of self-determination to the people of Algeria has already disturbed harmony between nations and has also caused a continuous breach of peace in that area.

Lastly, I wish to examine the claim put forward by the Foreign Minister of France that France had a special status and position in relation to Algeria, as there is a European minority population the future safe-guarding of which was the special duty and responsibility of France. In a democracy one can certainly understand the necessity for the protection of the rights and freedom of the minorities, but it is unthinkable that the concern for the rights and privileges of a favoured minority should be allowed permanently to block the progress of the majority towards democracy and national independence.

The Foreign Minister of France gave us a long account of the achievements of France in Algeria, which were examined in detail by the speakers that have preceded me in this debate, especially by the representatives of Syria and Morocco. Personally, I feel that we are not here to examine the achievements and failures of France in Algeria. Nor are we here to examine the charges against France and the counter-charges by it. To my mind, indictments and recriminations are not at all relevant to our present purpose. We are primarily faced with the task of finding a solution to the problem of Algeria. This problem, apart from being a political problem causing conflict and strife in the most critical area of the world -- which the Middle East is today -- has also proved to be a great human tragedy, even judged by the terrible loss of human life and blood it has involved. The only practical solution seems to exist in the negotiations between France and the leaders of the Algerian National Movement. Once France recognizes the right of self-determination for the people of Algeria, it should have no difficulty

(Mr. Shaha, Nepal)

in settling matters with the leaders of the Algerian freedom movement relating to the form of association between France and Algeria in the future and also to the adequate safe-guarding of the rights and freedom of the European minority in Algeria.

On the other hand, if France persists in its policy of getting tough with the so-called rebels and of imposing settlement by force, it will not only be forfeiting the goodwill of the Algerian people and thus wrecking the prospect for friendly association with Algeria forever in the future, but will also at the same time be keeping alive the threat to international peace by affording all, especially those who might be only biding their time, an opportunity to fish in the troubled waters of Algeria. It is really a strange irony of history and circumstances that this great nation of Europe which for the first time gave the world the declaration of the "Right of Man and Citizen", and proclaimed the principles of equality, liberty and fraternity, should itself err on the side of denying the right of self-determination to the people of Algeria.

May we hope that France, animated by its tradition of freedom and liberal thought and acting in the light of the trends of modern history and progress, will arrive at a political settlement with the leaders and people of Algeria in the same way in which it settled its affairs with Morocco and Tunisia. It is in this spirit and with the hope that France will no longer allow sham considerations of pretense and prestige to stand in the way of negotiating a political settlement with the Algerian people that my delegation has co-sponsored the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.165 along with other Asian and African Powers. Its purpose is not to humiliate or condemn France, but to help to achieve a lasting and friendly settlement between France and the people of Algeria on the basis of mutual benefit and co-operation. My delegation believes that all who desire the restoration of peace to Algeria and a friendly settlement between France and the Algerian people should have no difficulty in supporting it.

Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic)(interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR has studied with great care the statement on the Algerian issue made by the Foreign Minister of France, Mr. Pineau. Mr. Pineau has tried to convince us that the Mollet Government wishes to implement a sort of new policy with respect to Algeria. What is the substance of this new policy? The substance of this new policy is to be found in the fact that the Mollet Government requires the National Liberation Front to cease fire in Algeria, and this without any preliminary conditions. A proposal has been made by the Mollet Government concerning the conduct of elections under the international control of the so-called democratic States. In addition, that Government promises the elaboration of a new status for Algeria and the implementation of certain other measures. Simultaneously, Mr. Pineau stated that France will never abandon Algeria.

In his rather prolonged speech Mr. Pineau has not given any positive reply to any of the substantive questions which have been raised by the Algerian people at the present time. Mr. Pineau has refused to recognize the right of the Algerian people to national independence and self-government. The intention of his entire speech was to mislead world public opinion and to place the guilt of the colonial war, which is being led by the Government of Mollet in Algeria, on the shoulders of the political parties in Algeria.

The speech of Mr. Pineau does not contain anything new and there are no constructive proposals in that speech calling for the constructive settlement of the Algerian problem. It is not possible to find in the statement of the representative of France any hint of an effort to attempt to solve the Algerian issue by peaceful means. Yet, in the tenor of the speech we can see threats directed at the leaders of the National Liberation Front of Algeria, the Algerian National Movement and the Algerian Communist Party.

Therefore, it is not possible to state that the governing circles of France have soberly assessed the international situation and have drawn the proper deductions from the disgraceful failure of the Anglo-Franco-Israel military adventure against Egypt. At the same time, after the plans to grab the Suez Canal, to crush Egypt, to bring to their knees the other peoples of the Near and Middle East who, like the Algerian people, are struggling for independence, after all this has failed, the position of the French colonizers in Algeria remains even more obscure and without any hope for the future.

(Mr. Kiselev, Byelorussian SSR)

The colonial war in Algeria has weakened the international position of France; it has made its economic difficulties even more acute and has been responsible for worsening the relations between France and the Arab States. The Government of Mollet has sent a 400,000 man army into Algeria, armed with modern weapons. From documents we have received of the National Liberation Front of Algeria, it can be seen that from November 1954 when the Algerian patriots were forced to take up arms and started their national revolution, tens of thousands of Algerians have been killed. How can these facts be accepted in the light of the statement of Mr. Pineau that the policy of France with respect to Algeria corresponds to the great traditions of the great democracies and that the French authorities in Algeria have attained a very high level of civilization and progress for the Algerian population? That statement of Mr. Pineau is surely in contradiction to the mass murders of the people of Algeria who have struggled for their independence. The Mollet Government tries through the guise of democratic traditions of France to camouflage the colonial aims of the monopolistic capitalists of France who are trying to preserve the existing order in Algeria. Yet, in the United Nations we find delegations that are supporting the colonial policy of the French Government. This has been quite frankly stated by the representatives of the United Kingdom, France, the United States, Spain, Cuba and even some others; moreover certain States have supported this policy not only in words but in fact.

As is well known, the ruling circles of France have succeeded in having a part of the armed forces of NATO sent to Algeria to fight the peace-loving Algerians. The Council of NATO on 28 March 1956 officially blessed the Government of France for the colonial war it was conducting against the Algerian people. The Mollet Government has recourse to weapons received by France as a Member of NATO.

The New York Times on 27 March 1956 stated that the contribution of the armed forces of France and NATO constitute a little more than fourteen divisions, four of which at the present time are in North Africa. Explaining its policy, French military authorities state that the repression in North Africa by the French forces is a very important factor to insure the political stability of France and for the rear area of NATO.

(Mr. Kiselev, Byelorussian SSR)

All this shows that the activities of the military forces of NATO in Algeria not only constitute a crude violation of the Charter of the United Nations but is in fact an act of colonial aggression. The divisions of NATO at the present time kill Algerians who struggle with courage for the cause of liberty and the independence of their country. It is impossible to read without emotion the document submitted by the National Liberation Front of Algeria, an Algerian national movement, which describes the terror and the atrocities perpetrated by the French colonial troops and the victimizing of the Algerian population.

Let me cite some examples. In the French newspaper Le Monde of 25 May 1956, its correspondent wrote that the details which have come out through broadcasts of Radio Algeria concerning the elimination of ten villages, have forced the inhabitants to move to the cities. The military forces found there only old people, women and children. The correspondent said: "I did not have the opportunity of participating in all of these operations, but I can state what happened in a village close to Philippeville; fifty women, children and old people have been killed. I do not recall any more tragic situation than the one I have seen there after the departure of the troops. When I arrived I was welcomed by the barking of dogs who were the only ones who survived".

These are just separate examples taken from the French Press. The French military authorities, having been angered by the resistance of the Algerians, used repressive and terroristic methods on the population.

Mr. Ben Ahmed on 5 July 1956 in the National Assembly of France stated: "The situation becomes more and more tragic. Torturing and repression are practised on behalf of France. Recently in the area of Constantine, one of the Algerians who had protested against the burning of his house was thrown into the fire by the French gendarmes and died. These actions will lead us to a catastrophe." This was stated by a Socialist, in other words, a member of the party which is governing France at the present time.

These repressions are not exceptions. This is an example of the permanent colonial policy practised by the French Government in Algeria. Today 400,000 French soldiers are practising what is called the pacification of Algeria. In fact, they are carrying on a real war against the Algerian people and yet they cannot compel the Algerian people to desist from its struggle. The army of the National Liberation Front struggles with success against the French colonial forces.

(Mr. Kiselev, Byelorussian SSR)

The colonial war in Algeria has been very costly to the French taxpayers, amounting to more than 1 billion francs per day. In 1956 alone, 500 billion francs were spent for the struggle in Algeria.

Mr. Pineau and Mr. Soustelle have made many statements concerning the French achievements in Algeria in the improvement of the living conditions of the population. They have mentioned the cultural contributions of the French, their development of civilization, and so forth. The French have distributed all kinds of information, through propaganda manuals and other media, about the development which has taken place in Algeria since their presence there 126 years ago. A close study of the facts will show, however, that the French occupation has merely helped to create a typical colonial regime in the country. I should like to cite a few figures. The population of Algeria is approximately 10 million, of which 1,200,000 are Europeans. Preceding speakers have mentioned this fact. Of this population, 2,100,000 children receive no education at all owing to the lack of schools and teachers. However, the children of the European population attend school regularly. The absence of schools and teachers for the Algerian children has resulted in an illiteracy rate of the local population of 86 per cent. The Arabic language, which is the mother tongue of the population, is considered by the French authorities to be a foreign language. All studies in the schools have always taken place in the French language.

As regards conditions in the medical field, the situation is just as bad. For a population of 10 million, there are only 149 hospitals, with 26,000 beds. In all of Algeria there are 1,851 doctors, with the majority of them in the three main cities of Algeria, Oran and Constantine; there are only 350 doctors for the rest of Algeria, which constitutes one doctor per 6,000 inhabitants, as compared to one doctor per 1,000 inhabitants in France. It is not surprising, therefore, that approximately 50 per cent of the Algerian children die before they reach the age of five.

The standard of living of the Algerian population is very low indeed. The people are living in near-starvation conditions. A direct consequence of the colonial regime is the poverty of the indigenous population. Thus, the Bishop of the city of Constantine, Mgr. Pinier, declared on 25 May 1954, according to the French newspaper Economie et Politique of 13 June 1955:

(Mr. Kiselev, Byelorussian SSR)

"When one speaks of starvation in Algeria, it is not a literary form for social protest; it is a horrible reality; it is the common drama of the population and not merely the fate of a few beggars who beg on the streets. This is not a tragedy of only a few unfortunate families who might be helped by being granted some bread; it is a tragedy of millions of people who live with us on the Algerian soil. It is not a passing tragedy; it is a permanent tragedy which is to be found in the very heart of our economy, in the heart of our country, and this tragedy will affect generations of families as a result of being underfed, sick, and lacking in all the requirements of existence."

