

Statements made during to 13<sup>th</sup> Session of The United Nations  
General Assembly

By His Excellency

Mr. Ahmad Shukairy

Minister of State for United Nations Affairs Permanent  
Representative of the Saudi Arabian Mission to the United  
Nations

Chairman of the Saudi Arabian Mission to the General Assembly

Prepared by the Saudi Arabian Mission to the United Nations

New York 1959

## CONTENTS

Page

Opening statement before the Thirteenth Session of the  
United Nations General

Assembly

Disarmament

Cyprus Question

Algeria

## PREFACE

His Excellency Mr. Ahmad Shukairy, Minister of State for United Nations Affairs, headed the Saudi Arabian Delegation to the Thirteenth Session of the General Assembly. He took an active and constructive part in the general debates, as well as in the proceedings of the First Political and Special Committees of the United Nations. The leader of the Saudi Arabian Delegation intervened during the discussions and deliberations of the various items that were placed on the agenda of last year's session. He, however, delivered four major addresses that surveyed the developments of the burning problems of the year 1958.

Mr. Shukairy delivered his main speech on October 1, 1958 in the General Assembly during the general debate. He touched upon many problems affecting East-West tension, the Law of the Seas, recognition of the Arab League as a regional organization, the Palestine question, and various facets of the problems afflicting the world.

The Minister of State turned next to the perennial question of Algeria in his second speech in the First Political Committee on October 10, 1958. His third address was devoted to the item of Disarmament. Last, Mr. Shukairy participated in the question of Cyprus.

The Saudi Arabian Mission to the United Nations has received many requests for the text of the four aforementioned speeches, including inquiries as to the stand of the Government on the major political issues of the year 1958. It is in view of these demands that it was deemed necessary to print in speeches in a booklet and circulate them to all interested parties.

Opening statement before the Thirteenth Session of the United Nations General Assembly ...

A general survey of the problems facing the Thirteenth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations was contained in the initial speech delivered by His Excellency Mr. Ahmad Shukairy on October 1, 1958. The following is the complete text of His Excellency's address:

This gathering of ours is the thirteenth regular session of the United Nation's General Assembly. Such it has been inaugurated and such it has been publicized. The title, the fashion, and the ceremonies-all belong to the category of an ordinary and regular session. In form this nomenclature of the session is admittedly true and it would be idle to question its validity. Thus, this is the thirteenth session of the General Assembly and there is no doubt about that.

Yet, fellow delegates, except for the calendar of the United Nations, this session, by its very essence, by its very nature, is not the thirteenth regular session. I say it is not, with all seriousness and upon deep reflection. It is no play on words or figures, nor am I engaged in a riddle or pun.

For, if we are to make a sincere examination of the present state of affairs now dominating the world, if we are to pulse the fears of mankind, if we are to penetrate right through the heart of the current events, and lastly, if we are to read intelligently the barometer of the international atmosphere, this session becomes neither the thirteenth nor the regular session of the United Nations. It is an emergency session of the highest order. To be more precise, this is the fourth emergency session of the General Assembly held upon the heels of an emergency session, and regrettably enough within an interval of three weeks, fully charged with turmoil and excitement.

Maybe this is a dim portrayal too painful and too dreadful to admit. Maybe optimism condemns our evaluation as a sheer

pessimism. Maybe our approach can seemingly appear as an attempt to dramatize the international situation.

No, gentlemen, it is nothing of this sort. It is neither pessimism nor dramatization. Rather, it is cold thinking, candid talking and plain calculation. And this is the central duty which we are bound to discharge in the United Nations. Here, we are not assembled to suppress facts or tarnish events. The United Nations is the forum of the human race to speak its mind and conscience. It is the last resort for human hope when hope becomes shaken. It is the ultimate refuge for international peace when peace is endangered. Lastly, it is the supreme tribunal for clear thinking, for fact-finding and for fair adjudication.

