



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 62:	
Question of Algeria (<i>continued</i>)	131

Chairman: Mr. Victor A. BELAUNDE (Peru).

AGENDA ITEM 62

**Question of Algeria (A/3197, A/C.1/L.165)
 (*continued*)**

1. Mr. DE LEQUERICA (Spain) said his delegation had been in favour of placing the Algerian question on the agenda of the General Assembly so as to permit discussion of the issue. During the debate on the inclusion of the item in the agenda, he had indicated (655th plenary meeting) that discussion did not prejudice the merits of the question nor the question whether a draft resolution should be adopted. The French delegation had been wise in undertaking to throw light on the Algerian problem.

2. Spain had often been accused of living in the past. However, some history was needed to understand the Algerian problem. Spain had played an important role in Algeria. About the time of the discovery of America, Spain had occupied Oran and thereafter all the coast from Mers-el-Kebir to Tripoli. After various vicissitudes, Oran and Mers-el-Kebir had been ceded to the Regent of Algiers for commercial concessions. That had not been the total of Spanish connexion with Algiers, however. A great number of Spaniards had settled in Algeria and had contributed by their labour to that development of the country, of which France could justly be proud. For quite a long time, there had been almost as many Spaniards as Frenchmen in Algeria. Even at present, the number of Spaniards in Algeria remained considerable.

3. Of the 1.2 million Europeans said to be in Algeria, more than 400,000 were of Spanish origin. It was not in order to present a national claim or to complicate further an already very complicated matter that he had dwelt on that point; he did so in order to draw attention to the important role played by Spanish peasants in the development of Algeria.

4. More important was the character of the Spanish peninsula as a link between France and Algeria, between Europe and the great continent stretching to its south. In that context, the statement that Africa began at the Pyrenees, contained a certain amount of truth. Important links of culture and commerce bound Spain to Africa, with whose people it had common roots. The interest of Spain in North Africa and in its development was, therefore, quite understandable. The African and Moslem heritage in Spain had left many traces still visible. Thus Spain felt that it was linked to the Moslem peoples and was in duty bound to co-operate with them, always, however, on the basis of respect for truth.

5. General Francisco Franco, Head of State of Spain and a man who knew North African problems, had stated that North Africa was the backbone of Europe, a necessary starting-point for military operations against the European continent. The free world would be endangered by anything which aroused the hostility of the peoples of North Africa, such as a denial of their equality.

6. A united Europe of free peoples who were ready to defend universal peace could not permit Africa, with its immense network of communications, its territory and enormous resources, to be left open to invasion by powerful aggressive forces which aimed at making of the African continent a gigantic Hungary. The destiny of the peoples of Africa was vital to the defence of civilization. The problem of their future could not be solved by vague declarations of independence nor by treaties reserving the sacred interests of the parties. It was essential when launching a new policy and planning the future economy of Africa to pay special attention to the security of the area. The nations charged with maintaining order and justice were obliged to seek, by every means and on the basis of respect for tradition and for the rules of law, to establish bonds of friendship with the entire Maghreb and with the Moslem peoples in general. The latter could not be left out in the solution of those problems, and it was necessary to demonstrate to them that their immediate interest called for their consent to the sacrifices necessary in order to achieve friendship with Europe in the cause of their common security.

7. There was a common and mistaken tendency, when speaking of Europe, to mean those who had dominated it. The coexistence of the European nations had been very difficult by reason of the great diversity of the peoples, cultures and traditions, and that had been the reason why the dominant Powers on the continent had arrogated the exclusive right to speak in the name of Europe. There were great gaps in the unity of Europe. Indeed, the Spanish Head of State had observed recently that European unity was only an ambitious dream impossible of realization. Nevertheless, European States must raise their sights in order to lift themselves to a more general plane. A European association was necessary. Spain would support all efforts of that kind.

8. At the same time, he drew attention to certain efforts to make of Europe a distinctive entity, a kind of bloc opposed to other blocs with different interests. Groupings of peoples had never been and could not now be based on geography; people formed groups in accordance with their traditions, their spirit of sacrifice and their community of interests. An example of one such grouping was the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), which did not rest on geographical principles, since it included Canada and the United States. The British Commonwealth was another example of a grouping of States based on non-geographic ties. Spain felt closer to certain nations distant from it

by thousands of miles but connected by ancient tradition than to certain countries situated nearer to it.

