

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FOURTEENTH SESSION  
Official Records



**856th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Saturday, 12 December 1959,  
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| <i>Agenda item 59:</i>  |      |
| <i>Question of Algeria (concluded)</i>                                    |      |
| <i>Report of the First Committee (concluded)</i> .                        | 735  |
| <i>Statement by the President</i> . . . . .                               | 751  |
| <i>Agenda item 25:</i>  |      |
| <i>Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space</i> |      |
| <i>Report of the First Committee</i> . . . . .                            | 752  |

President: Mr. Víctor A. BELAUNDE (Peru).

## AGENDA ITEM 59

### Question of Algeria (concluded)

#### REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/4339) (concluded)

1. Mr. LORIDAN (Belgium) (translated from French): When a vote was taken in the First Committee last Monday, 7 December 1959, on the draft resolution submitted by twenty-two African-Asian countries, it became evident that the draft would not obtain the necessary two-thirds majority if it was submitted to a plenary meeting. For that reason, the sponsors endeavoured to draw up a new draft resolution which would be acceptable to the Assembly, as was announced here last Thursday, 10 December [852nd meeting], by the Burmese representative. He also stated that the African-Asian group had discussed this matter at length and that a new draft resolution, which stood a good chance of adoption, would be submitted the next day. But it was only last night, 11 December, that a new draft resolution was submitted by the Pakistan delegation [A/L.276].

2. The Belgian delegation considers that this draft resolution has very serious implication. Several Member States consider that, at the end of the debate on the Algerian question, the adoption of a resolution is a matter of course and is indeed, indispensable. The Assembly's failure to adopt a resolution would, they think, be tantamount to a self-imposed paralysis. Of course, the Assembly adopts a large number of resolutions on the most varied subjects every year. Some of them do not achieve the desired result, but at least they have no harmful effects.

3. For legal considerations, and because it does not think such action appropriate, the Belgian delegation will not vote for the new draft resolution now under discussion. Belgium is no less attached than any other country to the principle of self-determination. It has, in the course of its history, repeatedly had to struggle for its freedom and independence. It welcomed the French Government's recognition of the right to self-determination for the people of Algeria. But the

proclamation of this right by France does not create a corresponding right for the United Nations to intervene in the Algerian question.

4. The Belgian delegation feels that the adoption of the new draft resolution could have the most unfortunate consequences which all Members of this Assembly would deeply regret. We all wish for a cease-fire as soon as possible to put an end to the bloodshed in Algeria and to all the evils which war brings. Everyone admits that the end of hostilities is the first step, the necessary condition, for a settlement of the Algerian question on the basis of the principle of self-determination by referendum.

5. This Assembly must, therefore, do nothing which, far from encouraging negotiations for a cease-fire between the French Government and the National Liberation Front, would merely hamper them. To jeopardize a cease-fire would, in effect, jeopardize the arrangements which the French President has undertaken to make, in co-operation with the leaders of all parties without distinction, whatever their origin and their previous activity, with those representing the views of all sections of the Algerian people, and with the advocates of all policies, in order that the Algerians may freely decide their fate by a referendum.

6. The debate which took place in the First Committee emphasized once again the extreme difficulty and complexity of the situation. It showed the antagonisms, the hostility of the political forces involved, the clash of ideas, and the bitter passions, rendered more acute by five years of struggle. Nevertheless, it is generally recognized that the prospects for a peaceful and just settlement have never been as good. The general tone of the discussion, which we are pleased to see conducted with such restraint, shows that some progress has been made towards allaying passions since the thirteenth session of the General Assembly. An inconsiderate action by the United Nations would only cause a stiffening of attitudes, encourage intransigence and extremism, and thwart the efforts of those who are courageously, and with goodwill, trying to overcome the obstacles in the way of the just, peaceful and democratic settlement which the Belgian Government sincerely desires.

7. My delegation cannot share the responsibility for the most unfortunate consequences which it feels would result from intervention by the Assembly, however well-intentioned and however restrained its language. The new draft resolution which is now before us may meet, though only apparently, some of the objections raised against the draft resolution submitted by the twenty-two African-Asian countries. The scope of the present draft resolution, which is somewhat ambiguous, is essentially the same: it has the same aim, and it favours some positions as against others. Its effects would be no less harmful than those of the African-Asian draft resolution to the cause of the Algerian people, to the cause of France and, gen-

erally speaking, to the position of all those concerned in achieving a satisfactory settlement of the Algerian problem with the least possible delay.

8. Sir Claude COREA (Ceylon): We have expressed our views rather fully in the course of the general debate [821st meeting] and again during the discussions in the First Committee [1075th meeting], and we do not therefore propose to cover the same ground at this stage. If I have decided to ask for the opportunity of making a few observations, it is only because of the new draft resolution [A/L.276] that has been submitted to us. I would, however, before doing so, crave your indulgence to make one general comment. I would like to remind the Assembly of the fact that we are dealing here, in Algeria, with a conflict which has world-wide significance and which has evoked world-wide interest. Our sympathies surely go not only to the people in Algeria, but also to the people of France. We deplore the existence of this conflict. It has gone on year after year during the last five years, resulting in serious loss of life and imposing a huge and almost unbearable drain on the slender financial resources of the gallant fighters in Algeria, and it has also caused great material loss and imposed heavy burdens on the French people. This is something which we cannot allow to continue, and it is certainly the responsibility of the Assembly to do whatever is possible to bring an end to this conflict. It is only in that sense that we wish to submit our views to this Assembly: not in a way which would probably prevent a settlement, but in all sincerity, with a view to promoting a settlement which is certainly long overdue.

9. Last year the First Committee called for independence, despite the warnings of many at that time that any call for independence would be considered as an act inimical to the interests of France and as something which France would not be able to accept or consider. In spite of that, a call went out saying that, in view of the grave threat to international peace and security and in view of the serious disadvantage in the continuance of this conflict, the rights of the Algerian people to independence should be recognized.

10. I should like to remind the Assembly that that was done despite the warning that any resolution would jeopardize the chances of any settlement to which France itself would be a party. But I am sure the great French people took a different view and will continue to take a different view; because, after all, the French people understand the meaning of freedom, the French people are a people to whom the significance of freedom is not strange, a people who have proved to the world that they themselves are and have been fighters for freedom. It is for this reason that General de Gaulle could, even at the time of this acute conflict, refer on 23 October 1958 to the Algerian fighters as the "brave" fighters of Algeria. So that the idea of fighting for freedom is not something unknown to the French people.

11. Our view has been demonstrated to be correct by the steps taken by President de Gaulle himself since the draft resolution of 1958, because when we called for independence the French Government, led by its great President de Gaulle, did not hesitate to promise self-determination for the people of Algeria. The point I wish to make is that a great people, a brave people, a people with experience of the world are not frightened by mere empty words, but under-

stand the significance underlying action taken by such a great Organization as the United Nations, and we, therefore, should not be too unwilling to express our views, to tell the people of the world and to tell the great people of France what our feelings are on this matter. That is the reason why we have to consider this matter that is now before us.

12. We have before us also the fact that after the adoption of the draft resolution in favour of independence the French Government gave its promise of freedom and independence to all the overseas territories, and as a result of that we find Guinea represented here as an independent country and we find that a number of others have opted for autonomy and some of them will, perhaps, in agreement with France, also be getting their independence soon. Here we have another indication that France, despite any prognostications to the contrary, is willing to recognize the rights of peoples to freedom and independence; and again, as I said before, since then we have had this unique gesture made by France in offering self-determination to the Algerian people.

13. The draft resolution of the African-Asian countries which was adopted in the First Committee was put forward entirely as a means of implementing that promise of self-determination. We wished to see that self-determination made a reality, and those of us who supported that draft resolution felt very clearly and very strongly that if discussions can be arranged to take place between the Government of France and those who can bring about a cease-fire, then the day of the implementation of self-determination will be near.

14. Now, what is it that prevents self-determination from becoming a fact? It is true that the fighting nationalists of Algeria are still unwilling to take the promise of self-determination without first considering certain questions which appear to them important. Now, is that such a request as should be turned down completely out of hand, as it were? Is it not right for them to ask for some talks to take place so as to enable them to discuss and clarify their position and to find out what would be the terms under which they would lay down their arms and what kind of self-determination would be granted after they have laid down their arms?

15. My delegation has no reason to retire from the position we adopted in the First Committee. We would like to stand by the draft resolution that has been adopted. We believe it to be a reasonable draft resolution that has been adopted. We believe it to be a reasonable draft resolution, and despite what is said to the contrary, it is not a draft resolution which in any way can be considered unsatisfactory or antagonistic by the French Government. We understand, however, that there are certain countries represented here which would not be able to go along with that draft resolution because of the use of certain words or the expression of certain views, but that, on the other hand, they would be able to go along with it if certain amendments were made.

16. We have given full thought to that point of view and, along with a number of other African-Asian countries, we have not found it unacceptable. We are prepared, as an earnest of our desire for a peaceful solution in Algeria, to go a long way to make any changes which are not fundamentally different or which do not involve any question of vital principle in order

to find the way of peace. My delegation is therefore quite prepared to accept the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Pakistan, a draft which I know has the agreement of a large number of the African-Asian countries. We accept that draft resolution and would commend it to the Assembly not because we think it is necessary and not because we are abandoning the draft resolution which the First Committee adopted, in which we fully believe, but because here is an attempt to bring in the support of as large a number of other Members of this Assembly as possible. What is at issue is an important stake, the stake of a country fighting for freedom, the stake of a people who are bleeding every day in the fight to secure that right. In that context, it is unwise and morally wrong to stand by words and technicalities and either accept or reject this strong plea for freedom and independence.

17. We must eliminate all these technicalities. We are therefore prepared to accept the wording which has been incorporated in the new draft. For that reason, we shall support this new draft resolution. We ask the Assembly to give it its overwhelming support as a formula for peace and as a means of stopping the killing and the bloodshed that is going on, and as a means of recognizing the inalienable right of all peoples to self-determination.

18. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Before I call on the next speaker, circumstances oblige me to propose that the list of speakers be closed at 4 p.m. If there is no objection, it will be so decided.

*It was so decided.*

19. Mr. VENKATARAMAN (India): The delegation of India is one of those that co-sponsored the draft resolution which is embodied in the report [A/4339] of the First Committee. During the debate in the Committee, several delegations felt obliged either to vote against or to abstain on the draft resolution out of a genuine desire not to do anything which would hamper discussions between the Government of France and the representatives of Algeria.

20. Taking into account the ideas and suggestions made by several delegations, the representative of Pakistan has brought before this Assembly a draft resolution [A/L.276], which embodies the general view among the delegations on this question.

21. Our belief is further strengthened by the response from the representative of Argentina who, in his brilliant intervention in the course of the debate this morning [855th meeting], endorsed the approach to the solution contained in the draft resolution submitted by Pakistan.

22. As we sit and debate whether or not to have a resolution on Algeria, the situation created by the hostilities in Algeria is causing serious concern and alarm. Human sacrifice, purposeless and waste, continues unabated. It is the duty of the General Assembly to ease the situation in Algeria and bring about peace to this land. We cannot accept the principle that there should be no resolution by the General Assembly on this or on any other difficult problem. It is the right and the duty of the Assembly to further the solution of problems with its advice and guidance.

23. It is our belief that the acceptance of the draft resolution submitted by Pakistan will help to bring about a peaceful, democratic and just solution, which is indeed the accepted objective of the General Assem-

bly, and it is in this hope that my delegation will vote in favour of this draft and commend it to the acceptance of the Assembly.

24. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) (translated from French): My delegation does not consider it necessary to make a further statement at this stage in the debate, and I shall therefore confine myself to expressing our full approval, and that of all the African countries, whose views I am confident that I can accurately interpret, of the statement made this morning by the Argentine representative [855th meeting]. We believe that he put the Algerian question in its true light, as a question of peace in Algeria for the benefit of the Algerian people, and peace as the essential condition for friendship and true co-operation between the peoples of France and of Algeria.

25. We are happy to be able to point to the admirable stand taken by Argentina, to which the great majority of representatives who spoke this morning rightly paid a tribute, as further proof of the effective unity of purpose between the countries of Latin America and the peoples of Africa and Asia in achieving a just and peaceful settlement of all disputes in the interests of international co-operation, peace, friendly relations and the prosperity of all peoples.

26. To conclude, my delegation believes that the General Assembly, at its fourteenth session—the session at which the historic resolution on disarmament [resolution 1378 (XIV)] was unanimously adopted and at which three Heads of State spoke in defence of peace and international co-operation—will fully deserve the name "the Assembly of Peace" by contributing, through the adoption of the new draft resolution [A/L.276], to a prompt agreed solution of the Algerian conflict.

27. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): In the statement which I made on this item in the First Committee on 2 December 1959 [1069th meeting], I explained the United Kingdom view that in present circumstances any resolution adopted by the General Assembly on the substance of this matter would be likely to make an early solution of the problem more difficult. Those who heard my statement in the Committee will have realized that the United Kingdom Government is principally concerned by a profound anxiety that nothing should be done in the Assembly to prejudice what are undoubtedly—and we are all agreed on this—the most favourable circumstances which have ever existed for a satisfactory solution of a most complex and serious problem.

28. There is in the present case common ground about the right method of solving a delicate and urgent problem, that is by the application of the principle of self-determination; there is, further, an opportunity of talks without prejudice between those concerned about what all are agreed is the essential first step to that solution, that is the cessation of hostilities.

29. We believe that in these circumstances the United Nations can only do harm if it seeks to pronounce on the matter in any way which is likely to make the opening of those talks more difficult.

30. It is known that there is a difference of view between those concerned about the nature and scope of the talks which General de Gaulle has proposed. We do not believe that these differences are likely to be resolved by public exchanges, still less by a suc-

cessful attempt on the part of either side to secure endorsement from the United Nations of its own interpretation. Much can be done in the way of clarification and explanation, and much progress can be made in private exchanges, which the limitations imposed by the public exposition of attitudes can only make more difficult.

31. Speaking in Committee, I recalled what I regard as a close similarity between the problem of Algeria as at present before us, and the situation with regard to Cyprus as it was last year. The matter before us is of such great importance that I make no apology for asking my colleagues to consider this point again.

32. At that time there was, as in the present case, a possibility of talks between those immediately concerned. Then, as now, there were differences of view strongly held as to the basis for these talks. Then, as now, there were many Members of the Assembly who sincerely believed that the view of one or other of the potential participants as to the proper basis for the talks was the correct one, and who understandably considered that it was the duty of the United Nations to give an impulse in that direction.

33. We took the opposite view and argued with all our conviction that a directive from the Assembly which favoured one thesis rather than another could only make it more difficult for those concerned to make the necessary act of faith and open the discussions on a basis of confidence.

34. Paradoxical as it may seem at first sight, we believe that the successful outcome of the Cyprus negotiations, from which there resulted a solution of one of the most difficult problems of the post-war period, was directly due to the fact that the General Assembly was wise enough last year to refrain from any pronouncement on the substance of the item.

35. Now, it was because we considered that any substantive resolution could only be harmful as it would introduce a new element into this complex problem, and one which would be damaging to the prospects of a solution, that we voted against the draft resolution sponsored by twenty-two delegations in the First Committee.

36. The delegation of Pakistan has now introduced a draft resolution [A/L.276] for which priority has been asked over the draft resolution contained in the Rapporteur's report [A/4339]. I shall confine myself to commenting on this new draft resolution.

37. Although some of the wording to which we felt objection in the original draft resolution has been omitted or modified, it is still the view of my delegation that this new resolution is open to serious objection. I will not dwell on our general view that in the present situation, which is generally admitted to constitute a new start, it is doubtful wisdom to hark back to past resolutions and discussions. I will, therefore, not touch on the preambular paragraphs of the draft. It is the operative part of the resolution which we feel is open to serious objection.

38. We do not object to the general sentiment enshrined in operative paragraph 1, though we have reservations as to the legality of this paragraph as drafted with regard to the terms of the Charter. Our practical objection is that it is superfluous, seeing that the present prospects for a solution stem from General de Gaulle's proposal that the principle of

self-determination should be applied to this problem, and the acceptance of this idea by the Algerian nationalists.

39. Moreover, the juxtaposition operative paragraphs 1 and 2, and the omission of any reference in the draft to a cease-fire, can only be intended to lend the authority of the United Nations to the thesis that the "pourparlers" should deal with the political conditions for the consultation of the inhabitants of Algeria proposed by the French Government. And in view of what is known about the attitude of the two sides towards the proposed "pourparlers", we believe that this attempt to slant matters in the direction desired by one of them can only, in all the circumstances, set back the prospects of the "pourparlers" taking place.

40. I think I have said enough to show the United Kingdom attitude to this resolution. Not only is it open to the particular objections which I have described but it takes no account of the new and favourable circumstances established by the far-sighted proposals put forward this autumn by General de Gaulle, and by the statesmanlike reaction which they elicited from responsible Arab leaders. It would surely be unwise for this Assembly to adopt a resolution of a partisan character which goes much farther—and in a much more partisan way—into the substance of the problem than any previous pronouncement by the Assembly.

41. As I said in the Committee, I know that there are many delegations who believe that the United Nations can and should do something to bring about those talks of which the prospect already exists, and which we are all agreed are the essential first step towards a solution. I would, however, appeal to them most earnestly to reflect on their very grave responsibilities, and to examine again the reasons I have sought to expound why the passage of the new draft resolution before us, or indeed of any draft resolution of substance, is in present circumstances likely to make the realization of their hopes less likely and the continuance of the present tragic conflict more likely.

42. In recent years there seems to have developed a view that the General Assembly has a duty to express an opinion in the form of a resolution on any matter which it decides to discuss, and that it is in some way undignified for it to conclude its deliberations without doing so. There is nothing in the Charter which lays such an obligation on the Assembly and the United Kingdom delegation believes that this view is a mistaken one which may often have dangerous consequences.

43. It is, of course, very natural that delegations here should be disposed to think that the United Nations can usefully take some positive step to contribute to the solution of some difficult international problem. Often this is indeed the case. But there are times when it can be dangerous for us to let our actions in international affairs be guided by such considerations, especially when promising developments are taking place between those directly concerned outside the United Nations. It is rather in our view our first responsibility to consider the actual effect on the course of events which our actions here in the United Nations are likely to produce.

44. My delegation has long held and often expressed the view that there are certain stages in the development of international problems when the opinions of Members of the United Nations expressed in responsi-



ble statements are more likely to have a constructive effect through the influence of international public opinion than would the passage of a resolution which any of those directly concerned might regard as a complication.

45. After studying the recent statements by the President of the French Republic and responsible Arab leaders, we have come to the conclusion that these considerations apply fully to the problem of Algeria at its present stage. We shall therefore vote against the new draft resolution.

46. We are all aware that the draft resolution introduced by the delegation of Pakistan as Chairman of the African-Asian group is the result of long and careful consideration by the sponsors of the draft resolution which has come to us from the First Committee and is contained in the report of that Committee. My delegation, therefore, takes it that the new draft resolution introduced in plenary, about which I have just explained my delegation's views, does, when taken as a whole, represent their final position. In the circumstances my delegation foresees the possibility that a paragraph vote on the draft resolution might produce a false situation which would obscure the intention of the sponsors of the draft resolution and of those with whose concurrence it has been presented. If, however, a paragraph vote was taken and if, as a result, operative paragraph 1 was adopted and operative paragraph 2 was rejected, the Assembly would then, in our view, be faced with an unreal proposition. We should in fact be asked to vote simply on the proposition that the Assembly recognized the right of the Algerian people to self-determination. As I explained earlier, I would regard this proposition as entirely superfluous since it is already common ground on the proposition of General de Gaulle that self-determination is to be the basis for the solution of the Algerian problem. The substance of the draft resolution would have fallen with the failure of operative paragraph 2 to carry. The residual operative paragraph 1 would amount merely to a repetition of what is the actual state of affairs and for that reason would, in reality, be in our view no resolution at all.