In these days, we do not need to dramatize current events, for a lively drama lives in the wake of events. The drama is there, and it is no use to blind our sight or shut our insight to the glaring realities of the day. In fact, it requires no genius to assess the present situation. Even a layman can fathom its depth easily and intelligently. We live in an age of information radiating to the four corners of the globe. The general awareness, the press, the radio, the emergence of world public opinion, and last, but not least, the media of information of the United Nations—all combined have served to educate the people of the world, far and near, of the crucial problems that affect international peace and security. Thus, under this avalanche of information, even the man in the street, not conversant as we are with our Charter and rules of procedure, can readily perceive for himself the sense of emergency that captures our deliberations in this session.

Hence, to us, all of us, I assume, the situation is crystal clear. Indeed, I might venture to say, the situation must be crystal clear, for we are, each and all, in the midst of the stream. In this great human drama, we are neither amateurs nor spectators—we are on the state ourselves. It is true, the great heroes lead the play, still the play is ours, and the players are all.

Therefore, it seems hardly necessary to make any introduction for the current international situation. By itself, the general anxiety now plaguing the whole of mankind is an eloquent preface. The events of the day shoot their way to the top of our agenda, with our will and without. Coincidence or no coincidence, we are before the crisis face to face, as if at a rendezvous with the present session. It seems as though a wild race has been set in motion between the United Nations on one hand, and international outbreaks on the other. To follow this race, you have to follow the tracks of Mr. Hammarskjold, who is not only our distinguished Secretary-General, but the master of our missions and the servant of our Charter. No sooner had Mr. Hammarskjold embarked on his assignment in the Middle East, than the situation flared up in the Far East. It is a wild race of events, which we must face squarely. It is a race that must be ruled out at any cost, any cost except the dictates of peace and justice. For such a race brings victory to none, and defeat to all, let alone the untold misery, the unspeakable destruction and the unthinkable annihilation.

This is no unwarranted fear, fellow delegates. The brutal fact, and nothing could be more brutal, is that we live in a state of war. Although, in a fragmentary shape, it is an actual war with human suffering and material destruction. It is a war waged in more than one area of our world.

In Africa a crusade of liberation is on the march with the Algerian uprising as a spearhead. It is an independence war that carried the battlefield far and wide, to every town and village, to every hill and valley and to every cave and meadow.

In the Far East, Korea, and the like, are still visited by partition and disunity, the greatest pests of our time. What is more, the Far East is now the theater of war, and a hot-bed for a global war.

Thus, ladies and gentlemen, we are not only at the peak of tension, nor are we at the brink of war. I am afraid we are at the brink of the brink.

Yet, this is only a side view of the current situation. Viewed through the items of our agenda, or through the report of the Secretary-General, the position is no less alarming.

#### DISARMAMENT

Disarmament, as we all know, has progressed in every direction except disarmament. Commissions and sub-commissions were established. Conferences and meetings were held in camera and in public. Resolutions and declarations were adopted, and heaps of records have grown in volume. But all this labour produced not disarmament, rather, it stepped up armament. It brought not a balanced reduction of arms, but an unbalanced increase of military expenditure. It led not to a prohibition of atomic weapons, but to a stockpiling of hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction. It brought not the cessation of nuclear tests, but the continuation of tests of all types and forms.

This year, disarmament suffered another retreat. There was a deadlock of default. No meetings were held and no deliberations took place. It was a deadlock that comes after years of United Nations' failures, preceded by a League of Nations' frustration.

This, Mr. President, has been a long and weary way. But the catastrophe is that it has no end within sight; and what is more, the way seems to lead to a precipice of despair, not to a plateau of hope. Disarmament is becoming the growing literature of the United Nations and nothing more. We admit, however, that disarmament is taking place through substitution. Hence, by chemists, physicists and arms, troops have been reduced. Conventional weapons have yielded to atomic weapons, and these in turn we giving way to nuclear and thermonuclear stockpiles. Now, with the age of space, weapons of the inner

space are on their way to surrender to weapons of the outer space.

This is the disarmament we have been watching in the life of the United Nations—disarmed from the old, to be armed with the new; abandoning the less destructive to the more destructive; and in a word, deserting the humanely barbarous to the ghastly barbarous. This is the balance sheet of disarmament, whose only balance is turbulence, anxiety and frustration.