9. There appeared to be no reason to set up artificial barriers. Indeed, Europeans had no choice; they must defend the common heritage of civilization energetically and resolutely, or perish slowly by throwing themselves into undertakings destined to fail.

10. Turning to the question of colonialism, he pointed out that alongside the colonialism of self-interest there had also been colonizations which were more spiritual in character. Against the horrors of which others had spoken, he would set the tributes paid to the cultural enrichment brought to the Philippines and Latin America by the Spanish colonization. The very differences in the appraisal of the concept of colonialism made the solution of the problem correspondingly more difficult. It was necessary to acknowledge that colonialism had several aspects. It created categories of mankind of greater and less degrees of freedom. It impeded the development of public consciousness in certain peoples. That negative aspect was as nothing, however, when compared to the despotism, the arrogance and the tyranny in the relations of nations to each other. The smaller Powers had also suffered from the policy of violence, which did not always originate in the European continent. In recalling the history of those matters, his aim was to show those countries which were most sensitive to colonialism and the countries which still suffered from the colonial yoke that colonialism was a phenomenon which did not affect them alone. It was an integral part of the march of humanity; the evolution of public conscience and of international law had suffered many eclipses, not only in the colonies, but elsewhere as well.

11. Colonialism had been rejected by the modern conscience. In its place, had come a policy of collaboration among peoples, a policy which did not seek to make them produce raw materials to enrich the metropolitan areas, a policy which sought first to enrich the peoples themselves, to raise their standard of living and to accelerate their industrial progress. That was the policy which the United States had introduced and which had nothing in common with the subversion or subjugation of peoples. The new policy went hand in hand with the ideas of friendship and coexistence, and marked the progress of law.

12. The foregoing considerations were not superfluous in examining the Algerian question, which did not involve merely the interpretation of treaties and of legal instruments. Moral factors, history, and the forces involved were among the factors to be taken into consideration in their general context before solving a particular problem. Clearly, the problem was not a strictly colonial problem, and those who urged prudence, moderation and clarity were right.

13. On the soil of Algeria, 1.2 million Europeans had settled. Their contact with the primitive populations of the area had improved the conditions of the latter. But the legal texts invoked by France were not enough to form the basis for an objective judgement on the legal and moral situation of Algeria. In a recent speech, Mr. Guy Mollet, Prime Minister of France, had said of the situation of Algeria that, since 8 million Moslems lived there, it was impossible to claim that Algeria was a French province like the others. Assimilation, in its origin a generous idea, was now a bankrupt conception. Algeria was neither a Moslem State, nor an Arab State, nor a French province. Algeria, Mr. Mollet had added, had a special character, unique in the world. It had its

own personality which France must recognize and affirm.

14. Mr. de Lequerica paid tribute to the bravery of the Moslem inhabitants of Algeria.

15. An objective study of the problem required that consideration be given to the Charter of the United Nations. It was necessary to have in view the legal position of France, and in that connexion to reread a provision of the Charter which deserved to be written in letters of gold. That was Article 2, paragraph 7. The occupation and possession of Algeria by France for 120 years, the Constitution of France, and the French Union, together with the legislation enacted by France for Algeria, had a legal value recognized by international law as corresponding to Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. That provision constituted a safeguard for the body politic of the United Nations. Care should be taken not to breach that instrument of protection.

16. What the world sought was a peaceful solution which would satisfy the parties to the dispute. In that connexion, he recalled the statement made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Spain during the general debate (588th plenary meeting) in which he had said that any determined and persistent opposition to independence movements would be likely to inflame feeling and poison the atmosphere.

17. The Charter also contained a discreet affirmation of the principle of self-determination. But it was not possible to agree that that principle should be employed in an automatic way to favour caprice and subversive activities, for danger could follow for the great human achievements created in the course of centuries thanks to self-determination, thanks to sacrifice and to the human will. Self-determination, which was an instrument of anarchy when it was at the service of intrigue and of impatience, represented a great danger, and the United Nations could never, without risking its own existence, accept such manifestations of it.

18. He did not mean to imply indifference to the great suffering of Algeria. The Algerian problem was not solely a legal one, nor did it depend only on the generosity and the resolution of French policy. It was also a problem which concerned the Mediterranean, and even the whole of Europe, and all nations which desired peace and knew that the Arab countries had a role to play in bringing it about. He had confidence that France would bring forward a satisfactory solution to the problem.