This is the testimony of a Catholic priest. The colonial authorities keep the Algerian population in ignorance and in poverty so as to have cheap labour and so as to be able to compel them to work for practically nothing.

The poverty of the Algerian villages offers evidence of the exploitation to which the population has been subjected. The best land generally belongs to the French colonials. Figures show that 549,400 Algerian landowners possess only 23 million acres of land, which is an average of 42 acres per inhabitant, and 65 per cent of that land is actually desert land. At the same time, 25,800 French colonials possess 6 million acres, which is an average of 233 acres of arable land for each member of the French population.

The organ of the French Bourse, La Vie Française, was forced to admit on 17 December 1954 that the average annual pay of a village family did not exceed 25,000 francs, which is about \$72.

These figures speak for themselves. There are hundreds of thousands of unemployed in Algeria who are even in a worse situation. Unemployment prevails mainly among the Arab population. The great majority of the population is forced to live in miserable dwellings. The Algerian economy is exhausted because of colonial exploitation.

These are facts which characterize the colonial regime in Algeria and the miserable conditions in which the impoverished population must live.

The representative of France, Mr. Pineau, in speaking of the causes of the revolt in Algeria, stated that the main reason for the crisis was to be found in the activities of the terrorist groups which, according to him, have been preparing for this revolt for a number of years, on the instructions of foreign Powers.

(Mr. Kiselev, Byelorussian SSR)

It is necessary in the first place to show to what extent the statement of Mr. Pineau is incorrect that the Algerian struggle for independence has only come about during the past few years. History shows that the Algerian struggle for independence has continued for more than one hundred years and that it has never stopped. During certain periods it has weakened under the weight of repression and terror, but that is all.

Now more than half of the French troops have been thrown against the Algerians. These French troops are equipped with helicopters, tanks, airplanes, machineguns and other weapons. They possess all the modern armaments. Despite that, however, the struggle of the Algerian people has not weakened; on the contrary, it has found new strength.

The strengthening of this struggle of the Algerian people shows that they are ready to sacrifice everything in order to achieve their independence.

At the last Congress of the French Socialist Party, the delegate from Algiers, Ben Ahmed, stated that 15,000 people were struggling against the French troops in Algeria. He stated:

"These fighters are unanimously supported by the Algerian people.

Those who are called rebels are hidden, fed and helped by the population. Everyone is on their side, even the women and children -- the inhabitants of cities and the workers in the rural areas are all as one."

Therefore, we are not speaking here of terroristic groups, but of the whole Algerian population which is struggling against the French colonizers. A study of the facts related to the situation in Algeria reveals that the policy of the French Government is purely a colonial policy. It does not conform to the requirements of our time. The struggle of the Algerians and the results which they have achieved show that the colonial policy in Algeria will fail.

The settlement of the Algerian question will be possible only by following new methods and by taking into account the historical links between France and Algeria. It would be possible to find a solution by taking into account the suggestions recently made by the representatives of the Algerian people, who insist that Algeria must be given its independence. However, if the legitimate aspirations of the Algerian people will continue to be ignored, it will not be possible to achieve an equitable solution of the problem.

(Mr. Kiselev, Byelorussian SSR)

The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR considers that a peaceful settlement in Algeria and the granting to Algeria of independence, within the framework of Franco-Algerian relations, will correspond not only to the interests of the Algerian people but of the French people as well. The example of the peaceful settlement of the Moroccan and Tunisian issues can serve quite well. But the leading circles of France do not want to understand that the bankrupt old colonial policy is a thing of the past and will fail.

It is possible, however, to find an equitable solution to the problem. There is the possibility of negotiation between the Government of France and the representatives of the Algerian people. The absence of such negotiations merely helps to continue the present situation, with its potential threat to peace. At the present time, the Algerian issue has become one of the most important international problems, and it is necessary to settle this problem as soon as possible. The movement against the colonial institutions has taken on the aspect of a popular torrent so powerful that it cannot be stopped by armies, the most modern military equipment, or promises of reforms.

At the present time, the struggle of the Algerian people for its freedom and independence is meeting with powerful international support. The position of our delegation, like that of numerous other delegations, is well known with regard to granting independence and self-government to colonial peoples. The moral support and the sympathy of the Byelorussian people are on the side of those who struggle against colonialism or against any form of national subjection.

The French Government must follow the path of friendship between the Algerians and the French. They must recognize the national existence of the Algerian people by granting them their independence. We should not make the chasm even wider and develop hatred between two glorious people. It is necessary to put a stop to this unfair colonial war in Algeria. Such a policy would correspond to the interests of the Algerian and French peoples.

In the light of what we have said, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR supports the resolution of the eighteen Asian and African States and will vote in favour of it.

Mr. CHAVEZ ORTIZ (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): We take part in this discussion on the so-called question of Algeria at a time when the play of passion and argument has agitated the atmosphere around us and has led to much heat. It could not be otherwise, for conflicts among peoples reach their highest point when one sacrifices his life for liberty. That, we believe, is what is happening in Algeria today. That is why we do not wish to add to the passion and the heat of the discussion. As far as possible, we wish to place ourselves in such a position that we will be able to analyse coolly the reasons advanced by both sides. That is difficult enough when it is a question of matters that concern France. No Latin American can be unaware of the decisive influence of that great nation. It is more than a nation; it is a source of culture that has created landmarks in the progress of man. We have always been, we are and we will be, friends of France. In our own hearts we felt what was experienced by France when it was invaded and laid waste in two world wars. We witnessed the joy of all Bolivians when France was able to celebrate its triumph over the forces of Nazi aggression. We stood by France in both wars, and it is our conviction that we stood by liberty and justice -- that sacred attribute that we learned to love as we became familiar with the glorious pages of French history. This heroic history is well known to us, because it is closest to us, and it is from that source that our liberators drew their inspiration. Bolivar and San Martín based their policies of independence on the policies of France. That is why we want the delegation of France to forgive us if, at this time when we take part in this debate, we do not agree with it in everything. We want France to consider that we are having a discussion with a friend, although with different points of view, but in no way casting shadows on the friendship.

At first sight, this case seems to be a conflict between two basic principles of the Charter. There seems to be a contradiction or a paradox in the application of the principles expounded in paragraph 2 of Article 1 and paragraph 7 of Article 2. But the provisions of Articles 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 give the Assembly the necessary power to be seized of any question, although this might appear to be a restriction of the sovereignty of France. A general interpretation of the Charter demonstrates that the competence of the United Nations on such matters as the reduction of armaments, the application of measures of coercion as set forth in Chapter VII, and the Trusteeship System, are also limitations on the sovereign rights of peoples. Sovereignty, if we are to understand it in too wide a sense would be

(Mr. Chavez Ortiz, Bolivia)

to impose our own decisions and our own will on any country. But, understanding sovereignty thus, we should have no right to recommend the reduction or the control of armaments, no right to oversee the trusteeship administration of a Power over a colonial territory, no right to take measures against a State whose sovereign will leads it to act in such a way as to endanger international peace and security. Along the road of unlimited sovereignty, we would arrive at a world dominated by the most powerful.

We must nevertheless not forget that all juridical norms imply a restriction on individual liberty in the name of the collective interest.

I do not wish to have what I have said interpreted as a panegyric of intervention. Nor do we believe that in the case of a domestic conflict in a country, which we call civil war, the United Nations might be called in by one side or the other. The Bolivian delegation could never state such a thing. Were we to state such a thing, it would be to speak for intervention, which would be extremely regrettable. On the contrary, Bolivia feels that we must have absolute respect for the principle of non-intervention as the only possible guarantee of the sovereign rights of peoples. We believe that between intervention and self-determination there are certain divisions, that there must be some space between these two principles.

But, in the case of Algeria, there are two rights of self-determination which face one another and which conflict, and which provoke the situation which now confronts us.

Were it a question of an absolutely French territory, a question of a problem involving the nationality of the French State, we would be the first to oppose its being considered here. But, in this case, we are confronted with a conflict between the sovereignty of the French State and the right of the Algerian people to self-determination.

We do not think it is too much to the point to bring up here the work that France has done, or has not done, in Algeria.

(Mr. Chavez Ortiz, Bolivia)

We find in this territory two perfectly definable nationalities. One of them is the Frenchman transplanted to Algeria, the product of French culture, a cog in the historical wheel of France with different religions all of them within Christianity. His life and destiny are part of the destiny of France.

Confronted with this nationality, we find the Algerians subdivided in two different categories: the first is that of the native Algerians, mainly Arabs, the product of many mixtures among the millennial inhabitants with Arabs that have lived there for many generations, with contributions of Turkish nationality brought by Barba Roja. This produced an admirable mixture of language, religion and common historical background and -- something else that should be stressed -- with ideals and aspirations leading towards their own historical destiny as a real consciousness of nationality.

The second category is the product of both nationalities, the son of France and the native of Algeria, keeping the culture, religion and language of his parents and retaining the characteristics of both cultures, the heritage of France fed and strengthened in Algeria.

In the American emancipation, and I refer to Latin America, this nationality and the category of American nationality known as Creole, was the product of the conjunction of Spain with America and it played one of the most decisive roles. The heir of the Spanish peninsula with common religion, language and race, linked its destiny with that of Latin America and made its own nationality, being the product of both realities.

We do not think we are wrong when we say, in the case of Algeria, that those who found themselves in this position, or many of them, have already linked their destiny with that of Algeria; and this must be true unless there had been a closed process of racial segregation. And had that been the case, we must see in this factor the link wherein France and Algeria draw closer together by means of which the permanent influence of France in North Africa will remain, the reality which is a mixture of the cultures of France and the Arab world has created its own personality.

(Mr. Chavez Ortiz, Bolivia)

It is also through this factor that we might find a hope of a solution for the problem of the rights of the French minority in Algeria. If we seek for a historical parallel, we will find in the capitulation of Ayacucho a concrete example for the solution of a similar case, since we see that in Algeria there is a conflict of nationalities. We see the existence of its own nationality which has inherited the titles, deeds and rights of the ancient kingdom of Algeria, part of the Ottoman Empire, although it was an independent kingdom, with its own nature -- of pirates if you like -- but with a perfectly recognized individuality in the field of international law; a nationality which is a prolongation of the Arabic culture, the influence of which was decisive in the renaissance of Spain. It was this which brought to the exact sciences the concept of zero and of infinity, without which we would have been unable to arrive at the atomic era. But the nationality of Algeria is not only that; it is also the product of the land itself of its way of life, and customs; it is the merged product of France and Algeria which has engendered a being with its own life.