#### GENEVA MEETING OF SCIENTISTS

Yet, we cannot shut our eyes to certain marginal gains whose gleams can penetrate the heavy clouds that hand over. First of all, we have the Warsaw talks dealing with the situation in the Far East. The whole world is now awaiting the deliberations in Warsaw with ardent prayers for a peaceful, just and honorable settlement. Here in the United Nations, the best service we can render is to keep the question outside our debate. In certain problems and at certain times, the greatest contribution of the United Nations can be made by its silence. This may seem paradoxical but the Far East question, for the moment, is one classical illustration. So let us keep silent for a while.

In the second place, the meeting of the scientists of the atomic powers held last month at Geneva, is now without significance. Notwithstanding that the findings were of a scientific nature, strictly isolated from political consideration, no doubt the results were a success. We must bear in mind that the possibility of detecting nuclear tests through a network of monitory systems is a great achievement by itself. It is no exaggeration to say that this a thrilling finding, crowned by unanimous agreement. If the matter is technically feasible and enforceable, then to refuse suspension of nuclear tests, or even to procrastinate agreement, becomes highly serious. Now that scientists have agreed before the altar of science, statements are left to stand before the bar of history. They stand to make their

choice - a choice between peace or no peace, between war or no war.

## LAW OF THE SEA

The Geneva meetings, Mr. President, bring to our minds another international gathering held in the Spring of this year, namely the Conference on the Law of the Sea. This Conference has formulated the text of four conventions and an optional protocol for the compulsory settlement of disputes. The Conference, however, has failed on certain important aspects of the Law of the Sea. Of particular mention, the width of the territorial sea and the regime of historic waters were amongst the subjects that remained unfinished. With this result one can hardly say that anything was really finished. The extent of the territorial sea is the base of the pyramid for this branch of international law. Without defining the width of the territorial sea, the law of the sea stands in vacuum; and both nature and law cannot survive in vacuum. For once the limit of the territorial sea is defined, we know where to stand. We can know where are the internal waters, the contiguous waters and the high seas - a delimitation of great importance in time of peace and in time of war.

This is no talking in the abstract. We have a vivid illustration quite fresh and very much on our minds. We all know of the dispute that broke out between Iceland and Great Britain over matters pertaining to the limit of the territorial sea. In the Conference at Geneva, Iceland stood for a 12 mile limit, while Great Britain advocated the three mile limit, now a piece of antiquity in the archives of international law. After the Conference, Great Britain has launched a fishing armada in the waters of Iceland in total disregard to the legitimate rights of Iceland and in flagrant violation of the established modern trends of international law. It was a bloodless combat that was a source of amusement to the British press. For what can Iceland do in the face of the British fleet, determined to take the law in its own hands or more correctly to take what Great Britain desires the

law to be. It is a sad episode between two members of the United Nations—two members of the same NATO organization, and between a great power and a powerless power. We wonder whether the British Government would venture such an adventure against a country of a different caliber. This action on the part of the United Kingdom should cause concern to us all for many reasons. The British conduct, and to give it a legal term, the British mis-conduct, reflects an aggression against a defenseless country like Iceland. Also, it reveals on the part of Great Britain an outrageous disrespect to the United Nations as the supreme organ for the settlement of international disputes. Lastly, it betrays British adamance in defending the three mile limit, which once upon a time was a rule of international law. I stress again, the expression once upon a time, for today the three mile limit is no more than a "fallen idol" - as brilliantly described by Professor Jiddil, the great French jurist. It is really a "fallen idol" and the United Kingdom cannot row the seas with such an idol on board its glorious fleet.

#### RECOGNITION OF ARAB LEAGUE AS A REGIONAL ORGANIZATION

This is how we view the major aspects of the international situation; but no matter how varied our appraisals may be, one central fact stands out in our minds without any controversy—namely the impact of our region on international peace and security. The Arab homeland, stretching from the Atlantic to the Indian Ocean, has recently provoked a great deal of excitement and interest. With its strategic position, with its vast economic riches, and what is more valuable, with its eighty million people full of zeal and determination to live free and united, this home of ours is becoming again one of the most important areas of the world. In testimony, if testimony is required, nothing could be more telling than a perusal of the agenda of this organization ever since its creation.