19. Contrasting the position of France at the tenth session of the General Assembly with that shown at the present session, Mr. de Lequerica noted progress. The representative of France had expounded the problem before the First Committee (830th and 831st meetings), and it could be hoped that a road to agreement would be found. Similarly, the representative of Syria had stated (831st to 833rd meetings) certain propositions which might help toward a solution. France, which had been looking for an interlocutor had perhaps found one, and it was possible to hope for progress in that respect. The duty of the Assembly was to follow events with close attention, in the hope that difficulties and rivalries would disappear and that it could contribute to such a result.

20. In colonial, semi-colonial or pseudo-colonial questions, it was imperative to induce a frame of mind adapted to the necessities of the time. Things could not be accomplished overnight. Too many historical memories and factors of an emotional kind were involved.

21. The attitude of Spain was best expressed in the message which General Franco had addressed to the Spanish people on the subject of North Africa and the Middle East. The problems of those areas, he had said, were of general importance and interest. By granting independence to the people of Spanish Morocco, Spain had shown the nobility of its attitude to those territories and had consolidated fraternal relations with its neighbours.

22. He again stressed the importance of North Africa to Europe, and the compatibility of its interests with those of the West. Association between North African countries and Europe would also serve the interests of those nations which were linked to the North Africans by ancient ties. They would thus be able to regain confidence and play an important role in the world. Europe's interests required the progress of the Arab peoples. The danger to them came not from the West, but from Soviet imperialism, which was much closer to them.

23. Europe should avoid committing new mistakes, should give up antiquated policies and should envisage a wider association of peoples and a greater range of relations, principally at the commercial and industrial level.

24. Spain, which had a special role to play in that union of Mediterranean countries envisaged by General Franco, which included Africa and Europe, could serve as an intermediary between France and North Africa.

25. He concluded his statement with the observation of Sallust: "There are many vassals, but none of us has too many friends."

26. Mr. SOUSTELLE (France) stated that the French delegation wished to clarify certain points in order that the Committee might be accurately and completely informed. Replying first to certain observations of the representative of Syria, he denied that in 1830 there had existed an Algerian State, fully endowed with all the attributes of sovereignty, which had been the victim of French aggression and conquest. After reviewing the occupation of Algeria by the peoples of classical antiquity, he pointed out that the Arabs had succeeded in installing their control only after fierce struggles lasting from the seventh to the eleventh centuries. At the beginning of the sixteenth century complete anarchy had reigned in the territory now called Algeria. Arab tribes and Berber villages had fought with each other, while certain localities had been occupied by Spain. Following the capture of Algiers in 1529 by Barberousse, a Turkish colony had been established whose principle activity was piracy. For three centuries the Barbary pirates had practised their trade of pillage, rapine and slavery. The representative of Syria had referred to conventions which had been concluded between the Dey of Algiers and various Powers before 1830 without saying that their object had been to obtain respect for earlier conventions or to ransom slaves. Those treaties had been continually violated, which had obliged the Powers to attack Algiers repeatedly — first Great Britain, then France, then Spain and in 1815 the United States fleet. Those treaty relations were, therefore, of a special nature: piracy on one side and defence against it on the other. The decision of the French Government in 1830 to destroy slavery and piracy on all the coast of Africa and re-establish freedom of navigation in the Mediterranean had been taken in response to the will of the civilized Powers as expressed at several international conferences.

27. As to the Dey's authority in Algeria, historical facts proved that no organized sovereignty had existed.

He noted that the allegiance of the Government of Algiers to the Ottoman Empire had ended in 1669, when the pirate chiefs had expelled the Pasha sent by the Sublime Porte and replaced him with a Dey elected by themselves. Thirty Deys had succeeded each other, of whom fourteen had been overthrown and assassinated. The Dey's authority had hardly extended beyond the limits of Algiers and its suburbs. The rest of the country had been divided between nomadic and semi-nomadic tribes and villagers, who had engaged in incessant armed expeditions against each other. In addition, there had been three Beys — one in Hédéa, one in Oran and one in Constantine — who were practically independent of their suzerain. Consequently, in 1830 the Dey of Algiers had not been able to transfer to France the sovereignty of Algeria, since no one could represent an Algerian State which had never existed.