Analysing the problem we are now facing, we find that we are confronted by two types of self-determination: that of the French State which has incorporated Algeria into its territory and the new personality which is the Algerian nation. It is this conflict that leads us to say that the problem does fall within the purview of the United Nations. Bolivia cannot deny itself the right to study this question through this Organization. This is a people which is struggling for its independence and freedom. It was in this light that our delegation supported, at the tenth session of the General Assembly, the inclusion of this item in the agenda. We also understood this to be so in the case of the problem of Hungary, when the Hungarian people was struggling for self-determination. We understand that the problem is not the same as that of Hungary -- which may have an even graver character -- but there is a similarity when peoples are struggling to achieve their right to lead their own lives; for the Algerian is fighting day by day in the attempt to achieve such aspirations. While we condemn the atrocities that have been committed on one side or the other, these acts are frequent in the lives of those people who struggle for liberty, because the force of the ideals which they defend produces the phenomenon of

(Mr. Chavez Ortiz, Bolivia)

the renunciation of life itself and frequently this leads to despising the value of another's life -- these are the horrors that we are called upon to face, that we cannot avoid, to ameliorate catastrophic consequences.

It was in this understanding that the delegation of Bolivia supported the right of Indonesia, of Tunis, of Morocco and many other countries in their struggle for independence. Perhaps because the case of Algeria may have certain characteristics sui generis, it is the common denominator of a national struggle for self-determination. In the general debate we made our views known and as far as we can see the characteristic of the present stage is precisely the birth and formation of new states; it is the liberation of oppressed nationalities which has given a new appearance to the world in which we live. If the United Nations had not been sensitive to recognize the existence of this process, the United Nations would have been trying to stop the march of history.

The new States which today comprise the community of nations are a living example of what we are saying; at least one-fourth of the Members of the United Nations are a product of this historical trend. If we analyze this phenomenon, we will see how the Communist predictions have been postponed for an indefinite period. The prediction of a Communist world as the result of the proletarian revolution has been relegated to the limbo of forgotten things. This applies to the national struggle and the conflict between classes which have often been channelled along the path of a more constructive national liberation.

We see also that the era of national liberation has left behind the orthodox predictions of Marxism. Nothing is further from the truth than to give a Communist interpretation to the movements of national liberation. The fact that Communism tries to use the opportunities which result from such a struggle is another thing altogether; it is nationalism itself which puts a brake on Communist pretensions. If we look at the world around us we see that national revolutionary and liberation movements have had their own effect on the course of history, but Communism has always had to be imported; and not only that, but in the countries behind the Iron Curtain there has arisen a certain national effervescence of national liberation which is not preoccupied with Communist trends, and even in that world this was controlled in its development by more

(Mr. Chavez Ortiz, Bolivia)

powerful forces. When nationalism does appear, we see its great jeopardy to the Communist structure; violence breaks out and this is the only thing which has been able to make the Soviet dictatorship totter.

National revolution is the force which constitutes the raison d'être of all nationality. It seeks always the integration of the nationality in order to give it its own personality, very often trying to affirm itself as a nation and a State, sometimes seeking the unity of those of the same nationality and at other times seeking to incorporate the elements of its own State to form one nationality. This tendency has such strength that it cannot be subjected, because nationalism is only satisfied by the full realization of its ideals. Revolutionary nationalism has freedom as its real objective -- the freedom to find itself -- and only when it has managed to achieve this will its explosive force die down. Let us not take the easy way by calling whatever we do not like Communism or Nazism. Very often we give these terms a virtue which they do not have.

At this stage in the discussion may I make a brief digression. When the Algerian movement was being labelled a Communist conspiracy I was wondering whether I had made a mistake in my opinions on Communism. We, the revolutionaries of Bolivia, were trying to integrate a majority of the population into the life of the State, while a ridiculous minority of rich landowners and miners tried to keep 3 million indigenous inhabitants outside the pale of Bolivian nationality. By this integration and as a result of the revolutionary nationalism we succeeded in preventing the advance of Communism. That is why we ask ourselves if Communism might have succeeded in my country; had the answer been yes it might have been a different story; and the answer might have been yes if in Algeria Communism had succeeded in combining all the roots of its nationalism and closing the door to liberation.

Fortunately, I recently received a telegraphic circular from a trade union organization in Algeria known as the ORIT. This telegram states clearly the orientation of the forces which are struggling for liberation in Algeria, when it says:

"The ORIT rejects the accusations of the Communists made against the UGTA, recognizing the UGTA as a sister organization of democratic ideology that fights against Communism."

EIG/tc

A/C.1/FV.842

30

(Mr. Chavez Ortiz, Bolivia)

This taught me the real nature of the Algerian movement because, as ORIT says, as far as the UGTA is concerned it is a force which fights honestly for the freedom of Algeria.

(Mr. Chavez Ortiz, Bolivia)

Hence, we must fully understand the meaning of the words "national liberation", because if we act unwisely we may throw a noble ideal of freedom into the arms of communism and drown that ideal in the desperation of failure.

Let us not look at nationalism from the point of view of imperialistic positions -- for such a viewpoint is that of nazism and is the antithesis of national liberation. Nazism is a philosophy that believes in the virtue of one race over and above all others, that believes in the imperialistic expansion of a nation which despises all other nations, that seeks to dominate the world, that uses violence as a means and domination as an end. Such a philosophy requires a tremendous military machine in order to satisfy the dreams of conquest. The Arab nations, however, do not fit into this category -- at least, we believe sincerely that they do not. The Arab peoples are struggling, not to dominate the world, but to form part of the free world.

If we wish better to understand the difference between liberating nationalism and imperialistic nazism, let us turn our eyes back to the last war. In that war, we saw the French maquis fighting clandestinely. In that war, we saw the France of de Gaulle, fighting to the very end, willing to sacrifice the individual for the freedom of France. What force inspired the French to fight against the dominating nazi imperialists? What link was there between the maquis, fighting clandestinely, and the soldier who had no land to fight for but still fought to liberate his country? The answer can be found in the French nationality itself. That is where we may find the root of the difference, a difference which is more understandable when one has lived through the events. Is there or is there not a difference between the liberating nationalism of France and aggressive nazism?

Pan-Arabism wishes to affirm the right of the Arab nations to independent personalities. These peoples are not strong. The majority of the Arab nations have only recently emerged from colonial domination. They therefore do not have sufficient strength to dream of an Arab empire. In taking their first weak steps in independent life, they must hold each other's hands in order to feel safe.

Much has been said about outside interference in the conflict in Algeria. Egypt, Syria, Tunisia and Morocco are accused of such interference. They are being painted as imperialistic nations. We do not believe that they have any

imperialistic aims. It is simply that the peoples of these countries have suffered the same fate as that of Algeria, or similar fates. These peoples are related; they have all started their fight for liberation. Tunisia and Morocco state that their only regret is that they cannot give Algeria more help.

May I once again make some comparisons from history? San Martín crossed the Andes with his grenadiers to join his forces with those of O'Higgins, and together they liberated Chile. Bolívar, the President of Greater Colombia -- a perfectly designed State -- went down from the Andes to meet San Martín, and together they liberated the territory which later became Ecuador. But that was not all. Through his victory in Junín, Bolívar saved the freedom of Peru, which was in danger because of the presence of the forces of the Viceroy, La Serna. Then there was Sucre, the victor of Ayacucho, who fought in the territory which later became Bolivia.

Are those examples of intervention? No. No one can deny that these were the last scenes in the great act of the liberation of America. They were the last battles of one great campaign.

I think that we have demonstrated that we are now faced with a nation's struggle to affirm its existence through the attributes common to all States. What does Algeria need to have an independent personality? It has a perfectly designed nationality. All that it needs are the attributes of statehood. In other words, it must have a juridical being so that it can exercise self-determination and become a State. On the other hand, there is the juridical being of France, which, in its Constitution of 1946, incorporated the territory of Algeria into France. There is, therefore, a conflict between the juridical being that is waiting to be born and the juridical being that wishes to postpone the birth. Has the Algerian nation disappeared merely because France has incorporated Algeria into its territory? Facts prove that it has not. We cannot close our eyes to what is happening. The struggle in Algeria is not taking place among phantoms and ghosts: it is taking place against this well-defined nationality, which does exist. What, then, does the French Constitution mean? It is only a unilateral act, the type of act which is, unfortunately, becoming very common in other colonial territories. There is a rather strong resemblance here to annexation. In these circumstances, Bolivia cannot recognize the legitimacy of these acts.

It would have been different had the people of Algeria decided, in absolute freedom and with all guarantees, that they wished to be a part of France. So far as the argumentation based on the Constitution of France is concerned, history proves that very often constitutions remain dead letters. Napoleon sent a constitution to Spain, but the Spanish did not accept it. The Spanish decided to draw up their own constitution. They continued to struggle, and it was in the face of that struggle that Tallyrand said, "This is the beginning of the end". If we turn our eyes to Mexico, we find that Maximilian was sent there with all the necessary papers guaranteeing a juridical status for Mexico, but the Mexicans would not accept these conditions. They preferred to struggle until they became completely free.

To demonstrate how devoid of meaning are these unilateral acts, let us take the example of Alsace and Lorraine. Alsace and Lorraine were twice annexed to Germany under the German Constitution. But this was not accepted by France or by the peoples of Alsace-Lorraine, who, today, are French. This clearly proves that a unilateral declaration of will is not sufficient to make a conflict a matter exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of a State.

We understand, however, that what the Afro-Asian countries are now seeking from France is something which France would have great difficulty in accepting. In practical terms, France is being asked to give up territory which France regards as part of its very being. We believe that it would be going to extremes to ask France immediately to withdraw from Algeria. We doubt whether the adoption of a resolution to that effect could achieve any positive results. This fact, however, should not turn the United Nations away from the course of history -- which is exactly what would happen if we were to declare that the United Nations was not competent to discuss the Algerian question. We believe that we must recognize the personality of the Algerian nation and that the problem should be solved, in accordance with the current of history, by direct agreement between France and the rebels of Algeria. That is why we cannot at this moment ask France to surrender. It would be utopian and unrealistic to do so. Neither, however, can we ask the rebels to surrender, agree to a cease-fire and simply hand over their weapons. That is why the rebels are staying in their country in the present conditions.

We believe that the United Nations must make known its existence through efforts and negotiations aimed at improving the present situation and avoiding the catastrophes of a further struggle. The possibility of a solution through the granting of freedom to Algeria must be recognized. This is a very difficult question, since we must choose between the ideal and the practical.

The eighteen-Power draft resolution is not, in our opinion, entirely suitable; we have not been convinced that it is drafted in the best possible way. We should be in favour of a draft resolution with more or less the same preamble, but which would recognize the right of the people of Algeria to self-determination, in accordance with the Charter, and would then invite France and the people of Algeria to enter into negotiations with a view to the cessation of hostilities and the peaceful settlement of their differences in accordance with the United Nations Charter.