47. Mr. ORTONA (Italy): During the exhaustive debate in the First Committee on the question of Algeria, the circumstance which, I feel, has been unanimously pointed out by all speakers was that the problem of Algeria has now reached an extremely important turning point after the solemn declarations of the President of the French Republic. A solution is already in sight, and it will be carried out under conditions of democracy and freedom. New perspectives of peace, in conciliation and harmony, are unfolding on the shores of the Mediterranean.

48. Difficulties certainly exist and unfortunately the fighting continues with great loss of life and wealth, thus causing a sinister and deterring influence on the craftsmen of the future peace.

49. The present phase of the problem is indeed a very delicate one and the Italian delegation is profoundly convinced that the utmost caution should be exercised in order not to jeopardize from the outside the further developments for which we all fervently hope. Our first and foremost responsibility is, therefore, to do nothing here which might delay and render more difficult the realization of the solution, the lines of which we can already envisage and which we cannot fail to approve wholeheartedly.

50. Therefore it is the considered opinion of my delegation that the proper course for the General Assembly in such circumstances would be not to express itself on the substance of the matter through a resolution.

51. We are aware that many delegations share a different point of view. We have no doubts of their sincerity and we cannot fail to appreciate the efforts which have been made in order to offer a new draft resolution [A/L.276]. On the other hand, nothing which I have said either in the First Committee or here has to be attributed to any reason other than to our strong desire to meet the expectations, hopes and legitimate wishes of the inhabitants of Algeria. We hope and pray that nothing will emerge from this debate of ours which might hamper or delay an agreement on a cease-fire.

52. I do not wish to enter into the substance or the merits of the new text at this stage, but I wish only to point out that it still contains provisions which we frankly do not feel would facilitate useful developments. As the Italian delegation pointed out in the course of the debate in the First Committee,

"The record itself of our proceedings will be rich enough to provide to all those concerned in this problem useful material for meditation and precious indications of the paths to be followed so that the interest of all will be taken into due consideration on all the questions connected with a final solution of the problem."<sup>1/</sup>

53. In conclusion, let me again express the very fervent hope that wisdom and restraint on all sides will soon facilitate the proper developments in order to bring peace and harmony again in Algeria.

54. Mr. ULLOA (Peru) (translated from Spanish): The Peruvian delegation has once again asked for the floor in the matter of the Algerian question—in connexion with the draft resolution [A/L.276] submitted by the delegation of Pakistan, which creates a new situation by introducing a proposal different from that which came before the First Committee.

55. We voted against the reopening of the general debate; we saw no reason for such reopening, since the various positions had been clearly defined in the First Committee and were reflected in the votes cast there. In our opinion it would have sufficed to confine the present debate to the final draft resolution or resolutions submitted to us.

56. The Peruvian delegation did not, and cannot believe that, as hinted in the lobbies, there was some move to delay matters, with a view to this discussion continuing until the time-table, the hour and human endurance had reached their utmost limits and culminating in a midnight vote, taken when everyone was impatient and tired, so that the shadow cast by the Algerian question across the early light of the dawn would be more pleasing to one group than to another.

57. As the second and third preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Pakistan refer to previous resolutions of the General Assembly, I will merely mention them in order to point out that they serve no useful purpose, since those resolutions were adopted in circumstances different from those facing us today. To make this difference

<sup>1/</sup>This statement was made at the 1075th meeting of the First Committee, the official record of which is published only in summary form.

abundantly clear, it will suffice to state that in 1957 the Algerian rebellion was at its height and that the formal and far-reaching offer made to Algeria by the President of the French Republic, General de Gaulle, had not then been put forward. It therefore seems pointless to dilate on previous statements made in different circumstances and hence with a different object in view. We must on the other hand examine, specifically even though briefly, the fourth preambular paragraph, whereby the General Assembly is asked to recall Article 1, paragraph 2, of the United Nations Charter—a paragraph which naturally, like all the provisions of that instrument, is always present to the minds of Members of the Assembly. But the reference to that paragraph in the draft resolution before us is not in the nature of an innocent and unnecessary reminder; it has been included in order to provide a basis for operative paragraph 1. In other words, an attempt is being made to adapt one of the Charter's provisions, theoretical in nature and having the character of a principle, to the specific case of the Algerian question. I trust I will be forgiven if I read the paragraph, since my argument makes it necessary for me to do so. The paragraph reads:

"To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace."

This amounts to saying that it is a purpose of the United Nations to develop between nations, whether Members of the Organization or not, relations based on respect for the principle of the self-determination of peoples.

58. The Charter, then, defines a principle to which we all subscribe; but it establishes no procedure for applying that principle to specific cases. Were we to concede that this purpose of the United Nations should apply in respect of all forms of nationalism and all aspirations to political independence, we should have to admit that the mere existence of a secessionist attitude, based on some form of "sociological" nationalism, would suffice to cause the United Nations to intervene, despite the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, in matters which are essentially within the jurisdiction of other States.

59. At the same time, we should be discriminating unfairly if, when applying the provisions of the United Nations Charter, we took into account only the cases in which there had been armed rebellion, and possibly ignored those in which the movement for self-determination was more extensive and more charged with unanimous national feeling. In that case, so long as a people or those claiming to represent it refrained from a recourse to force, their genuine nationalism might remain indefinitely stifled. The consequence would be that we should have to agree to self-determination where the Algerians were concerned—a self-determination which, moreover, has been formally offered to them—but not in the case of numerous other peoples who were not allowed to express their desire for it and who, within the traditional legal framework of a State, or even outside of it, were held in forcible subjection.

60. Lastly, were we to press this argument to its logical conclusion, it would suffice that a State already in existence and organized as such—even a Member of the United Nations—should foment or aid a nationalist rebellion in any part of the world, for an

international conflict to be created calling, possibly, for intervention by the United Nations. No—the only true, honest and clear interpretation of Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter is that the United Nations should develop the principle of self-determination in order to foster friendly relations between nations. The text of this paragraph specifically refers to international relations, and not to relations which are not international; it calls for the development of self-determination with a view to strengthening universal peace, and this in its turn means that it calls for the development of self-determination in order to prevent the subjection, by force, of some States or nations to others. What this provision of the Charter means—and I refrain from using the historic word which has become opprobrious—is that there should be no conquests whereby some national entities are dominated by others. What the Charter says, what the Charter means, is that the development of self-determination is intended to refer to Non-Self-Governing Territories and to the Trusteeship System.

61. I will not weary the Assembly by quoting the provisions explicitly linking the principles of self-determination to the position of the non-self-governing peoples and setting before them a goal, in their historical development, towards which to work in accordance with the provisions contained today in the Charter and formerly in the Covenant of the League of Nations.

62. For these reasons, the Peruvian delegation is opposed to the draft resolution now before us.

63. Mr. CORREA (Ecuador) (translated from Spanish): My delegation feels that it must explain the reasons for the Ecuadorian Government's decision to vote against a draft resolution on the question of Algeria. For many years, the Ecuadorian Government has shared the great concern of this Assembly at the continuation of hostilities in Algeria, the attendant sacrifice of human lives, and the resulting serious effect on international relations.

64. Representatives of the Ecuadorian Government have stressed here on previous occasions the urgency of seeking a solution based on self-determination and on the other principles of the United Nations Charter.

65. The French Government's statement of 16 September 1957 placed the solution of the Algerian problem on this footing, thus opening up a way which, in our opinion, will inevitably lead to the implementation of the principle of self-determination for the Algerian people. The Government and people of Ecuador fervently hope that this will happen as soon as possible.

66. In view of the present situation, my Government, after careful study, has reached the conclusion that it too is concerned at the prospect of a resolution of the Assembly obstructing, hampering or complicating the delicate and complex process of implementation of the principle of self-determination which has now been set in motion.

67. The General Assembly, through its debates, has already unanimously exerted its moral force in favour of a solution of the Algerian problem based on respect for the principles of the Charter. My Government believes that the implementation procedure does not require a specific recommendation of the United Nations, and for this reason it considers that it would be inappropriate to adopt a resolution, whatever its intrinsic merits might be.

68. If, as we have requested, a roll-call vote is taken on the Pakistan draft resolution [A/L.276] paragraph by paragraph, we shall explain our views on each paragraph on its merits.

69. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (translated from Spanish): My delegation feels that it is appropriate to explain its position once again to the Assembly, in the first place because it is most desirous that the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter should be observed; and secondly because it is anxious that, at this session, the General Assembly, which our President has called "the Assembly of Peace", should find a just, peaceful and democratic solution for this problem troubling the conscience of mankind—the problem of Algeria.

70. For this reason we were greatly moved this morning [855th meeting] by the words of the Argentine representative, whose moderation, common sense and altruism are unquestioned.

71. During today's resumed debate some doubts were expressed about the wisdom of adopting a resolution. The Panamanian delegation believes that the adoption of a resolution is justified and appropriate because of the moral and spiritual effect on peoples throughout the world of a reaffirmation by the United Nations of certain principles and fundamental rights which are essential if we are to live in a society based on peace and justice. Although at times the hard facts of economics prevent people from satisfying their legitimate desires, at least in regard to spiritual matters, to the affirmation of certain principles and to religious worship of one kind or another, we must not confuse charity with justice, and we must strive to make the rights inherent in the human person a reality.

72. My country has been a traditional defender of human rights. Soon after the United Nations was established Panama submitted the initial document which was used as a basis for the preparation of a Universal Declaration of Human Rights.<sup>2/</sup> Hence we are concerned not only with the theoretical affirmation of the right to self-determination, but with its practical application, its implementation among all peoples and nations, to use an expression which has appeared in various resolutions of this Assembly. For this principle of self-determination, as it is called in the Charter, has undergone a certain evolution within the United Nations and has come to be recognized as a right which, according to Article 55 of the Charter, as I mentioned in a previous speech, is the basis for all peaceful and harmonious relations between peoples.