28. Drawing the attention of the representative of Burma to the point, Mr. Soustelle contended that France could not be reproached for not having based its conduct in 1830 on modern laws. He conceded that, particularly since the Second World War, the acquisition of sovereignty over territory even by legitimate occupation, and in the absence of legal sovereignty, was no longer considered a normal method of acquisition; he was obliged to point out, however, that if it were sought to question the frontiers and the territorial composition of States by going back to the beginning of the previous century to determine their origins, vast changes in the configuration of many States would follow. France could not be reproached for having in 1830 acted in accordance with the international law of the time. What was certain, was that France's settlement in Algeria had not been disputed by any Power — not even by the Sublime Porte which could have invoked its former rights. Moreover, French sovereignty had been sanctioned from 1847 by the acceptance of the population, who had not only not questioned the French character of Algeria, but had shown their fidelity to France many times, notably in the two world wars.

29. As to the series of legislative acts mentioned by the representative of Syria (831st meeting) to show that France had been obliged repeatedly to decree that the Algerian population was French, he explained that those acts represented the successive stages by which the Algerians — French nationals — had acquired the rights of French citizenship, all of which they possessed at the present time. The Moslems also possessed the special privilege of keeping their personal status with regard to marriage and rules of inheritance.

30. Mr. Soustelle denied that there existed discrimination of any kind with respect to Algerians of Berber or Moslem origin. They were all full French citizens in accordance with the Constitution of 1946, which had been voted upon in Algeria as elsewhere. The assertion that the Algerians were heavily taxed without representation was doubly false. Taxes paid by Algerians were voted by the Algerian Assembly, which was elected by all the Algerians, and were lighter than those in metropolitan France. There was also no discrimination in matters of salary. A guaranteed minimum salary existed in Algeria amounting to 95.5 francs per hour, and applied to everyone in conformity with French law. The Syrian representative's assertion that the Moslem-Algerian workers enjoyed only one-third of the benefits laid down by French law was fantastic and arbitrary. The social service system in Algeria, was enjoyed by all Algerians equally and was subsidized by the French treasury.

31. Nor was it true that the hospitals of Algeria were reserved for Europeans or that there were none in the interior of the country. Up to 90 per cent of the available beds in the hospitals of Algeria were occupied by the indigenous population. He recalled with pride the magnificent hospitals and dispensaries in the villages and in the oases of the Sahara, and the network of mobile and collective medical services. The increase in population from 1.5 million in 1830 to 8.5 million in 1957 was the best answer to statements that France had been guilty of genocide.

32. Observing that he could not follow step by step the representative of Syria in his argumentation based on arbitrary assertions of fact, Mr. Soustelle stated that they had been inspired by the obvious wish to condemn *a priori* everything that France had done. He would note briefly the particularly inexact assertions of the Syrian representative. The figure of \$21,000 which had been presented as the annual income of the European inhabitants was a poetic exaggeration on the order of *The Arabian Nights*. Most of those of European origin were people of modest means. If there were rich Frenchmen of metropolitan origin in Algiers, there were equally rich Moslems. Inequality of fortune was a social phenomenon and not a national one.

33. With regard to the distribution of land, 22,000 European landowners possessed lands of which 13,000 were smaller than 50 hectares, and 2,600 were less than 100 hectares. Six hundred and thirty thousand Moslem owners worked 7,350,000 hectares. The European properties had not been acquired by theft, but through concessions of uncultivated land belonging to the public domain, land usually unsuited to cultivation, unhealthy, swampy or arid, they had been reclaimed at the cost of much money, stubborn labour and frightful mortality. Those concessions were also granted to Moslems. Contrary to what had been asserted he said that in 1956 there had been a surplus of wheat and barley under a system by which the Algerian farmer received subsidies from the metropolitan treasury. Finally, 85 per cent of the cattle-raising in Algeria was carried out by non-Europeans. By the decree of 26 March 1956, the share of the harvest received by the 140,000 sharecroppers in Algeria working for Moslem Algerians was increased from one-fifth to one-half.

34. Turning to the accusations that France had attacked the culture, the language and the religion of the indigenous inhabitants, he observed that Arabic had been recognized officially by article 57 of the Statute of 20 September 1947 as a language of the French Union, which could be used in courts, in notarial documents, and in the debates of the Algerian Assembly. He also recalled that French presence in Algeria had fostered the development of distinguished Arab scholars. The Moslem religion had enjoyed the respect of the French authorities for 127 years. The Algerian budget, subsidized by that of metropolitan France, paid for the upkeep of the mosques and the salaries of religious leaders. The French Administration contributed to instruction in Koranic schools.