The Bolivian delegation, however, could never take a stand which could be interpreted as a denial of any people's right to freedom. We do not think that the suggestion that we have put forward would close the doors of the United Nations to this problem.

(Mr. Chavez Ortiz, Bolivia)

In conclusion, we believe that the liberation of Algeria will be a task for the Algerians themselves, and that France will understand the right of the Algerians to their own independence. Although France may see in Algeria part of its own land, we feel that it will ultimately come to understand that Algeria has this right to its own independence -- just as a mother who sees a new child born of her being realizes that it is free to live its own life and that she cannot avoid the birth of that new life because she is afraid of the pain involved. We trust that one day France will understand that she can only understand and appreciate by looking at the example of Spain. It was a dreadful sorrow to Spain, also, to see America become independent, but now the existence of those countries which maintain the traces of Spain's old culture, linked to the physiognomy of American lands, with their own independent life, gives greater lustre to the glories of Spain than the Empire of Charles V on which the sun never set.

Mr. RIFAI (Jordan): Before addressing myself to the important question of Algeria, I wish to pay tribute on behalf of the delegation of Jordan to the wisdom and statesmanship shown by the Members of the General Assembly in unanimously inscribing the Algerian question on our agenda. This is a significant step which augurs the greatest hope that positive and conclusive action may be taken by this Committee to help bring to an end a cruel and destructive war which, being a cause of deep international tension, cannot long continue without endangering international peace and security.

In dealing with the question of Algeria my delegation is motivated by the earnest desire to achieve a just and peaceful solution of this long-standing problem whose seriousness grows with the lapse of time. The members of this Committee are well aware of the fraternal bonds that exist between my people and Algeria. Our admiration for the Algerian people not only springs from their present gallant and remarkable striving for freedom and independence, but also goes back to their past glorious history. North Africa was a centre of Islamic civilization and Arabic culture which flourished and extended far away in Europe and up to Southern France. The present heroism of the Algerians is deep-rooted in a history of brilliant nationhood. Therefore, the national aspiration

(Mr. Rifai, Jordan)

of the Algerians to freedom and self-determination is not an artificial or superficial movement; nor can it be crushed by brutal aggression and repression.

Rebellions of national liberation are like fire. The more wood a fire burns, the fiercer it becomes. Yet our concern with this problem is not more subjective than it is objective. The question of Algeria represents a human tragedy and a colonial problem of the highest magnitude. An adequate exposé of the problem would be too challenging to any representative -- and this is certainly true as it applies to me -- who might wish, as I do, to place all the facts before this Committee in order to make possible a full and objective judgement.

Here is a problem growing out of 127 years of history. Each of its aspects -- legal, political, social, racial, economic or military -- deserves equal and careful consideration before a true appraisal can be made of the emotions and tensions that rule the dramatic events in Algeria. Some of these facts, however, ought to be exposed to a certain extent in view of the regrettable but, perhaps, natural attitude of the French delegation. Despite the fact that we rejoice at the French delegation's participation in our present debate, it seemed nevertheless that the French representatives would like to have this Committee brush aside a situation which was so explosive that the French Government decided that its handling required the mobilization of France's military and economic potential, and with that decision the situation deteriorated into a tragedy that has already resulted in the massacre of thousands of innocent Algerian men, women and children.

It is a situation so costly that it imposes upon France a daily expenditure of \$2,860,000; it is a situation which is so critical that it has stirred the deepest emotions throughout the distant lands of Asia, Africa and other countries, and is disturbing peace and order in the neighbouring States of North Africa. However, this Committee has listened to the excellent statements made by a number of representatives who have already taken part in the present debate. The exposition which they have given of the question of Algeria has left nothing much for me to add to what they have said. On the other hand, reliable information is being distributed systematically to the Members of the United Nations by the Algerian representatives -- information which is taken from official and first-hand sources.

It seems to my delegation, therefore, that it will be sufficient to deal with the Algerian question from a point where we consider it to be a complete and solid international case. It is advisable that we pass the stage of queer French logic which contends that the Algerian question is an internal French affair and that Algeria is an integral part of France. There is neither historic nor legal ground for such claims, which certainly should not continue to be invoked within an international organization established to "save... generations from the scourge of war", to "reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights", and to "develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples".

The General Assembly, reaffirming its jurisdiction by its unanimous decision to inscribe the Algerian item on its agenda, has already shattered that colonial hoax. I submit that it would be abusing the intelligence and patience of the members of this Committee were I to press this point, and it would be a waste of time to review the history of Algeria, its sovereignty and independence before the French occupation, and its international relations prior to the French invasion. I need, therefore, make no further elaboration. It is self-evident that Algeria is Algeria, and not France. It is also evident that there are no similarities between the French and the Algerians, in traditions, in language, in religion, in blood, in physiognomy, in sentiments or in aspirations. The only one thing that makes the French people and the Algerians alike is that both are creatures of God. But even that law of Heaven was violated by France because it did not consider the Algerians and the French on an equal footing. Thus, nothing is left of similarities and union between the two peoples which might give the French allegation the slightest validity.

The gravity of the French theory is not only that it is a colonial concept of the type from which other nations suffered and recovered, but that it intends to depersonalize a whole nation through a policy of assimilation applied by the force of arms. Nevertheless, for an intelligent man it is somehow difficult to believe that such a policy, despite its vigour and cruelty, represents a true conviction of real French statesmen. Political opinions of illustrious Frenchmen appear every now and then denouncing the French concept of Algeria and calling for a reversal of French policy.

(Mr. Rifai, Jordan)

Examples of such expressions are numerous. Here is a statement made by Professor Raymond Aaron, a professor at the Sorbonne University and a famous commentator, when he addressed the members of the National Council of the Movement for Atlantic Union. He said:

"It is necessary to recognize sooner or later the existence of an Algerian State and to fix a time limit within which that State will be independent."

Sooner or later Algeria must emerge as an independent and sovereign State. Therefore, one might ask with some thoughtfulness why France persists in its attempt to crush the national uprising in Algeria, which has never faltered through decades and which, in a sharp revolt, controls three quarters of the Algerian territory. Why does France accept defeat after defeat in Algeria and failure after failure in its Algerian policy? Why does it choose bloodshed, death and destruction, rather than recognition of justice, negotiation, peace and friendship with the Algerians?

We read in the papers, and we are well aware, that the whole country of Algeria is inflamed with war. It is said that there is in Algeria one soldier for every two settlers and no security for any of the three. It is also said that out of 54,000 kilometres of roads, only 1,000 can be used with safety. The military force which France has shifted to Algeria to put down the national revolt can better be explained by the huge figures of the French troops there and the modern French war equipment used against the Algerian nationalists. We also read about the heinous crimes of the French in Algeria and acts of genocide such as are not dreamt of in our modern world.

For example, the French newspaper Le Monde reported on 7 January 1957:

"Two of their men having been wounded in a street-car, a group of French parachutists led a 'punitive' expedition in a section of Algiers."

In tracing the tragedy, it is unnecessary to go back to the year 1871, when mass killings of Algerian civilians by French soldiers took place, or to the punitive expedition of 1945 which resulted in 40,000 Algerian, men, women and children killed. But my delegation has a list -- which I am not going to read

now -- of the daily killings of Algerians by French forces during last year, which amount to several thousand Algerians. The list is taken from reports published in French newspapers. These victims -- Algerian nationalists -- are called by the French authorities and French spokesmen "rebels and criminals", while we describe them as "martyrs and unknown soldiers". If these tens of thousands of victims are criminals, then how much it is to be regretted that after a period of 127 years of French civilization in Algeria, France failed to produce anything except criminals. The French may call them anything they like. After all, since French forces find it so easy to kill them en masse, is it surprising that they call them criminals?

In this connexion I wish to correct the representative of France with regard to his concept of the Mujahid and the Mujahideen who are leading and fighting for the national movement in Algeria. The Mujahid is not a criminal; he is not one who fights the "infidels" -- according to the terminology of the representative of France. He is a person who dedicates all his personal ability, physical, mental and moral, to the cause of righteousness. If this class of man is condemned by the French as being criminal, then I regret that we must differ with the French in our ideals.

I cannot overlook another very essential consideration in the relationship between France and Algeria, a consideration touching on ethics and morality. I have observed -- as I am sure others have -- that the French spokesmen refer always to the conflict between France and Algeria as a conflict between Moslems and French or between Moslems and Europeans. This identification by the French is, I am sure, used intentionally in order to deprive the Algerian people of their Algerian personality and their Arabian characteristics. The terms "Moslems and Europeans" or "Moslems and French" are not parallel. Islam is a religion, while French is a nationality. The French concept of a distinction between an Algerian or an Arab in Algeria and a Frenchman or a European, on the basis of religion, is neither an adequate nor an accurate distinction.

The true distinction is between an Algerian Arab nationalist and a French colonialist. There are, certainly, in Algeria, Arabs and Berbers, so far as race is concerned; but Arabism is not racialism. In fact, we cannot trace

(Mr. Rifai, Jordan)

back the Arab populations of Syria, Iraq, Lebanon, Palestine, Jordan, Egypt, Morocco and some other Arab countries to a purely Arab race and purely Arab creed. These peoples are Arabs by nationalism, by culture and by aspiration, rather than by blood. They lived together and made their own history and civilization; and they wish to live together as one nation. Arab nationalism in Algeria, therefore, is a part of the great struggle of the Arab peoples wherever they may be, a struggle to gain their freedom and independence.

When Arab Governments or Arab representatives in the United Nations declare that the problem of Algeria is the problem of all the Arab countries, their declaration falls within the scope of this national belief. There is no Arab imperialism, as the Foreign Minister of France put it, but there is an Arab unity that embraces the whole Arab world. Thus, the problem of Algeria is an Arab problem and is of equal concern to every Arab nation and every Arab country.

At this point I wish to address myself to the charges of so-called external intervention in the Algerian conflict, which charges were aired by the French Prime Minister in his statement of 9 January this year and by the Foreign Minister of France in this Committee last week. My own country is not charged with intervention in the Algerian struggle, but I wish to make one or two remarks concerning this allegation by France.

This charge, often echoed by France, only serves to substantiate the thesis which the sponsors of the Algerian question have never ceased to stress -- that is, the impossibility of isolating a struggle of this nature, a struggle of such military and territorial scope, and keeping it from being an inevitable threat to the peace and security of an entire region.

Algeria, according to French logic, is a part of France in terms of unique French jurisprudence. But, according to Arab logic which, in this respect, I believe, is sound, Algeria is a part of the Arab homeland. If France should assume the right to consider Algeria as a part of France, the Arabs are in a much better position to call Algeria a part of the Arab homeland. On the other hand, if this Committee were to hear charges of intervention in the colonial war in Algeria, I would then say that the intervention of NATO forces should be the first to be considered. My delegation, however, does not wish to cover such aspects at the present stage of the debate.