In this region, and a few months before the advent of the United Nations, there has been established a League of Arab States with a pact similar to our Charter, in its aims and purposes, except for one main objective. The pact of the Arab League aims at closer bonds of harmony and unity. In its various fields of activity, this League of Arab States is not foreign to this organization, nor to its specialized agencies. In 1950 the General Assembly in its resolution No. 477V has extended a permanent invitation to the Secretary-General of the Arab League to attend the sessions of the General Assembly as an observer. Recently, in the last emergency session, the General Assembly has unanimously acted on a resolution which took note of one of the main provisions of the pact of the Arab League—an indication of great significance.

Doubtless, Mr. President, the Arab League is a regional organization within the letter and spirit of the provisions of the United Nations Charter. Therefore, it is high time that the Arab League should be recognized as a regional organization with all the rights and duties that a regional organization can exercise and discharge. The members of the Arab League are members of the United Nations and to accord such a status to the Arab League is simply recognizing a legitimate existing reality. We hope that our Secretary-General, well informed and keenly interested as he is, will take the necessary steps that will give effect to such a recognition. The advantages need hardly be emphasized. The United Nations can find in the Arab League an effective instrument to establish in the area conditions of peace, security, economic development, cultural and technical progress and social advancement.

This achievement, when realized, will not only be a source of satisfaction to the United Nations, but a great contribution for the cause of peace and human progress.

In this context, Mr. President, I take the liberty to bring to you happy news. We rejoice to convey to the Assembly that

Morocco and Tunisia have decided to join the Arab League. In fact, this joinder is a mere formality. Tunisia and Morocco have been with us for all time, and we have been with Morocco and Tunisia for all time. Together we have shed our tears and blood; and together we have shared our rise and decline. To us, all of us, the time has come to unite our efforts for ultimate unity, and liberate our energies for final liberty.

Yet Morocco and Tunisia, as well as all the Arab States, have before you a burning question, affectionately dear to their hearts, the question of Algeria. As a matter of fact, open to no doubt whatsoever, the question is ours, and ours is the question. On such a matter, we need not be shy or reluctant, for the problem is one of independence which is worthy not only of the support of the Arab nation, but of the whole civilized world.

#### THE QUESTION OF ALGERIA

In dealing with the question of Algeria, I deem it unnecessary to reiterate any of the many arguments in support of the Algerian question. The competence of the United Nations, and the right of the people of Algeria to independence, have all been established. By now these matters have become past history for the United Nations. Our main concern should be focused on the present and future.

For the present, the picture is free from any shred of obscurity. A provisional government for an independent and fully sovereign Algeria has been established a few days ago. There were a number of recognitions and the rest will follow. The emergence of the Algerian government, apart from its national necessity, was a natural step in the right direction and at the right moment. It will be recalled, the question of Algeria has been on our agenda since the tenth session. Ever since, neither the impact of war, nor the weight of the resolutions of the General Assembly have led France to give up its intransigence and recognize the inherent right of the people of Algeria to their liberty and freedom. Your resolution of last year, calling for *pourparlers* to

arrive at a solution in conformity with the purposes of the Charter has been recklessly ignored by France.

Instead of the pourparlers, a French term extended as a courtesy to France, French troops have translated pourparlers into further acts of aggression, this time against Tunisia, as well as Algeria. The cowardly bombardment of Sakiet Sidi Ben Yousef, with which the Security Council was seized, is only one illustration.

On the political side, France has committed another violation of your resolution. And here again instead of seeking a solution in accordance with the Charter, France is attempting a solution in accordance with a new draft French constitution. Well, it is our Charter, not the French constitution, which must be the basis for the solution of the Algerian question. This is the letter and spirit of your resolution which you adopted by a unanimity of acclamation, last year.