35. He emphasized that the people of Algeria were not Algerians and foreigners, but different peoples, communities differing in origin, language and religion, all of whom belonged equally to Algeria and to France. Two million were Berbers, the only people truly native to Algeria, 6.5 million were Arabs who had invaded Algeria in the seventh century, and 1.2 million were non-Moslems of the Christian or Jewish religions. Stressing the equal rights of all the inhabitants to regard

Algeria as their home, he protested against the use of the racist fiction of pan-Arabism to support claims of Arab imperialism to an empire extending from the Persian Gulf to the Atlantic Ocean. Citing declarations by Mr. Nasser, the President of Egypt, and the representative of Syria, he said that Algeria was not an Arab country and considered as barbarous the principle by which one treated as foreigners men and women born in Algeria. He added that the fact that a part of its population was of Arab origin did not give Syria or Egypt particular rights to Algeria.

36. Turning to the nature of the National Liberation Front, to the disputed the claim that had been made in a pamphlet that the "*moudjahid*" was a "freedom fighter". In reality, the *moudjahid* was a fighter in the holy war against the infidel. The use of the term explained the spirit behind the atrocities committed by the rebels.

37. Contrary to the affirmation of the representative of Syria (832rd meeting) that the rebels constituted a regular army in occupation of entire regions under the civil administration of the National Liberation Front, no such authority was exercised over a single village in Algeria. The *fellagha*, or bandits as they were called by the peasants, attacked farms, burned barns, stopped vehicles and assassinated civilians. But brigandage was not the same as administration. If it were true that the Moslem population stood squarely with the rebels, Mr. Soustelle asked why they were massacred by the bandits, why there had been no massive uprising, and how it was that harvests were gathered in the usual way, trains ran, 98 per cent of taxes were received, and young Moslems presented themselves regularly for military service. Moreover, he wondered how one could explain the fact that hundreds of villages had asked for arms for their defence and had formed defence groups against the exactions of the rebels. Regarding the assertion that the National Liberation Front was the sole national movement in Algeria, he observed that in fact there were two organizations which fought each other violently. Proof of that fact was contained in the latest issue of the National Liberation Front publication. In addition, the Algerian Communist Party took credit for contributing to the union of the armed forces of the resistance by concluding an agreement with the National Liberation Front. He asserted that in fact the Communist Party was taking control of the so-called nationalist movement. As they were beaten in the country, the rebels resorted to terrorism through the use of infernal machines which took innocent lives.

38. While the French Government shared the desire expressed by the representative of the Philippines (833rd meeting) to see an end of bloodshed, he emphasized his agreement with the reservations expressed by the representative of Ireland (833rd meeting). Any encouragement to the rebellion which might be represented as enjoying the high authority of the United Nations could only prolong the conflict further, against the wishes of the immense majority of the peoples of Algeria who aspired to peace and an equitable settlement of Algerian problems. Such a settlement was possible only on a democratic basis and not, as the representative of Syria had proposed, by capitulating to the dictatorial demands of a profoundly anti-democratic movement. An inopportune interference which put new obstacles in the way of a return to calm and peace would constitute disrespect for the letter and above all the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations.

39. Mr. Soustelle wondered to whom the elections in Algeria could, in the phrase of the representative of

Morocco, be "dangerous". If the rebels were so sure of the support of the people, he wondered why they should fear elections. The reason could only be that they were by no means certain of that support and aimed to take power by force.

40. With regard to the accusations made by the representative of Morocco in his statement (834th meeting) to the effect that France was guilty of racism, he declared that the French were the least racist of all peoples and that the racists were those who discriminated between Moslem and non-Moslem French Algerians and between various nationalities among the latter and who said that 1.2 million non-Moslem Algerians were an argument rather than a difficulty. He emphatically declared that France would be covered with dishonour if it abandoned the French of European origin as well as the Moslem French of Algeria to the despotism of pitiless masters.

41. He also challenged the theory of the representative of Morocco according to which a breach of peace in any country made necessary an intervention by the United Nations. Such a theory created an incentive for subversion and offered a bonus for aggression.

42. In reply to charges of French parsimony in matters of Algerian education, he stated that 30 per cent of the Algerian budget was devoted to education. The rebels, however, had during the previous two years burned 400 schools. He agreed with the representative of Morocco that force was not a way of settling problems, but advised him to address the admonition to those guilty of arson or murder.