(Mr. Rifai. Jordan)

Perhaps I went a little far in my remarks when I did not mean to do so. I was trying to find for myself an explanation for the stubborn attitude of French military policy against the Algerian people who are determined not to yield to armed force in their movement of national liberation. The only explanation I can find is colonialism and exploitation -- nothing else.

The French war in Algeria can be explained in economic terms, for it is a conflict between the "have" and the "have-not", between the master and the slave, between human greed and human self-preservation. This was formally admitted in a report of a French Parliamentary Mission that visited Algeria last year. This mission was headed by none other than Mr. Christian Pineau, the Foreign Minister of France. It stated:

"Without minimizing the achievements accomplished by the Metropole in North Africa, it must be recognized that this effort has benefited the European much more than the Moslem population. No man with a heart can fail to be shocked by the destitution which still exists in numerous regions of Algeria and which increases as one travels south. It seems as if the Algerians constitute but shadows against a background where the French live and prosper in an artificial security."

The Parliamentary Mission's report, published in Le Monde of 1 July 1955, received wide circulation in France. The report said that:

"Economic and social conditions have provided a groundwork particularly conducive to the growth of discontent and rebellion."

Of course, this is the price that the conquered has to pay for his defeat -- a price which the people of France have themselves paid, in a lesser degree and in a much shorter period, at the hands of the Nazi occupation. The calamity which fell upon Algeria was well explained and summed up in an editorial published in the May 1922 issue of the periodical "Latin Africa" which observed:

"We French are at home in Algeria. We have mastered the country by force, for a conquest can only be achieved by force, and it necessarily implies that there were victors and vanquished."

(Mr. Rifai, Jordan)

But this French theory of conquest, which is to subdue the victim to the victor, and to subject the slave to the master lacked in its application in Algeria every humanitarian consideration or moral restraint. Mr. Mendes-France wrote in his newspaper "L'Express of 22 December 1955:

"The Algerian drama results from the criminal policy which the Government conducts in the name of France. This policy is one of a naked, collective and blind repression which has succeeded in arousing the whole Algerian people against our country."

The whole history of Algeria in fact establishes the typical pattern of a conquering "master-race" keeping the conquered "inferior race" down to a level beyond which freedom and independence are becoming a desperate dream rather than the evolving reality it should be under the United Nations Charter.

But these crimes against the Algerian people are not limited to my reporting, nor to history. They have better reporters and more recent ones, and always among the French themselves.

Among these, none was more indignant than the then leader of the Comité Directeur of the French Socialist Party who issued a communiqué condemning the repression, and who on 31 August led a delegation which called on Premier Edgar Faure. He told the press:

"We drew the attention of M. Faure to the situation in Algeria; we denounced the repression."

Who speaks these words? Mr. Guy Mollet, now Premier of France. There were other eloquent protests against the repression, its brutality, its futility and its senselessness from political leaders now in power. They rose to power on this criticism. Now that they are in power they have forgotten their words.

I do not think that I need to give here the detailed reports of the French repression in Algeria to impress upon this Committee the necessity of immediate action for an immediate peace. I should, however, say that the continuation of this inhuman war would make illusory the hopes of reconciliation between Algeria and France. The continuation of this war is costly not only to the Algerian people -- although they are determined to pay the highest price for their freedom -- but also it is disastrous to France and to its international reputation and, I must add, to the prestige of the United Nations.

(Mr. Rifai, Jordan)

Would the world be reconciled to an abdication by the United Nations in the face of such a cruel war, particularly after the gratifying action of the General Assembly in inscribing this question on its agenda? The people of the world, and certainly in Asia and Africa, would be bewildered and shocked if the eighty Member States were to frustrate efforts for a real and honourable peace in Algeria.

We are sure that French governmental policy concerning the question of Algeria is not a policy which is approved by a large section of French political thought. Yet we know how influential the colons of Algeria are in French politics. We know that the interests of French feudal circles and capitalists in Algeria will be impaired if a solution on the basis of recognition of right is to be adopted. We sincerely believe that it is in the interest of France itself to put an end to bloodshed and death in Algeria and to seek the appreciation and friendship of the Algerians and, to a larger extent, that of many other nations.

We hope that the French Government will view the Algerian problem with clear vision and a broad outlook. In this connexion, I should like to quote what Mr. Mendes France wrote in his paper on 9 November 1956. He said:

"The general aggravation of the situation in Algeria, and tomorrow, the certain intervention of the United Nations make more urgent than ever the need for a complete revision of our policy in North Africa."

Then he continued:

"This implies a total revision of our local policy, of our administration, of the men who are in charge, and the renunciation of the methods of government and of repression which arouses against us even those upon whose friendship we could still count."

In his statement of 9 January 1957, Mr. Guy Mollet said:

"The solution of the Algerian problem can result only from negotiations and free discussions between the representatives of the populations of Algeria and those of all France, of France, which is the first to be interested in the peace and prosperity of Algeria, France, which is in the best position to act as an arbiter.

"Only France, I must say this in all seriousness, can assume the role of arbitrator."

(Mr. Rifai, Jordan)

We understand from this statement that the Prime Minister of France has admitted the principle of arbitration. Yet we cannot agree with him that France can assume the role of the arbitrator. France is in the midst of a dispute with the Algerians and is in a military conflict. France is denying the Algerians their inherited right of self-determination and independence. France is assuming for itself the right of conquest and occupation in Algeria. How could France then assume the role of arbitrator between itself and Algeria? The only body and authority which could conduct such arbitration is the United Nations.

The task of the United Nations as regards the Algerian question is self-evident. It is stated and explained in very simple language in the joint draft resolution (A/C.1/L.165) submitted by eighteen States. The United Nations is urged to invite France and the people of Algeria to enter into immediate negotiations with a view to bringing about a cease-fire. This will certainly envisage a recognition on the part of France of the right of the Algerians to self-determination.

Responsible French spokesmen are inviting the Algerian people to undertake an unconditional cease-fire. The Algerians would indeed be naive if they were to put down their arms and terminate a costly but successful resistance merely because they are invited to do so by the French Government without any commitment as to their national aspirations. The Algerian people are fighting for self-determination in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. They would be naive indeed to trust such a surrender to their colonial ruler, especially when their leaders are being kidnapped or sentenced or sent into exile.

We hope that the combined efforts of the Members of our supreme Organization will put an end to this fierce armed conflict between France and Algeria. We believe that France, a Power with major responsibilities, owes it as a duty to co-operate in a flexible manner with all the parties interested in liquidating this peril and in solving the question on the basis of right and equity.

Mr. NASE (Albania) (interpretation from French): The war of national liberation of the Algerian people has already lasted for more than two years. This war, which has been imposed upon the people of Algeria, is becoming crueler every day and is causing tremendous sacrifices for the people of Algeria. It is causing tremendous losses in material and in human lives. On the other hand, the present policy of the French Government in Algeria -- which consists of repressing by force the national liberation movement -- is costing that country many lives and considerable sums of money. Not only did France not achieve any result in so doing, but despite military operations on a wide scale the situation of the French Government is becoming more and more embarrassing, both internally and on the international level.

The Franco-Algerian conflict is causing great concern for the peace-loving peoples of the world and is threatening the peace of the world. This is also true as regards the Anglo-French-Israel onslaught on Egypt, which created a risk for a world war, because there is no doubt in anyone's mind that the motive which pushed France into joining England against Egypt was an illusion whereby the French felt that the submission of Egypt would mean the end of the difficulties which France is meeting in Algeria. According to the expression used by Mr. Lacoste, the fate of Algeria would be decided in Cairo.

The situation in Algeria has become an international problem and deserves consideration by the United Nations. The General Assembly, in conformity with the objectives of the Charter, considered this question at its tenth session. Despite the efforts of the Afro-Asian delegations, the General Assembly did not continue the discussion on this problem and withdrew it from the agenda. This disappointed the Members and prevented the Member States from considering, with France and the Algerian people, the possibility of finding a solution to this problem.

Unfortunately, the negotiations which took place last year, between the representatives of the French Government on the one hand, and the representatives of the National Liberation Front on the other, have not resulted in any success. Thus, the war continues in Algeria, increasing in proportions and causing havoc and destruction.

(Mr. Nase, Albania)

My delegation does not wish to deal with the issue of determining whether the Algerian problem is one of an international character. This particular aspect of the problem was discussed by many other delegations and we do not wish to overemphasize the point. We feel quite clearly that the Algerian problem is an international one and that France cannot claim that it is strictly within its domestic jurisdiction. Algeria was invaded and deprived of its independence by France more than 125 years ago and it now enjoys a purely colonial status, and no juridical subtlety invoked by the French Government can cover the international camouflage, the international character of the Algerian problem.

We consider that the United Nations, in conformity with the Charter, is quite competent to deal with this problem and to try to find a peaceful solution for it. One of the fundamental principles on which the Organization rests is the right of self-determination of peoples. In the present evolution of international events, at this stage in the history of humanity, we can see a renewal of the national consciousness of peoples, and we can see the implementation of this great principle of the Charter. In particular, a number of peoples in Asia and Africa, because of their resolute struggle in favour of independence, have achieved, one after the other, the ~~throwing off~~ of the yoke of the Western Powers and of achieving national independence and sovereignty. The struggle of the Algerian people is part and parcel of this great movement of peoples who want to lead a free and independent existence. In doing this, these peoples are ready to bear any sacrifice.

In fact, the struggle of the Algerian people against the colonial yoke has not stopped ever since the country was invaded by France. Despite the efforts exerted by France for more than a century, despite all the measures adopted, including the pacification operations which took place on a number of occasions, it was not possible for France to create in the consciousness of the Algerian people durable links with the Metropolitan Power. The policy of integration and assimilation, which was followed by France for more than a century, has not yielded the expected results.

(Mr. Nase, Albania)

Algerians have resisted resolutely that particular policy. They themselves have been distinct from the colonizers because of their traditions, mode of living, religion, culture, as well as language. This is the ineluctable course of history which should help the imperialist Powers to draw the proper conclusions. The existence of the colonial regimes comes to an end. Because of their experience, because of their history, the peoples are aware of their rights, are resolute in their task, in their struggle against a colonial regime in whatever form or guise it may assume.

Today the Algerian people as a whole participate in the struggle for national liberation. It has launched a war which knows no conditions until the end is achieved. This struggle means great sacrifices to the Algerian people; but France also bears many sacrifices in Algeria. This war, therefore, is only to the advantage of a mere handful of privileged people in France and of certain French citizens living in Algeria.