73. Thus it has been argued that no resolution is necessary. We believe not only that a resolution is necessary, but that the text submitted by the Pakistan delegation [A/L.276] is sober, moderate, respectful, and couched in terms as friendly as the circumstances permit.

74. We have great respect and admiration for France. We cannot imagine for a single moment that the text of this draft could be interpreted as directed in any way against France. On the contrary, it reaffirms the noble aims set forth by General de Gaulle in his statement of 16 September, 1959, in which he also spoke of the right to self-determination.

75. When we comment on the laws of God in theology or religious doctrine, we are reaffirming the principles affirmed by priests in their sermons, philosophers and by teachers. There cannot be anything wrong in mentioning in a draft resolution that the General Assembly of the United Nations respects and reaffirms the principle of self-determination.

76. However, to appease my own conscience and to explain my country's attitude, I should like to point out that our inter-American regional organization has adopted clear, concrete and specific resolutions on self-determination, all of them subsequent to the adoption of the United Nations Charter. These resolutions not only bear the seal of the Chancelleries of the American States; they are also backed by the enthusiastic support of the peoples of the continent. For it can be said, to the credit of this Organization, that there is no country that does not believe in the principle of self-determination; nor can it be argued that it is superfluous to mention a principle accepted by all. In the laws of our countries moral principles are constantly restated, because the principles of virtue, rectitude and morality must be hammered on time and time again if the world is to follow the straight and narrow path of law.

77. In conclusion, let me quote from those resolutions in order to demonstrate the principles by which we are guided in supporting the Pakistan draft resolution. The Ninth International Conference of American States, held at Bogotá in 1948, was of fundamental importance for the establishment of our regional system because it adopted the charter of the Organization of American States which governs the relations of States within the system. The Conference adopted resolution XXXIII entitled "Colonies and occupied territories in America and creation of the American Committee on Dependent Territories"; the third preambular paragraph reads:

"Ever since they achieved their independence, the American States have had this common objective, which has lately been defined in precise terms at the Meetings of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, held at Habana and at Rio de Janeiro, in resolutions condemning colonial régimes in America and reaffirming the right of the peoples of this continent freely to determine their own destinies."<sup>3/</sup>

78. Subsequently, at the Tenth Inter-American Conference, held at Caracas in 1954, this right was again reaffirmed in resolution XCVI on colonies and occupied territories in America adopted by the conference. The second preambular paragraph of that resolution reads:

"The present stage of evolution of these peoples, which has given them the consciousness of their right to self-determination ..."—I repeat "of their right to self-determination"—"makes more urgent than ever the final elimination of colonialism in any of its forms."<sup>4/</sup>

79. Operative paragraph 2 of the same resolution embodies the following principle:

<sup>3/</sup> See Pan American Union, *Final Act of the Ninth International Conference of American States*, Bogotá (Colombia), March 30-May 2, 1948, Washington, D.C., 1948, p. 50.

<sup>4/</sup> See Pan American Union, *Final Act of the Tenth Inter-American Conference*, Caracas (Venezuela), March 1-28, 1954, Washington, D.C., 1954, p. 97.

<sup>2/</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Second part of the first session, Third Committee, Annexes, annex 17 (document A/148).

"To express the sympathy of the American republics with the legitimate aspiration of now-subject peoples to attain their sovereignty." 5/

80. I believe I have now made my country's attitude clear and I hope it is shared by the majority necessary for the adoption of the Pakistan draft resolution. This resolution concerns not only France, but also its neighbours, especially Morocco and Tunisia; in fact it concerns all mankind.

81. Because of the great spiritual values which immortal France has bequeathed to modern civilization, we deem it an honour to vote for the draft resolution submitted by Pakistan.

82. Mr. PLIMSOLL (Australia): When we approach the vote that is about to be taken here, I think we have very much to bear in mind the realities of the situation as they present themselves in North Africa and in Paris. We have to avoid thinking solely in terms of a paper resolution which may give us some satisfaction as representatives who have been sitting round the table discussing the matter for a week or more, but which may nevertheless not contribute to a constructive advance of the question of Algeria. We have had a debate at some length at which representatives of most countries assembled in this hall have presented their views, and as a result of that exchange of views we are all much clearer than we were when we first came here as to what is at stake, as to what the people of Algeria in their various sections need, and as to what the various obstacles are. We are also aware of some of the difficulties that have to be overcome in France itself.

83. Let us have a look at these realities. On the one side there is the fighting and turmoil which has been going on in Algeria and which it is the common objective of all of us to put an end to on an equitable and permanent basis. On the other side there is the French Government and the French people whose policy has been taken a dramatic step forward in the last couple of months by a series of statements by General de Gaulle. There is nobody in this room who would deny the courage and imagination that General de Gaulle has shown in making his latest statement. Tribute has been paid to him and to the French Government in the First Committee by representatives from all the geographical groups represented here. He has taken a tremendous step when we regard all the emotional and historical background to the Algerian question.

84. As I said in the First Committee [1069th meeting], the situation which confronts us now is quite different from the situation that confronted us when this session of the General Assembly first met, and it is now a matter of how we respond to this new situation. What do we do now? What can the General Assembly do which will usefully advance the question? In this situation the Australian Government does not have any position with regard to supporting one Government or one country rather than another. Australia is a long way from Algeria. We do not have a direct interest in the sense of being violently "pro" one party or the other. What we want is a peaceful and just outcome of the situation, a peaceful and just outcome of the various negotiations that are opening up. That underlies the whole of our approach to this problem. Will a resolution—and if so, will a particular resolution—provide a satisfactory outcome to the problem? It

is not whether it will support one party or support another.

85. We have come to the conclusion, having regard to the various statements made in France and elsewhere, that a resolution by the General Assembly will not be helpful, that the need at the present moment is for a greater exploration by the number of interested parties of the various possibilities which have emanated from General de Gaulle's statement—an exploration of possibilities and of the implications of that statement. There are many parties involved in both Algeria and France. There are other interested and friendly Governments in North Africa, and a whole nexus of international relations in the Mediterranean area, in North Africa and in France. All these things have to be reconciled in some way, and we have been given grounds for hope, in the First Committee and elsewhere, that something can be achieved if there is opportunity for exploration, and if there is no road block or obstacle created unnecessarily by this Assembly.

86. We are not voting here on the substance of the Algerian question. In point of fact, on certain aspects of the substance there has been complete agreement expressed in the First Committee; agreement has been expressed between the French Government and the various interested Algerian bodies. It is common ground that the French people will accord to the Algerian people the right of self-determination. General de Gaulle has said that in one of his pronouncements, and that is common ground. It is also common ground not merely that the right exists but that the Algerian people are to be given an opportunity to exercise it.

87. I am not going to say that the way ahead will be easy. None of us here will be prepared to underwrite the attitudes and policies that any of the interested parties might adopt, be they French or Algerian. All we can ask is that an opportunity be given sincerely, practically, to explore these possibilities. That is where the value of the discussions in this session of the General Assembly may lie, in indicating a broad consensus of view on many of the aspects of the question.

88. In the statements by the Foreign Minister of the United Arab Republic and others, there has been mention of some of the practical things that still have to be solved, some of the points that are in doubt and that have to be cleared up, some of the objectives which some of the parties want and which others have not yet conceded, and none of us will be so rash as to say that there is necessarily going to be an immediate solution of those problems. What we want is the opportunity for such a solution, and the Australian delegation believes that, in view of the statement of the French Government particularly but also in view of other considerations, it would be most useful to have no resolution just now. If we are going to be asked to vote on any part of resolutions, then, in view of the fact that we do not think there should be any resolution, we feel that the best course would be for the Australian delegation to abstain on votes on any parts of resolutions, because we do not feel that we should be expressing an opinion on what is ultimately put before us. We are of the firm view that the best outcome of our discussions would be to have no resolution at all, that we should rely on the value and effect of the discussion that has taken place in this Assembly and should not seek to crystallize it in a resolution that could be a bar to a satisfactory outcome.



89. Mr. SOSA RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) (translated from Spanish): I have already had occasion to state the position of Venezuela on the Algerian question in the First Committee [1074th meeting]. It was clear and unequivocal: we believe and maintain that the people of Algeria, like all other peoples, have a right to self-determination. We further believe that in order to achieve a peaceful, just and democratic solution of the problem in accordance with the principles of the Charter, the best thing we can do is to recommend negotiations between the parties as the United Nations has successfully done on various other occasions.

90. The reason why we are intervening once again in this debate is because a draft resolution [A/L.276] demonstrating the conciliatory and understanding position of the Asian and African countries has been submitted to the Assembly for consideration. If we analyse this draft objectively and dispassionately, we see that its preamble merely recalls resolutions already adopted by the General Assembly. Its operative part contains only two paragraphs: the first recognizes the right of the Algerian people to self-determination; the second urges the holding of "pourparlers" with a view to arriving at a peaceful solution on the basis of the right of self-determination, in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

91. My delegation believes that it is not pointless, as some other representatives had said, for this Assembly to reaffirm the right of the Algerian people to self-determination. This right, expressly stated in Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter has been recognized by General de Gaulle. However, the Algerian people have it, not as a gracious gift from General de Gaulle, but because it belongs to them in accordance with the principles of the Charter. Consequently, since France itself has recognized this right, what difference does it make, what objection is there, what danger can there be in having the United Nations recognize and reaffirm it?

92. Operative paragraph 2, merely recommends "pourparlers" between the parties without even specifying who the parties are and without stating the purpose of the negotiations. And this to counter the objections raised to the previous draft resolution.

93. Such negotiations have proved successful on other occasions, as in the specific case of Cyprus—I recall the resolution [1287 (XIII)] the General Assembly adopted at the time; it read as follows:

"The General Assembly,

"Having considered the question of Cyprus,

"Recalling its resolution 1013 (XI) of 26 February 1957,

"Expresses its confidence that continued efforts will be made by the parties to reach a peaceful, democratic and just solution in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations."