43. In conclusion, he warned against the oversimplified antithesis which placed colonialism on the one hand and the Algerian people on the other. The reality was more complicated. Some sought a violent solution by the pure and simple suppression of all opposition. The French Government was seeking peaceful and constructive solutions, permitting the coexistence of different communities equally worthy of respect and affection. He warned again that any imprudent initiative would risk prolonging the conflict and jeopardizing for a long time the chances for a reasonable solution. Such action, would not be in conformity with the spirit which should animate the United Nations. In any case, France was determined to continue its efforts to restore peace in Algeria on the basis of equality for all and of human progress.

44. Mr. TARAZI (Syria) reserved the right of his delegation to reply to the representative of France.

45. Mr. AZIZ (Afghanistan) hoped that, since the inclusion of the Algerian question in the agenda of the eleventh session had not been opposed by France, it would be possible to have a constructive discussion in the First Committee.

46. The Algerians were closely linked by race, religion, culture and history to the peoples of Morocco, Tunisia and Libya, and formed a part of the Arab world. Singling out the seventh century invasion of Algeria by the Arabs as the most important event in that territory's history, he concluded that, politically, Algeria shared the history of North Africa, while economically it revealed the characteristics of a colonial, agricultural economy complementary to that of France.

47. He defined the Algerian problem as the case of a country that had been annexed by a colonial Power after a military conquest and whose people had continued to resist until 1910, and whose national resistance was continued by the Algerian National Movement, the

Army of National Liberation and the National Liberation Front.

48. Algeria was not an integral part of France, for the French Ordinance of 22 July 1834, proclaiming Algeria an integral part of France, and a decree dated 24 October 1870 declaring Algeria as being three French Departments, had both been expressions of unilateral decisions by France. The Afghanistan delegation submitted that such unilateral assertions in the case of the Algerian people were contrary to the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations. They believed, furthermore, that no thesis supporting the recognition of forcible unions could be validly sustained.

49. Notwithstanding the half million men of the French Army conducting military operations in Algeria, the Algerian resistance showed no sign of diminishing. If a peaceful solution were not found by the General Assembly, fighting would continue in Algeria.

50. Declaring that discussions — presumably looking to a peaceful settlement — had taken place between representatives of the National Liberation Front and representatives of Mr. Guy Mollet, the Prime Minister of France, Mr. Aziz said it was unfortunate that no concrete agreement had been reached at that stage. A peace conference which was to have taken place in Tunisia had not occurred because of the arrest of five representatives of the National Liberation Front while they were travelling to Tunis. It was difficult to envisage a solution unless the French Government were ready to consider the demands of the Algerians for self-determination.

51. In conclusion, he recalled that the African-Asian Conference, held at Bandung in 1955, had supported the right of the Algerian people to self-determination. He earnestly hoped that the General Assembly would adopt a resolution on the Algerian problem which, being the verdict and moral judgement of the United Nations, could not easily be ignored.

52. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) stated that the United States welcomed France's decision to discuss with Members of the General Assembly its intentions with respect to Algeria. That discussion should lead to greater understanding of the problem and contribute to a just and peaceful solution.

53. The United States Government welcomed in particular France's willingness to conclude a cease-fire without prior conditions and without reprisals. It also welcomed France's intention to hold general elections by universal suffrage within ninety days of the achievement of a cease-fire, and then to work out with the elected representatives a new structure for Algeria. If that programme could be put into effect promptly, a significant forward step would have been taken.

54. Observing that there were differences of opinion in the First Committee with regard to what should ultimately constitute a satisfactory settlement, he said that two immediate considerations seemed fundamental: the first was that violence and bloodshed in Algeria should cease, and the second was that a situation should be created which would permit the inhabitants of Algeria to elect representatives to work out with the French Government a solution that would satisfy the aspirations of all the people of Algeria. That would not be easy or even possible without good faith, restraint and statesmanship by all concerned.

55. The United States was opposed to any action which might be harmful to the prospects of a peaceful settlement. Consequently, the United States opposed the

adoption of the eighteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.165). It was also opposed to proposals which the United States delegation believed constituted intervention in matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of France. Such proposals, if applied indiscriminately in the Organization, could destroy it.

56. Above all, the Assembly must avoid action which might hamper the achievement of a cease-fire and the carrying out of a programme which appeared to offer a reasonable prospect of advancing an Algerian settlement. There must be no external interference in Algerian affairs from any quarter, for such action would be bound to lead to an increase of tension and violence there.