The French people as a whole oppose the struggle and have to bear the sacrifices in lives and in material. This policy of assuming military measures has not yielded any results and has put France in a bad light in the eyes of the world. It cannot do anything to shake the will of the Algerian people who are resolved to struggle for its freedom and for its independence.

When, in February last, the French Government launched its pacification policy in Algeria, Mr. Robert Lacoste affirmed that he would conclude the struggle with the Algerian maquis in June. A month later Mr. Guy Mollet stated that because of the sending of troops to Algeria the situation would be settled. Mr. Robert Lacoste on 20 June stated that pacification would achieve considerable results before the beginning of winter. What is the situation today?

During the last period of the war it has spread throughout Algeria. People are fighting in the Sahara as well as elsewhere. Zones which had been considered pacified are now the arena of bloody struggles. The situation in Algeria is getting worse every day. The situation is such that Mr. Jacques Chevallier, mayor of Algiers, and former minister, stated in an interview granted on 6 September 1956 to France-Soir:

"I regret to be compelled not to share the official optimism, but if I may judge on the basis of what is taking place daily in this city of 500,000 inhabitants which I administer, the situation is not improving but is getting worse."

(Mr. Nase, Albania)

The military anti-colonial acts which began on 5 November 1954 have spread and at the present time encompass the entire country. The military detachments have now been united to form a national army of liberation which struggles against France quite successfully despite the lack of equipment and troops.

The French are using more than a half million men and they are equipped with the most modern equipment in NATO; in other words they are using French and American equipment. The most cruel methods of reprisals are used to crush the liberation movement. During these cleaning-up operations, wholesale villages are destroyed, massacres are to be seen every day, and the entire disarmed population, irrespective of sex or age are victims of repression.

Despite this superiority, despite all the military operations on a wide scale that is being carried out by the colonialists, the Algerians do not waiver. They are supported by the entire population. This is a mass struggle, and that is what gives the liberation fighters a tremendous strength. The Algerian people is aware that its war is a just war; that is what makes it invincible.

The only desirable way out is the peaceful settlement of the conflict. The utilization of force could not be justified and could not possibly make waiver a whole people who are resolute in their desire to gain independence.

The Movement for national liberation has always shown that it is ready to negotiate. It is up to the French to recognize the legitimate rights of the Algerians to independence and full sovereignty.

The United Nations cannot ignore the real situation prevailing in Algeria. The peaceful settlement of the issue is not only in the interest of the parties concerned but also in the interest of preserving peace throughout the world. The General Assembly has much to contribute not only in helping the Algerian movement of liberation, but also the French Government by achieving a peaceful settlement of the issue in conformity with the Charter.

My delegation considers that the draft resolution submitted by the eighteen Afro-Asian States meets these aims and we fully support it.

Mr. PETREN (Sweden) (interpretation from French); The direction which this debate has taken has led us to discuss and to decide whether Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter of the United Nations excludes from the competence of our Organization the question of Algeria and whether it falls essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of France. Although there was no objection to the inclusion of this item in the agenda, France has chosen to invoke Article 2, paragraph 7, formally opposing the General Assembly's taking decisions on the substance of this question.

The First Committee therefore has to take a stand on the interpretation of Article 2, paragraph 7. This provision of the Charter as we all know has very often been interpreted in different ways when different matters have come before the Assembly. The only way that the General Assembly can decide on this question is to vote on it; and it has done so.

With regard to the Algerian question, the Swedish delegation considers that as far as this matter was concerned, more than such questions as Tunisia and Morocco, we have to realize that this is a domestic matter, since Algeria administratively speaking forms part of France and its inhabitants elect deputies to the French National Assembly.

This state of affairs does not necessarily mean that no matter concerning the situation in Algeria can be discussed in the General Assembly of the United Nations. I shall take the liberty of citing a few previous cases concerning the application of Article 2, paragraph 7. The General Assembly has very often declared itself competent to vote on resolutions concerning racial discrimination in South Africa despite the objections of the South African Government that its racial policies are part of its domestic jurisdiction. The General Assembly also decided to set up an investigating committee to study racial discrimination in South Africa. The General Assembly also voted on the resolution directed against the system of forced labour that is imposed in certain countries, despite the fact that in this case also and not without foundation, it has been stated that these were domestic affairs.

Recently the General Assembly set up an investigating committee with the task of considering the situation in Hungary, despite the objections that were raised saying that this matter was essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of Hungary.

The Swedish delegation believes that there is a very clear reason why the General Assembly considered itself competent to discuss two of the questions that I cited. And that is that Article 62, paragraph 2 of the Charter recognizes the right of the Economic and Social Council to "make recommendations for the purpose of promoting respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all." If the Economic and Social Council has competence to receive such matters, then it is obvious that the General Assembly must possess the same right.

I should like to add here that if in the course of the debate on discrimination in South Africa, and on the violation of human rights in Hungary, the Government in question had made public its programmes of action to set on foot reforms that would put all the different groups of the population on an equal footing, enjoying greater public freedom and increasing their civil rights, then the Swedish delegation would have felt that the General Assembly should be reticent in making any recommendations on the issues.

From what I have said, you will gather that the Swedish delegation wanted to stress how in the past we have understood the provisions of the Charter that are now being discussed. Regarding the present painful situation in Algeria, I should like to state that my delegation has been pleased that France did not oppose the inclusion of the Algerian question in the agenda of the General Assembly. We are also happy that the French delegation in submitting this question to the First Committee, in the fashion that she has, has wanted to make known to the Committee the reform programmes that the Government of France was about to implement in Algeria. We consider it extremely interesting that the French Government has replied to many of the criticisms that were raised in the course of the debate against the policy of France in Algeria.

(Mr. Petren, Sweden)

We also appreciate the fact that the French delegation, in presenting its case to the First Committee, wished to make known to the Committee the reform programme which the Government of France intends to implement in Algeria. We consider that it is extremely significant that the French Government has replied in the manner in which it has to many of the criticisms that were raised in the course of the debate against French policies in Algeria. France has thus contributed substantially to the work of the First Committee, which my delegation considers to be very promising.

We still must know, however -- and this, of course, is another question altogether -- whether at the present stage it would be wise and appropriate for the General Assembly to make recommendations concerning the way in which France should act so as to eliminate the present deplorable difficulties in Algeria. This question is naturally linked to what I said a few moments ago regarding the importance of a reformist attitude which should have been shown by the Governments of the Union of South Africa and Hungary when their questions came before the General Assembly. We must realize that the French Government has publicly announced its reform programme which is to lead to a revision of the political position of the Moslem population of Algeria. The French Government has declared its willingness to put these reforms into action, and to negotiate with the elected representatives of the Algerian people when the fighting has ended.

To return to the question of whether the General Assembly should at this time adopt any resolution on the Algerian question, we should not lose sight of the status of Algeria at the moment, but before taking any stand on this matter we must realize the effects which might be produced by such a recommendation. Will it contribute to a satisfactory settlement of the present situation in Algeria, or will it rather endanger such a settlement?

The Swedish delegation believes that a recommendation such as the one proposed by the eighteen delegations would not contribute to the satisfactory settlement of this question. The Swedish delegation, therefore, will have to vote against that proposal when it is put to the vote. We naturally reserve our position with regard to any other draft resolutions which might be submitted.

(Mr. Petren, Sweden)

In conclusion, we should like to express the firm hope of our delegation that France will follow its reform programme and will apply its democratic tradition and humanitarian wisdom in the solution of the Algerian problem.

Mr. ULIRICH (Czechoslovakia): The General Assembly is again discussing the question of Algeria, because the hopes which were expressed at the tenth session of the General Assembly have remained unfulfilled.

In the explanatory memorandum attached to the request of the fifteen Asian-African States for inclusion of the question of Algeria in the agenda of the eleventh session of the General Assembly (A/3197), these States recall the fact that already in 1955 they requested the General Assembly to discuss this question. In that memorandum, they referred to the deteriorating situation in Algeria, the mass arrests which had taken place, the outlawing of national parties, the outright banning of certain newspapers and the seizure of homes by the French armed forces. They stated that the employment in this region of massive armed forces totalling over 150,000 "testifies vividly to the grave situation existing and that the continuance of this situation was creating a serious threat to peace". In referring to the deteriorating situation in Algeria, they reminded the United Nations that the continuance of that situation would create a serious threat to international peace and security.

As it is known, the Algerian question was not discussed at the tenth session of the General Assembly. In this connexion, the explanatory memorandum (A/3197), reminds us of the following:

"...manifesting their conciliatory spirit, the Asian-African States decided to accept a proposal to postpone further discussion of the Algerian issue at the tenth session. They did so with the hope that France would be guided by the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and would seize this opportunity to negotiate with the true representatives of the Algerian people a peaceful settlement securing their legitimate rights to self-determination and independence.

(Mr. Ullrich, Czechoslovakia)

"This hope for the re-establishment of peace has been frustrated. Instead of adopting a policy of conciliation, France continued its acts of extensive military repression, which led to a heavy daily toll of lives and property. While the armed forces of France were 150,000 when the question was inscribed in the agenda of the last session, today the French armed forces in Algeria exceed 450,000, including French troops of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

"To suppress the Algerian liberation movement the French Government has adopted a policy based on repression and extermination of the Algerian people.

"...

"The continuance of war-like operations with the aim of subjugating the Algerian nation will only lead to a mounting toll of suffering and bloodshed and will endanger international peace." (A/3197, page 4)

It is our belief that the cause underlying this state of affairs is the fact that France still refuses to recognize that the time of mere reforms, many times promised but never realized, is irrevocably over, that the situation develops in a different way and that mere reforms do not suffice for a permanent settlement of the Algerian problem.

Events which we are witnessing in Algeria are truly characteristic of our epoch, rich in far-reaching revulsions marking the course of history. The subjugated nations have taken up arms to fight for the liberation from the colonial yoke. The disintegration of the colonial system cannot be averted any longer. Since the end of the Second World War, more than one-and-a-half billion people have raised their heads to break the chains of bondage by which they had been fettered up to now.

Was it ever possible to suppose that the Algerians, possibly one of all nations, would make an exception and would fail to respond to this challenge of history? Was it possible to expect this, after two neighbours of Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia, had achieved the right of independence and sovereignty? On the basis of what historical anachronism should the people of Algeria, who have the same aspirations as the people of other nations, remain apart from the historical movement of the still dependent nations for freedom?

Was it really possible to expect that this fight would stop at the Algerian frontier? If the struggle in Algeria has gained in violence, if it requires sacrifices of both material possessions and human lives, the more urgent is the necessity to proceed immediately to the solution of the problem, since any delay will render the ultimate solution still more difficult and complicated. The interests of both the Algerian and the French people require a peaceful settlement of the Algerian problem. A continuation of the colonial policy of the French Government, a continuation of the war against the people of Algeria and of the total denial of its fundamental rights, both are equally harmful to the interests of the French as well as of the Algerians. The French people realizes that no nation can be free while it is oppressing other nations. It is also aware that the colonial regime, which serves the interests of the colonialists, is incompatible with the ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity solemnly proclaimed by the French people in 1789.