If in that instance the General Assembly recommended negotiations and, as a result, the parties were brought together and the problem was solved, why cannot the United Nations do as much in the case of Algeria with a view to achieving a peaceful, just and democratic solution and putting an end to the warfare and bloodshed in that country?

94. My delegation's position on this new draft resolution is thus the same as on the original proposal. We

shall vote in favour of it, not only in accordance with the principles of the United Nations, but in accordance with all the principles of our American law, as reaffirmed at numerous conferences, and in particular, in resolution XXXIII of the Bogotá Conference, held in 1948, to which the representative of Panama alluded. We American nations have always upheld the right of peoples to self-determination, and we want that right for Africa as for America.

95. For that reason, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by Pakistan.

Mr. DE LEQUERICA (Spain) (translated from Spanish): I am sorry that I cannot address the Assembly as the champion of a popular cause such as enlists the general sympathy which we all appreciate. But if I did so I should be false to the solemn dictates of my conscience, to the stand I have consistently taken since 1957 on the question of Algeria, to my vote on the problem of Cyprus, and to Spain's strict theory with regard to the admirable principle of self-determination. My view is that if this principle were to be applied wholesale, as it is tending to be, it would plunge the world into complete anarchy and make the United Nations something worse than an organ for interfering in the domestic affairs of other countries, as prohibited by Article 2 of the Charter; it would make the Organization the most outrageous and dangerous tribunal in the world, where all the world's discontentment, all the domestic squabbles within countries and all the petty conflicts of interest which in the ordinary way are settled peacefully, would be brought before us here, magnified and built up into tremendous world problems; so that the United Nations instead of being a means of settling them, would be a permanent organ for fanning conflagrations, stirring up quarrels and perpetuating discord. That is why my delegation cannot vote in favour of the new draft resolution which is now before us [A/L.276].

97. We were not in favour of the original draft resolution either, as our vote in the Committee showed. But though the draft resolution now before us embodies more moderation and is couched in language more acceptable to other delegations, it raises the same vitally serious question of principle as the previous one and we feel compelled to vote against it. The point is that the draft resolution in its present form sanctions the palpable infringement of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, by authorizing the United Nations to interfere in the problem of Algeria—I need not say "the so-called problem", for it is so real a problem that it would be academic to describe it thus—and actually to lay down the principle of self-determination for Algeria and then urge that conversations should take place immediately with a view to reaching a solution based on the right of self-determination. That is tantamount to setting ourselves up not as judge in respect of the Algerian question, but as judge and party. We are helping to create and aggravate the problem by adopting an attitude which in my opinion does not contribute to world peace.

98. We usually find in this debate, that out of courtesy and good manners, nearly all speakers who intend to attack what they call the "French" point of view—although France is not present as a contending party—to preface their remarks with warm praise of French culture and of the great services France has for so long rendered to civilization. In the same way those who wish to express the kind of comment we have to

make on the position of Algeria also begin by expressing something that in this case is actually true, as we have repeated time and time again, namely sympathy for those who suffer in Algeria, strong feelings of friendliness and kinship with the Arab civilization and anxiety that a solution to this problem may come about as a result of the settlement sought by all of us, especially the peoples of the Mediterranean. But on the present occasion I will not now follow this practice or allow it to distract your attention for long from the business of the debate.

99. I may perhaps quote my previous statement to the First Committee:

"Mention here of Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter seems to connote self-determination granted to any community, people or group in the abstract, even though part of a greater political unit, such as the one that signed the Charter. On the contrary, we believe that the reference in Article 1, paragraph 2, to the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples can only allude to the equal rights and self-determination of people of sovereign States to decide their own future. We do not believe that there is any reason for including this precept in the Charter if it might in any way hamper or endanger friendly relations between nations. The peoples or groups referred to in the draft resolution are not signatories of the Charter; they have no international standing."<sup>6/</sup>

100. That is why we did not vote for that principle when it came up as a preambular paragraph in the original draft resolution, and we feel still less able to vote for it now that it has become the very basis of the new draft resolution with all the dangers that implies. If the draft were adopted with its operative paragraphs 1 and 2 which are virtually inseparable, we should be committed to constant vigilance over the question of Algeria, to an act of intervention never yet permissible in the United Nations, which, while recognizing that France on entering the Organization had legal rights, subsequently proceeded with intelligence, skill and tact to allow discussions such as these to take place. Certainly my delegation considers these discussions to have been useful for purposes of clarification, and although it is going to vote against the draft resolution, it does not share the view of some representatives that it would be preferable not to adopt any resolution; as I said in my first speech to the Committee, we can see no harm—in view of the fact that in 1957, as I remember, French representatives took part informally in our debates and were aware of the resolutions unanimously adopted—in exerting an influence through our advice, our exhortation and our very solicitude in the matter (a constant reminder to a sensitive country), upon the parties involved. The question of the two parties in the Algerian question is highly controversial, and it would be wrong of me to name it.

101. As I have said, our previous speeches and votes have contributed to the creation of a favourable atmosphere, and it is because we should like to see that same atmosphere created here and now that we voted in favour of the two preambular paragraphs beginning with "Recalling", since they expressed our own views. We were co-sponsors of one of the two 1957 proposals,

and we could hardly hold back out of a superstitious fear that no agreement could be reached. Agreements can certainly be reached here, but they must be reasonable, based on the legality of the Charter, and not calculated to encourage rebellion, from which no good can come.

102. It is only natural that General de Gaulle should have limited the principle of self-determination in the Algerian negotiations to the problems before him; we are not at liberty to extend it to cover an area of our own choosing. We can of course rejoice to see that principle affirmed by a man of power and influence among those concerned in this vital question, and simply hope that it will provide a basis for a solution.

103. The principle of self-determination has perhaps never been put more neatly than by the distinguished Argentine Mr. Mariano J. Drago, who represented his country in a debate here in 1957—though at this session it has again been shrewdly and perceptively defined by the representative of Peru.

104. I have often quoted Mr. Drago's words, but before I leave the rostrum, I should like to read them again for their extraordinary penetration. His words were summarized as follows:

"No recommendation from the First Committee or the General Assembly could change the nature of what was basically an internal affair of a Member State and therefore outside the jurisdiction of the United Nations, in accordance with Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter.

"Those upholding the contrary view argued from the principle of the self-determination of peoples, which was set forth in a different context in Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter. By lifting that phrase out of its context, they had distorted its contents and were possibly misleading people about its scope.

"He said that the word 'peoples' as used in Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter was synonymous, in that text, with 'States' and referred to the Governments of established States. In support of his view, he quoted from the writings of Professor Hans Kelsen, the world-renowned jurist, who said that only States had equal rights according to general international law, and that, if the term 'peoples' in the paragraph in question meant the same as the term 'nations' in the preamble, the expression 'self-determination of peoples' could only mean 'sovereignty' of the States.

"Therefore the 'self-determination of peoples' mentioned in Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter was the freedom of sovereign peoples to choose their own Government. There would be no sense in that provision of the Charter if it made the development of friendly relations between nations dependent on the right to self-determination, in the abstract, of communities or peoples which had not signed the Charter."<sup>7/</sup>

105. I regret once again that the view I express is not a highly popular one, but I do not believe that by professing such an opinion I would be serving the interests of peace in Algeria. All our most sincere wishes are for peace in that country. Even though we do not vote, we have always felt that we had the right

<sup>6/</sup>This statement was made at the 1078th meeting of the First Committee, the official record of which is published only in summary form.

<sup>7/</sup>Official Records of the General Assembly, Twelfth Session, First Committee, 921st meeting, paras. 22 to 25.

to speak and that our words might encourage all those who with goodwill and good intentions are seeking a settlement favourable to world peace.

106. Mr. SHAHA (Nepal): It is not my intention to reopen the debate on the question of Algeria; I have asked for the floor merely to explain my delegation's stand on the new draft resolution submitted by Pakistan [A/L.276].

107. The draft resolution, as has already been made clear by its sponsor on behalf of the African-Asian group, aims at achieving a wide margin of agreement on the solution of the question of Algeria in the light of the consensus of opinion expressed on this subject in the deliberations of the First Committee.

108. The draft resolution does not contain any elements which the overwhelming majority of the General Assembly has not approved of in the past in some form or other. The representative of Burma has proved [855th meeting] this with relevant facts and figures as regards voting. Even the representative of Belgium conceded [856th meeting] that the draft resolution as it stands meets some of the objections which some delegations had to the twenty-two-Power draft resolution.

109. This draft resolution is conciliatory in tone and highly constructive in purpose. It does not seek to secure endorsement—as Sir Pierson Dixon stated a few months ago—of what he described as the unilateral interpretation of the application of the principle of self-determination to Algeria. The operative paragraph, which contains a reference to "pourparlers", is general in character and does not in any way limit the scope for the application of this principle of self-determination in any rigid manner, as long as such application is consistent with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

110. I have not understood the logic of the arguments of those who are inclined to think that any resolution of the United Nations might hinder rather than help the cause of the settlement of the Algerian question. The question of Algeria is affecting the lives and fortunes of millions of people and vitiating the relations between nations. Here is an opportunity for the United Nations to do something to alleviate the suffering of millions and to reduce tensions among nations by endorsing the very principle which has been accepted as a basis for the solution of the problem by the principal parties concerned.

111. The Pakistan draft resolution, in our opinion, represents the necessary minimum which we can and should do to encourage the parties to pursue their efforts to arrive at a peaceful settlement of this question.

112. A parallel was drawn between the Cyprus question and the Algerian question by the representative of the United Kingdom. He even gave the impression that the absence of a resolution on the substantive aspect of the Cyprus question, at the thirteenth session, helped to bring about the speedy settlement of that question. To the best of my memory and knowledge, the Assembly adopted a resolution last year on the question of Cyprus—and I have in mind resolution 1287 (XIII). Of course, it did not go as far as the new draft resolution on the Algerian question, but it went far enough.