57. In conclusion, he considered the French programme for a cease-fire, elections and consultations a hopeful forward step. The First Committee must at the very least do nothing which would interfere with the prospect of a peaceful evolution. The United States delegation believed that true progress could only be made on the spot and that, in the absence of outside interference, such progress would take place.

58. Mr. BEN-ABOUD (Morocco), exercising the right of reply, recalled that his delegation had sought to distinguish clearly between the passing phenomenon of colonialism and France as a nation with which Morocco felt closely linked. The Moroccan delegation had adopted a rigorous and objective attitude which was as academic as possible and avoided sentimentalism.

59. Observing that, when there were disputes between France and Morocco, they were disputes between friends, he declared that such disputes must not be based on bad intentions or ulterior motives; in friendly discussions the sole criterion must be truth. By a truthful statement of the problem to the Committee, the Moroccan delegation was also helping France, with which Morocco wished to go hand in hand in the future as it had in the past. Consequently, there must be a clear-cut understanding that the intention of the Moroccan delegation was good.

60. Referring to four points from a lecture by Mr. Soustelle he said he felt positive that the programme would never succeed because the East and the West could meet only on one level — the level of principle. The four points of Mr. Soustelle must not be forgotten when considering the contribution made by Mr. Pineau. The latter had called for a cease-fire, elections and discussions, not negotiation. In those declarations there were flagrant contradictions. The basic status of Algeria would not be changed; it would remain a French territory. To say that the matter would be discussed, but that nothing would be changed anyway was an obvious contradiction. The reason for the numerous contradictions in the Algerian problem lay in the opposition of the French *colons* in Algeria. Members of the United Nations were obliged not to speak as partisans of one side or the other, but they could testify that a real contradiction could lead to nothing but a renewal of the insurrection.

61. As to the unanimity of the Algerians, he observed that, if it were not for the presence of 500,000 French soldiers in Algeria, one might claim that there was no unanimity. But the soldiers were there and, if they were struggling against men and not phantoms, there was unanimity. As to assassinations, he observed that the Algerians were human beings and what happened

in Algeria must necessarily occur in any part of the world where a national revolution for liberation was taking place.

62. Not wishing to dwell on the question of racism, he would say only that the Moroccans themselves had experienced permanent contact with it. He continued to maintain that elections were dangerous in a subjugated country. When the Algerians, after a century without the vote, obtained it, the elections had been rigged, and of a total of 120 seats, sixty were held by the representatives of 1 million individuals and sixty by the representatives of 9 million. Elections were the expression of democracy only where there was freedom. The question of elections demanded clarification. If there were to be elections, they must be supervised by an army of inspectors, which the United Nations could not set up. To ensure democratic elections, therefore, a political precondition was necessary, namely, liberty.

63. With respect to his remarks concerning education, he asserted that experience had provided tangible proof that wherever there was colonialism there was an impediment to intellectual development. Force was not a means of resolving the problem, but if the Algerians and other subject people turned to violence, that was because in the absence of any freedoms, that was their only way of expressing themselves.

64. The Algerian people had been free. Its wish to regain its freedom was legitimate. France would remain great through the force of justice and by accepting the application in Algeria of its own principles. In the colonies one was asked why it was that, wherever they went, the Communists imposed the government that they wanted by force, and why it was that France and the United Kingdom, when they entered a colony, opposed by fire and the sword the same system of democracy and freedom upon which their own nations had been set up.

65. Without attempting to accuse anyone, the Moroccan delegation had honestly sought to prove that colonialism was obsolete and must be replaced by co-operation between free equals. That was the intention of his delegation.

66. Mr. TARAZI (Syria) observed that his delegation would speak later on the various technical points raised by the representative of France at the present meeting and that he would take up now certain general statements made by that representative.

67. He would make no reply to the accusation that the representative of Syria had gone beyond the limits of international courtesy because when the representative of Syria had spoken, he had defended the cause of the Algerian people. When people were dying, it was impossible not to mention it on the pretext that international courtesy required appearances to be preserved.

68. The allegations concerning Arab imperialism were without foundation. While it was natural for the French and the British, who were imperialists, to suppose that all others must be such too, the Arab countries were neither seeking territory nor commercial advantages. Having fought against imperialism themselves, they sympathized with every anticolonial, national cause. Vigorously protesting against the use of the term "Arab imperialism", he noted that the Arabs had, instead, a sympathy for the cause of those who spoke the same tongue and belonged to the same culture.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.