After the experiences of warfare in Indo-China it is obvious that the continuation of the war in Algeria would have a most detrimental influence upon the economy of France and also that it is harmful to her international prestige. It is not in accord with the desire and the will of the French people that the French Government has been intensifying the war in Algeria in the last year and is now mobilizing its military forces in the hope of achieving a solution of the Algerian problem through armed force. As I have already mentioned, the armed forces of France in Algeria were about 150,000 when the question was inscribed on the agenda of the last session, whereas now the total of French armed forces in that country, including their armed militia, exceed half a million men and include the troops of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Instead of seizing the opportunity offered during the period since the last negotiations in the United Nations to seek a settlement of the problem by peaceful means, the French Government has been employing massive armed forces against the Algerian people and has sought to gain military advantages.

In the spring and summer of 1956 the French Government launched military operations which led to a heavy toll of sacrifice in both lives and property at the expense of the Algerian population. This development is the more serious

inasmuch as it constitutes an integral part of the extensive aggressive plans of the NATO countries. The increase of the French military forces in Algeria has been made possible by the transfer of the French troops of NATO to that country. These facts are proof both of the aggressive character of NATO and of its active role in suppressing the national liberation movements. Thousands and tens of thousands of Algerians have met their death, shot by the ultra-modern American weapons shipped to the French troops within the framework of the aggressive North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The ruling circles of the United States, which are the driving power of NATO, are preparing the ground for substituting the new American colonialism for French colonial domination, in the same manner as we have seen in Indo-China and in other areas of the world. The forceful maintenance of the colonial regime in Algeria is in the interest of those forces which are inspiring the aggressive policies of the North Atlantic bloc, NATO, which are unwilling to surrender either their war bases in Algeria or the sources of national wealth.

The Czechoslovak delegation, during the discussions of other matters in the United Nations, has repeatedly expressed its clear position with regard to the struggle of still-dependent nations for national freedom. The Czechoslovak people, who in their own history learned to know foreign domination, fully understand the aspirations of the Algerian people, as well as of all other still-subjected nations, for national independence. They are perfectly conscious of the fact that only under conditions of national freedom and independence can the creative forces of a nation develop fully and flourish. The Czechoslovak people therefore follow with sympathy the struggle of every nation for its freedom and independence.

The Czechoslovak delegation does not intend to make a detailed analysis of the Algerian problem, which has already been so thoroughly discussed. It is however convinced that this problem is not of such a nature that its solution by peaceful means is impossible; a solution of the Algerian problem which would respect the right of nations to self-determination, independence and the inviolability of their rights would create the necessary prerequisites for the establishment of new relationships between France and Algeria which would be in harmony with the interests of both the Algerian and the French peoples and would contribute to the lessening of international tension.

A further intensification of the armed conflict will inevitably lead to a widening of the division and to increased hostility on the part of the Algerian people towards France. The more tense and aggravated the situation in Algeria, the more difficult the ultimate solution will become.

The Czechoslovak delegation is convinced that a solution can be found which will remove the differences and ultimately the conflict itself, a continuation of which would endanger peace and security in North Africa, and an indispensable historical step on the road towards a final solution is that France should respond to the desire of the Algerian people and their claim to self-determination, independence and equality of rights. In the present situation the General Assembly should invite France and the people of Algeria to enter into immediate negotiations with a view to the cessation of hostilities and the peaceful settlement of their differences in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

The Czechoslovak delegation believes that the United Nations Organization should play a positive role in the solution of the problem of Algeria. We still have in our memory the important part played by the United Nations during the negotiations concerning Tunisia and Morocco, and an initiative from this forum leading to a just solution would contribute valuably not only to bringing calm to North Africa but to the enhancement of the prestige of the United Nations as an international authority, the purpose of which is above all to remove friction wherever peace and international security might be endangered and to settle international disputes by peaceful means.

Mr. CAÑAS (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): None of the phenomena that the world has seen in the last ten years has been more welcome to my country than the progressive movement of Asia and Africa toward independence. All countries of Latin America, I am sure, have shared the jubilation with which my own country welcomed the new countries that have been born in those continents. It is only 125 years since my own country embarked on that same road. I do not want to say that our experience was the same as that of Asia and Africa. As far as my own country was concerned, it was different because, due to some paradox of history, the zone now occupied by Costa Rica was very sparsely populated by the aborigines of America, so that, at the time of independence, Costa Rica was occupied almost solely by Spanish settlers, and therefore they were able to become independent without too much fighting. But the fact that our national history covers more years as a colony than as a sovereign State awakens in us a spontaneous sympathy and an emotional fraternity with those countries that desire or gradually achieve self-government.

The two years that Costa Rica sat on the Trusteeship Council were proof of our policy. The attitude of my country in the Fourth Committee of this Assembly has been constant in its desire to help, as far as we can, the populations whose fate is annually discussed in that Committee. My delegation has always voted in favour of the inclusion in the agenda of this item that we are now discussing, since we are sure that a discussion of this question would be useful to all concerned -- especially to the inhabitants of Algeria, who must be uppermost in our minds.

Perhaps because our own independence was achieved without bloodshed, as a corollary of Mexican independence, Costa Rica is extremely happy when any nation achieves self-government without any sacrifices. This, fortunately, has been the case in many countries that today share the burden of United Nations work with us. Negotiated independence has been the rule in our times. But, after the Second World War, the first phenomenon that humanity met with was a tendency toward an integration of States -- utopian in the political field, practical in the economic field, which is the one that is most important -- and, in Western Europe, the efforts on this question have been appreciable. In the small orbit of Costa Rica, the advances in Latin America have been very great and, so far as we can judge, successful.

We have gradually become convinced that the future of the world does not lie in breaking nations up into small States, but rather in the coexistence of different peoples. The American Hemisphere is a very good example of coexistence between different peoples. Our ports were open to immigration the moment America became independent. We received torrents of immigrants -- primarily from Europe, but also from Arab countries, from Asian countries and from Hebrew individuals. Our main idea has always been coexistence and, although we had just left European colonialism, we did not despise or mistrust anything that smacked of Europe.

A Latin American philosopher said that America was for humanity and, fundamentally, Latin Americans, who idealize ~~the practical things~~ but at the same time practice idealism, want a world for humanity. A world for humanity cannot be achieved by means of slogans or exclusivistic doctrines, centered around a race or a nationality or a religion or a philosophy, or by means of movements of retaliation, concentrated against men who believe in one philosophy or one religion or have one race or belong to one nationality. What we have to seek is the coexistence of all, everywhere. Let the European be able to live in Africa or the African in Europe. Doors should not be closed; no exclusive ~~ports~~ should be set up anywhere. Holy wars and racial crusades should disappear. The world has had to live through these -- but let it never live through them again. Anyone who tries to throw the Europeans out of Africa will be as mistaken as that man who swore to throw the Jews out of Europe. No human group will be thrown out of any place. Men and their ideas will have their influence, and the European will not disappear from Africa for the same reason that the Arab never disappeared from Spain or from the countries that were born of Spain. When England left India, she left, to a large extent, a British India -- but from India came a different type of nation, influenced by the Hindu philosophy, which has been demonstrated by the concern shown by the greatest men of Britain for the philosophy of the Hindus.

In the case before us, the most important thing is that somehow, in Algeria, a human coexistence must be maintained between the European inhabitants and the purely African inhabitants. That is why we are very much concerned with the bellicose chauvinism which is evidenced by all those who have opposed the present regime in Algeria. My country could not accept any solution that would exterminate

the French. Nor could we possibly countenance a solution that would exterminate the Arabs or the Berbers.

However, we have heard the Minister of Foreign Affairs of France here, who communicated to us that his Government is ready to negotiate on the future status of Algeria. This is most comforting and it raises our hopes. All negotiation is fruitful, since it brings men together. The problem, as it was submitted to us, is one of finding out between whom the negotiations are to take place. This also appears reasonable: there can be no doubt that anybody who is ready to negotiate should know who is ready to sit on the other side of the table.

My delegation does not know whether the proponents of direct action at the head of the rebellion in Algeria are competent to speak on behalf of the people of Algeria. Be that as it may, we give them the benefit of the doubt. A priori, my delegation cannot admit that this is a small gang of extremists, nor can we consider that this is a majority group of the Algerians. Either possibility, before we can believe it, has to be proved. We therefore believe that it would be very prudent to hold elections in Algeria, so that the leader can be chosen and a movement can be established that will receive the support of the majority of the inhabitants of the region.

The French Government has told us here that its plans are that the elections should be internationally supervised. The French Government has told us that it is ready to invite representatives of a group of countries to be present during the elections. Without in any way prejudicing the French idea that the Assembly is not competent to judge this matter -- an idea that we shall not refer to today -- the French could also invite the United Nations to participate with that group of observers, inviting either the Secretary-General or the President of the General Assembly.

We cannot accept the contention that the rebels of Algeria are necessarily -- merely because they are rebels -- the true representatives of the people. The fact that there is a rebellion in Algeria is not absolute proof that the Algerian people wish to be completely free from France. The existence of a rebellion is not always proof that the rebels express the will of the people. What I am saying is not something new in the history of the United Nations. Some delegations which conclude from the existence of the rebellion in Algeria that there is a movement for independence there did not take the same view when the United Nations was considering the rebellion in Hungary.

My delegation would give its wholehearted support to any formula aimed at solving the problem through elections, through direct negotiations between the interested parties. We are of the opinion that the very announcement of the existence of such a plan should bring about a cease fire. Let the Algerian people decide. After all, independence is not the only solution for all peoples. Other solutions are possible. In fact, in our hemisphere we have seen other solutions applied.

For many years, in all the countries of Latin America, there was a great deal of concern about the position of the island of Puerto Rico, which had become a United States possession at the end of the Spanish-American War in 1898. There was a group in Puerto Rico which engaged in a ferocious struggle for the independence of the island, and we must say that, emotionally, Latin America was sympathetic with this group that represented itself as the champion of the aspirations of the people of Puerto Rico. We should have been delighted to welcome another Republic in our continent. But the people of Puerto Rico freely decided their own fate in a plebiscite -- and in doing so they paid their tribute to the United States. The results of the plebiscite were surprising to many people. The plebiscite proved that the group known as the "independence group" of Puerto Rico -- which even went so far as to apply terroristic methods against the United States of America -- did not truly represent the majority of Puerto Ricans. The Puerto Ricans preferred a status that was sui generis, giving the island a special kind of autonomy within the framework of an economic and political union with the United States of America. Today, the Puerto Ricans

live in conditions where human rights are fully observed; they live in freedom and in justice; they are as independent as any peoples, except that they have not followed the magic slogan of "independence". They work in peace. Their elections are carried out in peace. They have proved that, although independence may be a very beautiful slogan, it is not always the panacea. They do not have their own seat in the United Nations. They have not brought one extra vote for the Latin American group of nations here. They are developing, however, and are fulfilling their aspirations.