113. Having listened to the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom, all I can say is that

we of the small countries only wish that the United Nations initiative and actions were less suspect with the representatives of the big Powers.

114. I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without publicly acclaiming, on behalf of the majority of the members of the African-Asian group, the noble gestures made by the representatives of Argentina, Panama and Venezuela in support of the rightful cause of the self-determination of peoples, in keeping with the highest traditions of the Latin American countries in that respect.

115. The Pakistan draft resolution seeks merely to endorse, in a way, what President de Gaulle himself has said that he is going to do. As we approach the moment of voting on this most important matter, I should like to appeal to the delegations assembled here that they should not, at this supreme moment of test, do anything the consequences of which they themselves are not prepared to be called upon to account for or to be held responsible for in the future.

116. I commend this draft resolution to the acceptance of the Assembly. At the same time, I would request that it should be voted on in parts and that the vote would be taken by roll-call.

117. Mr. BAIG (Pakistan): Before our draft resolution is put to a vote, may I be permitted to say a few final words?

118. We have tried, in all earnestness and sincerity, to submit a draft resolution [A/L.276] which would be acceptable to all those delegations which are not opposed in principle to any kind of draft resolution on the part of the General Assembly. The two operative paragraphs of our draft resolution have been carefully drafted with a view to meeting all the conditions stipulated by those delegations which felt that an expression of opinion by the General Assembly would be tantamount to an endorsement of the stand of one side as against the other. We do not consider that these paragraphs have been slanted to lend support to the position of the Algerian nationalists. Unlike the corresponding provisions of the First Committee's draft resolution, they contain no reference to a cease-fire or to guarantees for the application of the principle of self-determination to Algeria. The new draft thus represents a genuine attempt at the reconciliation of divergent views.

119. It is with profound regret that we are compelled to acknowledge that this text is still far removed from the position of those delegations which sincerely believe that the present stage of the Algerian question requires an attitude of the strictest "laissez-faire" on the part of the United Nations. We would appeal to those delegations which hold this view not to doubt or belittle the conviction of those of us who believe with equal sincerity that the present is an opportune moment for our great Organization to exert its moral influence to quench the raging fire in Algeria and put an end to the shedding of French and Algerian blood.

120. If our draft resolution is adopted, it will be a vindication of the position of the United Nations. If it is rejected, we, the African-Asian countries, will nonetheless have done our best. The matter is now in the hands of the Assembly. We could have done no more. But let none say that we did not display a spirit of moderation and compromise.

121. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): The representative of Pakistan has formally requested

priority in the voting for the draft resolution submitted by his delegation. I take it that the request is made under rule 93 of the rules of procedure. I would therefore ask the Assembly whether it wishes to vote first on the Pakistan draft resolution before taking a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee. As there appears to be no objection to the request for priority, I shall put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by Pakistan.

122. The representative of Nepal has asked for a separate roll-call vote on each paragraph and has repeated his request from this rostrum. I would ask him whether he also wishes to have a separate vote on the first paragraph of the preamble, or whether, since it is of a general nature, he would like to have it voted upon together with the second paragraph. The representative of Nepal has confirmed my understanding that the first and second paragraphs will be voted on at the same time.

123. Consequently I shall invite the Assembly to vote on the draft resolution submitted by Pakistan [A/L.276]. First, I shall put to the vote the first and second paragraphs of the preamble.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Norway, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

In favour: Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal.

Against: Peru, Union of South Africa, Dominican Republic.

Abstaining: Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Ecuador, Haiti, Honduras, Israel, Italy, Laos, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand.

*The first and second paragraphs were adopted by 55 votes to 3, with 22 abstentions.*

124. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): We shall now vote on the third paragraph.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Haiti, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

In favour: Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea.

Against: Honduras, Peru, Union of South Africa, Dominican Republic.

Abstaining: Haiti, Israel, Italy, Laos, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Ecuador.

*The third paragraph was adopted by 55 votes to 4, with 21 abstentions.*

125. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): We shall now vote on the fourth paragraph.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Romania, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

In favour: Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republics, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland.

Against: Union of South Africa, Peru.

Abstaining: Spain, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Haiti, Honduras, Israel, Italy, Laos, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal.

*The fourth paragraph was adopted by 53 votes to 2, with 25 abstentions.*

126. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I put to the vote the fifth paragraph of the preamble.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Poland, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

In favour: Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines.

Against: Union of South Africa, Peru.

Abstaining: Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Honduras, Israel, Italy, Laos, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway.



*The fifth paragraph was adopted by 56 votes to 2, with 22 abstentions.*

127. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): We shall now vote on paragraph 1 of the operative part.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Luxembourg, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

In favour: Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya.

Against: Union of South Africa.

Abstaining: Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, Dominican Republic, Honduras, Israel, Italy, Laos.

*Paragraph 1 was adopted by 58 votes to 1, with 21 abstentions.*

128. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): We shall next vote on paragraph 2.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Honduras, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

In favour: Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guinea.

Against: Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic.

Abstaining: Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Japan, Laos, Norway, Paraguay, Thailand, Turkey, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Austria, Bolivia, Cambodia, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti.

*Paragraph 2 was adopted by 40 votes to 16, with 25 abstentions.*

129. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): We shall now vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Bulgaria, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

In favour: Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina.

Against: Canada, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Honduras, Israel, Italy, Laos, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Belgium, Brazil.

Abstaining: Cambodia, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Japan, Norway, Thailand, Turkey, United States of America, Uruguay, Austria, Bolivia.

*The result of the vote was 39 in favour, 22 against, and 20 abstentions.*

*The draft resolution as a whole was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.*

130. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): In view of the vote that has just taken place, I do not think it is necessary to put to the vote the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee and contained in the Committee's report [A/4339].

131. Mr. ZEINEDDINE (United Arab Republic): When my delegation requested the floor in order to explain its vote, we were under the impression that once the various paragraphs of the draft resolution were voted upon affirmatively, it stood to reason then that the resolution as a whole would be adopted by the Assembly. Nevertheless, now that the vote has been taken in the manner that we have seen, an explanation of our vote is more necessary than ever.

132. We have tried with all possible means to bring a common ground of agreement and compromise between various delegations so that the United Nations as such would not be frustrated from being able to act in conformity with its mission under the Charter. We have stood for the right of self-determination, but not as expressed unilaterally by any one of the two parties concerned, for no party can authoritatively state the meaning of self-determination. The United Nations as such cannot uphold the meaning of self-determination except as set out in the Charter, and as conveyed in its provisions. That very meaning is the one which has served as a precedent in the case of many nations who, strong with the right of self-determination, proceeded to realize their liberation.

133. We are glad to note that the general feeling in the Committee, in particular in respect of the draft resolution that was transmitted to the Assembly from the Committee, as well as by the vote which has now been expressed, does indicate that the vast majority of mankind stands with Algeria in its right to self-determination and consequently in the full exercise of that right.

134. There were delegations among us who have now succeeded in preventing the adoption of any resolution. It seemed to us at times that even if we presented a blank paper and told them it was a draft resolution,

they would nevertheless vote against it. It is in this manner that international responsibilities are understood by some. Is it that these delegations are too busy to look into the Algerian problem from the international point of view and try to see that the United Nations exercises its mission in this respect? Are they too busy speaking about the free world, and leaving the so-called free world to search for freedom in its very midst? Are they too busy speaking about peace when, on the other hand, the only war in the world, that of Algeria, continues and the United Nations is not permitted to act? Are they too busy, preoccupied with their NATO or other kinds of solidarity that may result from the conditions of the cold war to look at the matter differently and see the new day when the cold war will not be able any more to suck into its vortex the various problems of liberation, when the various groupings of power will become obsolete and when the world will move little by little into a new condition, a new atmosphere, when real and wide international co-operation can be established?

135. These delegations are certainly free to vote as they like. Yet it is our duty to take note of their position and to hope that in the future they will certainly seek the means to try to think differently about such a problem as the one that now preoccupies us.

136. Lastly, let me say that the struggle of the Algerian people is the struggle of a people conscious of its national existence; it is a mass movement of a people marching to its destiny, a people determined to defend that existence, a people determined to realize its destiny and a people who have resorted to the United Nations, thus intimating its desire to co-operate internationally.

137. The issue before us is: Should domination in Algeria continue or should liberation take place? Should international co-operation replace exploitation or not? Should war and pacification be the means to a solution of the Algerian problem or should the means be orderly evolution with the help of the United Nations upon the basis of international understanding, discussions and "pourparlers"? The answer to these is the one that the world will experience. Possibly we might feel that it would have been better for the United Nations to have acted in a manner which would have indeed allowed it to take upon itself the complete commission of helping the two parties concerned to solve their problem.

138. I think that this discussion and the debate on the Algerian problem has been most useful. It has certainly put before all of us our responsibility to see that we try really and in every way to do what we can no matter what the stand is of the various parties. What we were after all the time was to see that the United Nations fulfilled its mission under the Charter.

139. Mr. BOLAND (Ireland): I should like, if I may, to take just a very few minutes of the Assembly's time to explain why my delegation voted as it did on the draft resolution.

140 My delegation voted in favour of the preamble and of operative paragraph 1 of that draft resolution. We abstained from voting on operative paragraph 2 and, when that paragraph was adopted as part of the draft resolution, we abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

141. Ever since Ireland became a Member of the United Nations, our delegation has supported the right

of the people of Algeria to decide their own destiny in free elections on the basis of the principle of self-determination. It was therefore a source of particular satisfaction to us when the President of the French Republic made his historic declaration of 16 September 1959. I say historic because we believe that that declaration will yet come to constitute a landmark in the history not only of France but of Algeria as well.

142. In our view, it would have been right and proper if General de Gaulle's proclamation of the principle of self-determination in his statement of 16 September had been noted, and noted with satisfaction, in the draft resolution. We think that the inclusion in the draft resolution of a preambular paragraph for that purpose would have detracted nothing from its force and would have added to its strength. A specific reference to General de Gaulle's statement would have seemed to us a natural and an appropriate introduction to this specific recognition of the right of the people of Algeria to self-determination contained in operative paragraph 1, which we warmly support.

143. The tragic conflict in Algeria, which has now lasted five years at the cost of immense sufferings and sacrifices to the Algerian people, cannot be brought to an end by the adoption of resolutions by this Assembly. We have always recognized—as indeed everyone must recognize—that there is only one way in which the Algerian problem can be solved; there is only one way in which real and enduring peace can be brought to Algeria and that is by way of negotiation—negotiation leading to agreement between the Government of France and the leaders of the Algerian freedom movement. Such an agreement must clear the way to a free consultation of the Algerian people. It is obvious that a final, just and democratic settlement of the Algerian question can only be reached through negotiations with the free-elected representatives of Algeria. It is not for this Assembly to define the details of the final solution of the Algerian problem or to attempt to lay down in advance the precise conditions for a settlement. We here may make known the sense of world opinion as to the basic principle on which any just and peaceful solution of the Algerian problem must be based, and the General Assembly is surely the best and the highest place in which world opinion on such a matter can find expression. But the form the solution should take and what steps should be taken to achieve it is a matter for negotiation between the political leaders concerned. Our main concern must be to ensure that nothing we say or do here places obstacles in the way of their endeavours.

144. The immediate task is to secure a cease-fire in Algeria followed as soon as possible by elections in Algeria which will reflect faithfully the wishes of the Algerian people. Our most earnest hope is that negotiations for a cease-fire will begin without delay because we are deeply convinced that once negotiations are started and once the opposing parties meet at the conference table most of the conflicts of principle which still exist will be resolved and there will be good hopes of a mutually satisfactory settlement. As we all know, however, differences of opinion exist as to the precise basis on which the initial "pourparlers" should take place. Because operative paragraph 2 of the resolution seemed to us to take up a position on these differences and to imply the intervention of this Organization on an issue which in our view is best left to be settled by agreement between the parties themselves, we felt obliged to abstain on it.

145. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Pakistan. We took this position not because we considered this draft preferable to the draft resolution adopted by the First Committee but because we felt it necessary that the Assembly at its present session should adopt a resolution on Algeria taking into account the recent important developments and urging further efforts to reach a peaceful and just solution on the basis of the exercise by the Algerian people of their inalienable right of self-determination which has now been accepted by France.

146. The draft adopted by the First Committee, after taking into consideration this recognition, urged "pour-parlers" to determine conditions for the cease-fire as well as for the free implementation of the right of self-determination. We believe this was a fair and timely request, fully consistent with the Charter and designed to serve the interests of justice and world peace.

147. Moreover, and this is very important, the draft resolution adopted by the First Committee maintained the interest of the Assembly in a question that has engaged our active attention since 1955. We feel that the time was particularly opportune for the Assembly to put its prestige and great moral weight behind the laudable effort to reach an understanding on the questions still outstanding between the two parties concerned regarding the proper, just and free application of the right of self-determination. We pointed out that the mere recognition of this right, though an important step forward, is not enough to solve the problem. If this right is to be exercised freely and the decision of the Algerian people on their future taken without hindrance, doubt or fear, it is necessary that agreement should be reached on matters which are bound to affect the proper exercise of the right of self-determination. These matters should be discussed and agreed upon by the two parties concerned before the Algerian people are called upon to decide their own destiny.

148. Unfortunately, this extremely reasonable, moderate and constructive approach to the problem failed to receive the endorsement of two-thirds of the Members of the Organization. It was, therefore, in order to eliminate the prospect of having no resolution at all that we voted in favour of the Pakistan draft resolution.

149. After all the paragraphs of this draft had been adopted, the draft as a whole still failed to receive the two-thirds majority required in the General Assembly. Thus the Assembly was again deliberately prevented from discharging its proper responsibilities under the Charter. As a result, the Assembly has indirectly accept the fact that the war will continue in Algeria, with all the consequent bloodshed and misery.

150. It has been maintained that the chances of a peaceful solution will be enhanced if no resolution is adopted. This has been the main argument used by France in order to defeat the efforts of the majority at compromise. Now that this negative objective of France has been achieved, we feel that France is in duty and honour bound, to this Organization as well as to the Members that have supported it in this endeavour, to take the opportunity to come to terms with the Algerian Provisional Government so that the conditions for a cease-fire as well as the conditions necessary for the proper and free implementation of the right of self-determination may be agreed upon.

151. It is in this hope that my delegation wishes to express to the Assembly its great disappointment that our laudable efforts at compromise have been defeated—and defeated by those who have been claiming that they are acting in favour of peace and in favour of a just solution of the Algerian problem.

152. We believe that the Assembly should have taken a firm stand and should have put its moral weight and its prestige behind the effort to reach a just solution through direct negotiations by the parties concerned. Now this effort has failed, and therefore the responsibility is entirely on the shoulders of France and of those who supported it in this effort. France now should take the first step to come to terms with the Algerian Provisional Government for the just solution of the Algerian problem.

153. Mr. WALDHEIM (Austria): The Austrian delegation would like briefly to explain its vote. In the debate on this item in the First Committee we made it abundantly clear that Austria will never hesitate to raise its voice at any time whenever it is necessary to recognize and to defend the right of all peoples of the world to self-determination. We have noted with great satisfaction that the French Government has recognized this right also with respect to the people of Algeria. This being the case, there can be no further question as to the validity of the right of the Algerian people to self-determination.

154. In these circumstances we felt that the draft resolution introduced by Pakistan would not have served any useful purpose.

155. The discussion which has taken place in the First Committee and in the plenary meeting has not convinced my delegation that the adoption of this draft resolution would have contributed to a speedy solution of the problem. If, therefore, the Austrian delegation abstained, this should by no means be construed as conveying any judgement on the right of the Algerian people to self-determination. This right remains untouched and valid. What we wanted to express was merely that the adoption of this draft resolution at the present time might hamper a solution of a problem which is very close to the hearts of all of us.

156. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): In my statement in the First Committee on 2 December 1959 [1069th meeting] I referred to the far-reaching and significant declaration concerning the problem of Algeria made on 16 September 1959 by General de Gaulle. I said that there are now real hopes that a just, peaceful and democratic solution of this problem can soon be found. I then expressed the hope that the General Assembly would see the wisdom of avoiding a resolution which could prejudice the solution of the Algerian problem, emphasizing our belief that moderation, restraint and patience should be the watchwords.

157. Guided by these considerations, we carefully examined the revised draft resolution on Algeria on which the General Assembly has just voted. The United States did not vote in favour of this draft, since we believe that, notwithstanding the modifications which it contains, it is not likely to be helpful in promoting an early and just solution. Moreover, this draft resolution also fails to take into account the most significant development on the question of Algeria since it has come before the United Nations, that is, the forward-looking proposals of General de Gaulle.

158 This draft resolution, however, embodies two principles which are of fundamental importance in our history and tradition, the principle of self-determination and the principle of seeking solutions to difficult problems through peaceful means. These principles we strongly endorse. The United States, therefore, abstained in the vote on this draft resolution.

159. I should like to add, in closing, that the United States Government reaffirms its conviction that the forward-looking declaration of General de Gaulle offers the best prospects for a peaceful, just and democratic solution of the Algerian problem.

160. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (translated from Spanish): The intention of the Pakistan delegation in submitting the draft resolution on which we have just voted was most laudable and deserved our whole-hearted support. The draft resolution was and is basically in harmony with the declaration of the Head of the French State, the interests of the Algerian people and the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, particularly those relating to the right to self-determination and the peaceful settlement of problems or disputes.

161. In this brief explanation of vote, I should like to point out that every paragraph of the draft resolution was adopted by an overwhelming majority exceeding two-thirds. The first two paragraphs of the preamble, referring to the discussion of the question of Algeria and recalling resolution 1012 (XI) of 15 February 1957, expressing the hope for a peaceful, democratic and just solution, were adopted by 53 votes to 3. The third paragraph of the preamble, recalling resolution 1184 (XII) of 10 December 1957 along the same lines, was adopted by 55 votes to 4. The fourth paragraph, recalling Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter, was adopted by 53 votes to 2. The fifth paragraph, expressing concern with the continuance of hostilities in Algeria, was adopted by 56 votes to 2. Paragraph 1 of the operative part, recognizing the right of the Algerian people to self-determination, was adopted by 58 votes to 1. This undoubtedly represents a moral victory for the Algerian people, for the African-Asian delegations which supported the resolution, and lastly, for all the Members of the United Nations responsible for this superb reaffirmation of the right of self-determination. Paragraph 2 of the operative part, urging the holding of "pourparlers" with a view to arriving at a peaceful solution on the basis of the right to self-determination, in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, was also adopted by over two-thirds of the Members present and voting. In the circumstances, I should merely like to point out that the fact that for political reasons and nothing more, the draft resolution as a whole did not obtain the two-thirds majority required under the General Assembly's rules of procedure does not in any way imply that the reasoning, the principles and the right expressed in the draft resolution have in any manner lost their validity or been rejected. Consequently, I should like to reiterate my fervent hope that peace will soon reign again in the hearts and homes of the Algerian people.

162. Mr. SKAUG (Norway): I would also like to comment briefly upon our vote and to explain why we voted as we did on the draft resolution. We abstained throughout, both on the paragraphs and on the draft resolution as a whole. Throughout the present session of the General Assembly, we have held the firm opinion that it would be the wisest thing for this session not to

adopt any resolution on the Algerian question. This was mentioned by the Norwegian Foreign Minister in the general debate [807th meeting], and it was later expressed by the representative of Norway on the First Committee in the following words:

"To the Norwegian delegation, the overriding consideration at this time is to avoid that any steps be taken, no matter how well intentioned, that may turn out to complicate the picture or which might even jeopardize the present hopeful prospects for a peaceful and just solution on the basis of the accepted principle of self-determination. It is our view that the wisest response of the United Nations this year would be to let the views expressed in this debate, which have been followed with great attention by the public both in France and in Algeria, speak for themselves."<sup>8/</sup>

163. Nothing which has been said in this long debate in the Committee and in the General Assembly itself has convinced us that the point of view which we have maintained is not a right and wise one. Voting as we did, our intention was to do nothing more than to give an expression to the fact that the best thing to do, in our opinion, was to avoid a resolution which we did not feel would further the gratifying development with regard to the Algerian problem that has not been developing over the last four months.

164. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (translated from French): My delegation was one of the sponsors of the first draft resolution adopted by a majority vote in the Committee. At the close of the statement I made at that time before the First Committee [1078th meeting], I declared that my delegation was not prepared to accept any alteration whatever in the text originally submitted.

165. Our position was based on the profound conviction that the terms of that draft resolution represented the ultimate expression of our belief and confidence in the measures which General de Gaulle proposed to take and of our confidence in the demands of the Algerian Government for safeguards and guarantees relating to the application of the principle of self-determination. Our intention was not only to confirm a declaration of General de Gaulle, taking into account the new situation created since 16 September 1959, but to reaffirm our determination, after five years of debate on the Algerian question in the United Nations, that that principle which had hitherto been applied to other territories in a manner which I might describe as "at second-hand" should be properly applied in the extremely significant case of Algeria.

166. We are still convinced—and today's vote does not alter that conviction—that the Algerian people, by dint of their determination, will regain their independence. We do not hesitate a single moment to say that it is because the Algerian people took up arms five years ago and proclaimed that the purpose of their struggle was to secure recognition of their right to self-determination that General de Gaulle, realizing both the internal situation and, as he said, the international repercussions of the question, finally, just before the United Nations was to discuss it again, officially recognized—and this time without the circumlocutions typical of other French Governments in the last five years

<sup>8/</sup>This statement was made at the 1076th meeting of the First Committee, the official record of which is published only in summary form.



—that the Algerian people would be free to choose its future status.

167. We drew the First Committee's attention to the obscurities still beclouding this recognition and to the contradictions in the words used by the French Head of State as well as the even more serious contradictions—and I quoted the most recent—in the statements of the French authorities, the very authorities which would be responsible for applying the principle of self-determination.

168. Nevertheless, we helped to work out a new text in response to a trend in the Assembly to reformulate a few ideas which we have not in any way abandoned, but which were reworded in a manner more acceptable to the Assembly and which we thought would command a majority.

169. Today's vote does not merely reflect the choice made by those who believe that no debate on Algeria at all and that no resolution would be regarded as a positive factor, as the United Kingdom representative explained at length. But the United Kingdom representative did not tell us whether, by debating the question of Hungary or raising the problem of Laos or discussing the question of Tibet just as the tensions which we have been working to reduce in this Assembly for the past five years are beginning to ease, we might not be jeopardizing the improved atmosphere which marked the opening of this session. Be that as it may, we have learned a lesson.

170. There is another comment I should like to make: its ingenuousness may do me a disservice, but I hope that it will serve the cause of truth. The way in which the vote was split geographically gives much cause for concern. On the one hand, we see the nations which emerged from a struggle for independence once again opposing independence for a people akin to them in race, mentality, culture and in respect for United Nations principles. That is why we call upon this Assembly to examine closely the background of this debate and discover the real political motives which have on this occasion operated against the recognition of a principle enshrined in the United Nations Charter. And I am certain that the Assembly's refusal to recognize it today and its rejection of this draft resolution will not have helped General de Gaulle.

171. I have a further comment to make which is no less disturbing. This Assembly has been aware of the efforts made by Tunisia and Morocco to speed a restoration of peace in Algeria. Since we became independent and despite all sorts of difficulties, and risks on occasion, we have not been sparing of our support to the Algerian people or of our efforts to work with France towards a just, democratic and peaceful solution. I have more than once spoken here of the effects of a continuation of the Algerian war on the relations between Tunisia and Morocco on the one hand and France on the other. While we have certainly not abandoned all hope, I fear that we have reached the limits of our patience. If, contrary to the view of those who rejected this draft resolution on the grounds that it would not make a constructive contribution, the war were to go on next year, I doubt whether Morocco and Tunisia could continue to remain passive while their frontier villages and the people of those villages suffer the direct consequences of that war, without calling upon the General Assembly, perhaps in grave circumstances, not only to reconsider the Algerian question,

but to examine the further problems created by the war.

172. I should also like to make something more than a passing reference to the Powers which bear moral responsibility in this world—and they will forgive me, I hope, if I fail to observe the code of the gallant husband who remembers his wife's birthday but forgets her age—I would remind them of the promises they made during the war, from 1940 to 1945, when, in their hour of adversity, they appealed for help to all those peoples who, though they may have been weak and even enslaved at the time, could make a useful contribution to the triumph of freedom.

173. I appeal to the conscience of General de Gaulle. When he meditates at Colombey-les-Deux-Eglises, he is not far from the "sacred road" which made possible the victory at Verdun, a victory which left that road strewn with graves, nearly all of which are the graves of Algerians and North Africans. I wonder whether he thinks about every valley of Kabylia, every mountain of the Aurès chain, where daily prayers are being offered for the dead, and whether he realizes that there are sacred roads which will evoke in the Algerians much more thoughtful and deeper memories than those they may still retain of the men of Verdun.

174. If the Moroccan delegation should unfortunately have to revert to the Algerian question next year, we would open our remarks to quoting in their entirety—we hope the President would allow us to do so—the speeches made this year to prove that by taking no position on Algeria, we were fostering a chance for peace. We still feel strongly that we may have let that chance pass. My delegation should like for the sake of those who are determined to put an end to the Algerian war by bloodshed or by crushing the Algerian rebellion, to place on record and reaffirm the fact that, if the war goes on next year, Morocco will remain solidly behind the Algerians at any price. It is still confident that they will win by peaceful means, but if things should happen otherwise, it would not be the first country, the first people to stand against a nation which is playing a double game with freedom and against Powers which are seeking to conceal that duplicity, for the Algerian people will win in the end.

#### Statement by the President

175. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): We have a few minutes in which to take up the item on outer space, since we cannot proceed with the election of a member of the Security Council; negotiations are apparently still going on.

176. Before taking up this item, I consider it my duty to renew and to stress the appeal I have already made to the parties concerned in the election of a non-permanent member of the Security Council, to bear in mind the higher responsibilities and the fundamental interests of the General Assembly and to enter into direct negotiations with a view to eliminating the obstacles to an agreement and thus enabling the General Assembly to fulfil its moral and juridical obligation and its constitutional responsibility in respect of the membership of one of the principal organs of the United Nations. I should like to address this appeal also to the parties concerned in the election of two members of the Trusteeship Council, requesting them also to try to reach an understanding before we take up this item at tonight's meeting.

## AGENDA ITEM 25

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space

## REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/4351)

*Mr. Fekini (Libya), Rapporteur of the First Committee, presented the report of that Committee and then spoke as follows:*

177. Mr. FEKINI (Libya), Rapporteur of the First Committee (translated from French): The First Committee, in undertaking consideration of the question of the peaceful uses of outer space, was deeply aware of the historic importance of man's exploration of space. The Committee's discussions were dominated by a sincere desire to bring about the peaceful uses of outer space on a basis of international co-operation under United Nations auspices.

178. With those aims in mind, the First Committee adopted two draft resolutions in the hope that the Assembly will give them the widest possible measure of support, thus opening the way to international co-operation in the field of the peaceful uses of outer space in the interests of the welfare and progress of all mankind.

*Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the First Committee.*

179. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I should like to remind the Assembly that the First Committee unanimously adopted draft resolutions A and B which it recommends for adoption by the Assembly and which are contained in the Committee's report [A/4351]. Unless a vote is requested, I shall declare the drafts adopted unanimously by the General Assembly as well.

*The draft resolutions were adopted unanimously.*

180. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The Soviet delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A and B in the First Committee and supported them here in plenary meeting. It considers it essential, however, to make a brief statement on operative paragraph 1 of resolution B.

181. The fact is that the Soviet delegation cannot agree to the proposal that participation in the international scientific conference for the exchange of experience in the peaceful uses of outer space should be restricted to Members of the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

182. The international conference on outer space should be open to all States that wish to take part in it and make their contribution in this important field. There can be no doubt that real international co-

operation in cosmic research can be ensured only if all interested States take part. Despite that fact, operative paragraph 1 of resolution B states that only "interested Members of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies" will take part in the conference.

183. In the First Committee we voted against those words, as they in fact discriminate against some States by closing the doors of the conference to those countries that are not Members of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies. In that connexion, it must also be realized that the countries referred to which are not Members of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies are in that position for reasons altogether beyond their control, and it would be unjust to prevent them from taking part in so new and important an activity as joint space research.

184. It goes without saying that the Soviet Union which favours the broadest international co-operation in space research cannot agree to the exclusion of such countries and will continue to make every effort to ensure that all interested States can take part in the scientific conference for the exchange of experience connected with outer space.

185. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) (translated from Spanish): On behalf of my delegation, I should like to make a statement in connexion with the First Committee's draft resolution A establishing a Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

186. This morning in the First Committee, in stating my delegation's views and stand on the problem [1081st meeting], I pointed out the significance of this question as an expression of progress, a message of hope and a manifestation of the way in which human thought is crossing frontiers and leading man towards his true destiny. However, I said that despite all this, my delegation found itself obliged to abstain in the vote on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A, since it was unable to vote for the inclusion of Hungary as a member of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. For the same reason, my delegation did not take part in the voting.

187. I am speaking with all due respect for the country and people of Hungary, but the debates on that problem of Hungary which took place in this room only a few hours ago have decided my delegation to withhold its vote and to maintain its position as just stated.

188. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) (translated from Spanish): Regardless of the importance of the question of outer space, the Dominican Republic persists in its determination to abstain, as it did in the Committee, and that its abstention is due simply and solely to the presence of Hungary on the Committee established by the resolution.

*The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.*