In 1949, when Puerto Rico had already decided on its future constitutional regime, a specialized commission of the Organization of American States -- the Commission on Dependent Territories -- was meeting in Havana. That Commission discussed the position of Puerto Rico. There was a debate on whether the countries of America should accept the decision of the people of Puerto Rico as a valid decision. Fortunately, the extremist nationalistic point of view was not imposed upon the majority, and the decision of the Puerto Ricans was accepted as valid.

Could not the people of Algeria adopt a similar course? Perhaps the Algerian people will decide that they wish absolute independence. Perhaps they will not. Anything could happen. What we must do is to give all opinions an opportunity to be heard. That can only be done as a result of free elections.

My country has no reason to believe that an election carried out by France would not be free. If we were to doubt that France would carry out a free election, we would have to doubt that there could be freedom anywhere. Costa Rica could never oppose the holding of elections, for my country has made a veritable cult of elections. In its history as a republic, Costa Rica has used civil war and rebellion only to defend its electoral freedom, which we in Costa Rica worship and of which we are most zealous guardians.

Let us, therefore, see what support the Algerians will give to the men who are fighting to achieve the independence of that country. France has said here, through the voice of its highest international official, that it is prepared to negotiate with the elected representatives of the Algerian people. It may well be that those elected representatives will be the representatives of the

movement that is now, practically speaking, at war with France. That is something which the elections will show.

To a large extent, the draft resolution submitted by some Asian and African States meets the point of view that we have expressed with regard to negotiations. I feel, however, that the adoption of the draft resolution would be premature at this stage. We must first know who are the true, authorized representatives of the Algerian people and whether they have a right to negotiate on behalf of the Algerians. It is that question which the elections referred to by the French delegation will answer. These elections are to be held once a cease fire has been achieved.

To sum up, it seems that a legal solution of the Algerian problem is almost at hand, a solution with which the peace-loving nations of the world -- if I may use an expression which has been used and over-used to the point that it sometimes means the opposite -- would be satisfied. But we must know what is the true will of the Algerian people.

My delegation is very pleased with the plan that France has outlined for determining the will of the Algerian people and for ultimately achieving the solution desired by that people. The best course that we can take is to give France the time to carry out its plan and to stop the struggle in Algeria so that the correct atmosphere for the elections may be created.

Mr. BELOVSKI (Yugoslavia): In speaking on the question of Algeria, I wish first to express my delegation's gratification at the fact that, this time, France is taking part in our deliberations on this serious and important problem.

I submit that our discussions have already clearly demonstrated the seriousness of the problem of Algeria. All that has been said here is proof of the general awareness, and also the general concern that the situation prevailing today in Algeria not only is a disturbing one, but also is assuming graver and more tragic forms every day. For years, this situation has shown no signs of improvement. Armed clashes and repressive measures continue without interruption. The number of casualties is growing constantly. Economic loss and damage are increasing, while, on the international plane, the adverse effects of this state of affairs are making themselves felt increasingly from year to year.

In appraising in this way the gravity of the problem and the seriousness of its effects, I would not wish to dwell upon its juridical and historical aspects, but would rather concentrate my attention upon its political implications and perspectives. These implications and perspectives are after all, I think, our foremost concern.

My delegation views the gravity of the situation in Algeria primarily as a function of the hardship and suffering that it is causing to the inhabitants of Algeria, for the people of Algeria undoubtedly suffer the most as a result of these developments. But my delegation wishes to point out that, even from the point of view of France's interests, the problem of Algeria is an extremely difficult one. Even if we are guided by the most sincere feelings of sympathy towards France and by a genuine desire that France should play an even greater role in world affairs -- and particularly in promoting international co-operation -- it is not possible to overlook the burdens and limitations which the approach which has so far been made to the problem of Algeria has imposed upon the French economy and the French policy.

(Mr. Belovski, Yugoslavia)

The situation prevailing in Algeria imposes a great strain on France, and I believe that at the present time, when the General Assembly of the United Nations is discussing this problem, those who are recommending and endeavouring to facilitate the search for a solution which would correspond to the national aspirations of the people of Algeria cannot be excluded from the ranks of sincere friends of France. Yugoslavia's sincere desire to contribute in this respect to the best of its ability to a satisfactory solution, is well known. In its approach to this problem my country has been guided by the desire to help in reaching such an agreement among the parties concerned with regard to the complex, grave and dangerous situation in Algeria as would bring about lasting and liberal solutions.

In this connexion it is necessary to state that in our view it is not possible to isolate the problem of Algeria from other problems of the North African region. The positive experience acquired in the course of the solving of the questions of Morocco and Tunisia should certainly be taken into account, regardless of the specific features and particular characteristics of the Algerian problem. Finally, the question of Algeria cannot be viewed apart from the general trend of world developments -- a trend which has only in the course of our last and present sessions been reflected in the admission of so many new States to the United Nations.

Our Organization should continue to foster this process -- the emergence of new nations on to the stage of history, and their efforts to organize, with as little conflict and upheaval as possible, their national lives and their political, economic and cultural progress. The United Nations Charter provides for the right of peoples to self-determination. Those provisions of the Charter are actually an expression of the requirements of the times in which we are living.

The presence of a numerous French community and its special interest in Algeria, as well as the existence of important and varied interests resulting from the long association of Algeria with France, constitutes one of the chief specific features of the Algerian problem. My delegation is deeply convinced that any lasting, realistic and just solution of the problem of Algeria must provide for an appropriate solution of the question of the position and interests of French settlers in Algeria as well as of the problem of future relations with France generally.

(Mr. Belovski, Yugoslavia)

The basic problem for us, however, is not to know the existence of a serious, tragic and extremely complex situation, but to try to find a method which will provide a way out. It would not be justifiable to disregard the efforts that France is exerting in this respect. However, it is a fact that the efforts exerted by France have not proved adequate to the situation and, even less, capable of arriving at a final solution of the problem of Algeria.

It appears to us -- and I want to emphasize this in all sincerity -- that not enough progress has yet been made towards understanding the genuine character of the situation in Algeria and towards admitting that the present French policy in that country amounts essentially to the opposing of a national liberation movement which enjoys the broadest support of the masses of the Algerian people. On the other hand, the use of force and repressive measures cannot prevent the strengthening and the spreading of such a movement. The examples to this effect with which history provides us are numerous and eloquent, and there is no need to recall them here. All these examples, in their various specific forms, have been before our eyes during the last few decades. Consequently, the use of force cannot lead to any results. This has, I believe, been borne out also by the developments in Algeria in the course of the last few years. On the contrary the use of force can lead only to results which will be in direct contradiction with the expectations of those who are resorting to it. The later this is realized the deeper will be the abyss separating both sides with regard to the question of Algeria, and the graver will be the consequences for the interests of peaceful progress and friendship in the world.

What are the criteria by which, in our view, the General Assembly should be guided in its efforts to point to the road to be followed with a view to solving the Algerian problem? We are faced, in the first place, with the existence of numerous and strong militarily and politically organized forces within the Algerian population, and the fact that no practical step forward can be made, as recent developments in Algeria have proved, without negotiating with the representatives of those forces for the purpose of reaching a solution. Therefore, my delegation is firmly convinced that a cease fire, which is undoubtedly a necessary and essential element for easing the situation, can be negotiated only through talks with the representatives of those forces, without whose co-operation it is not possible to attain either this aim or any other more lasting solution. We are

(Mr. Belovski, Yugoslavia)

inclined to believe that we should not overlook this fact if we wish to ensure peace and solutions which will generally correspond to the true interests of both parties.

Having all this in mind, we advocate the method of negotiation between France and the representatives of the uprising in Algeria for the purpose of concluding a cease fire as a first step towards the solution of the question of Algeria. That step, however, cannot be separated and isolated from the question of solving all other aspects of that problem. Thus we are guided by the conviction that a solution at the present time can be reached only through direct talks, negotiation and the showing of mutual respect among those parties upon which the reaching of a lasting solution and agreement in Algeria, as well as the consolidation of the situation in North Africa in general, primarily rests.

In recommending such a course of action to the General Assembly my delegation has been guided in equal measure by the interests of the people of Algeria, the interests of France and the interests of world peace and co-operation. Consequently, my delegation will give its support to any proposal leading towards such solutions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall call upon the representative of Indonesia, since I understand that his reply will be extremely brief.

Mr. HANIPAH (Indonesia): In exercising my right of reply I should like to express my feeling of regret that the representative of Chile, in a speech at our meeting this morning on the question of Algeria, felt it necessary to make some reference to my country. That reference, I believe, was unfortunate and, indeed, irrelevant since, in fact, there is no connexion between the events in my country and the item now before the Committee. Moreover, I do not think that my Government would be honoured by the interest of the representative of Chile in my country -- that is to say, in connexion with his comparison between the Algerian case and some events in Sumatra. It is perfectly clear that these are two different matters. Many countries have more or less similar difficulties such as those existing in my country today, and certainly nearly everyone in this room will agree with me that nobody wishes to compare such happenings with the Algerian question. The bloody struggle now going on in Algeria is a struggle for freedom against a foreign and colonial rule, while what is going on in Sumatra today is a quarrel within our own family, that family being the independent State of Indonesia.

I am afraid that the representative of Chile chose an incorrect example and I sincerely hope that the matter is now clear. I believe that the representative of Chile has some mistaken ideas in this connexion, possibly due to misinformation, and I hope that he did not intend to make a serious comparison, a comparison which I consider quite irrelevant, as was made clear in my statement on 5 February when I explained the point of view of my delegation with regard to a similar remark by the representative of France.

Mr. ALBUQUERQUE (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): I think that the representative of Indonesia has not quite understood the spirit underlying my statement to which he has referred. Possibly there was an error in the interpretation which he heard. In my statement I stressed the fact that I was by no means whatever comparing one situation with the other, and if I mentioned Indonesia it was merely to demonstrate the absurdity which might follow if indiscriminate use were made of the right to self-determination. What I intended to say was only that if we took into consideration every desire which was expressed for a separation between peoples of a country and brought such desires to the United Nations, it might lead to very absurd situations. This

(Mr. Aldunate, Chile)

was the spirit underlying my statement, and I stressed the fact that I was making no comparison between that case and the Algerian question. I believe that the explanation of the representative of Indonesia was unnecessary, since such a comparison was not in my mind when I mentioned Indonesia.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.