What has aggravated the situation is this referendum, or so-called referendum which the French Government has staged a few days ago. It goes without saying that a referendum conducted by France, in France and for France is not our concern, nor could it be. The only thing we can do is to extend our best wishes. But a referendum by France for the people of Algeria and under French administration is deplorable, unacceptable and entirely inadmissible. A constitution for Algeria can only be framed by the people of Algeria under conditions of freedom and liberty.

Obviously, this abortive referendum on the part of France does not possess the normal attributes of a lawful referendum. It is intended to cook a solution which carries the appearances of democracy. It aims at imposing on this General Assembly a fait accompli. But neither the United Nations nor world public opinion would accept such an international mockery.

Should France feel the least faith in this unconstitutional constitution for Algeria, we stand ready for the challenge. Let France walk out of the territory and we are ready to accept a

referendum conducted under United Nations auspices. We accept a referendum under Mr. Hammarskjold, but not one under General de Gaulle. This would then be a genuine referendum, not one held at the point of a gun, let alone various forms of pressures and inducements.

Let us try and see whether the people of Algeria will cast their vote to France or to Algeria; whether they seek dependence upon or independence from France; and lastly whether they will opt for Ferhat Abbas, the head of the Algerian Government, or General de Gaulle, the head of the Government of France.

If France has faith, if France has the courage and if France has the confidence, this is the real challenge-a challenge which we accept here and now-and a challenge we challenge France to accept, here and now.

So much, fellow delegates, for the past and present. As to the future, better prospects are within reach should France set aside the intransigence of France.

The chances for peace are available. Indeed, the chances for peaceful, friendly and cooperative relations between France and Algeria are not only possible but abundantly hopeful. A negotiated settlement of all disputes between the Republic of France and the Republic of Algeria is a central factor in maintaining peace and tranquillity in the whole of North Africa. With the emergence of the National Government of Algeria, this task becomes now easy. Thus the two parties are legitimately constituted, with nothing remaining except a distinguished mediator acceptable to both parties. For our part, we suggest and accept the mediation of Mr. Hammarskjold, either as a Secretary-General, as an outstanding person of our Age, or in any capacity whatsoever.

It is no easy task, but Mr. Hammarskjold is the man to rise to the responsibilities of this assignment. He can secure a cease-fire between the parties based upon recognition of the right of independence to the Algerian people. He can arrange for a round

table conference to be held in the United Nations between the duly accredited representatives of Algeria and France.

This, Mr. President, is the high road to peace. This is the only course open before France and to safeguard whatever legitimate interests France claims in Algeria. This is the only solution under which the French community in Algeria can live, prosper and flourish. In a word, this will mark the beginning of friendly and cordial relations not only with Algeria, but with all the Arab States.

Perhaps, Mr. President, this is the last offer that can be extended to France. Maybe, it is the last chance for France to save what could be saved. For what would be the final outcome, should France not yield to reason and wisdom? The final result is quite obvious. It is war and nothing but war. The Algerian people are determined to continue the war, not only on Algerian soil, but anywhere. So far, a second front has been opened in France itself, and *La Guerre est La Guerre*. It is a war of liberation. It is a sacred war and the Algerian people have an inherent right to war and to carry the war to its ultimate victory.

We should bear in mind, however, that in this war Algeria will not be alone. Many will come to assist Algeria in all forms of assistance. This is quite normal and I would say admissible. Assistance, military and economic, is the fashion of the day. It is being extended under the cognizance of the United Nations to all, and by all. There is no reason why Algeria should not be one. Such an assistance extended to Algeria is now made feasible, first because a government has been established and second because that government has declared a state of war with Algeria.

As to the ultimate end, we harbour no doubts. The end is definitely a victory for Algeria. Such has been the course of history and such has been the coronation of all liberation movements all over the world. I scarcely need to cite cases and events, for the irrefutable evidence lies in the midst of this august body. Many a state, yes, too many a state, has come to this

Assembly not through the main door of admission, but right through the battlefields of liberty and independence.

And, Mr. President, no one more than France should realize this historic reality. For the modern history of France herself provides valuable lessons. And what tragic lessons they were, only for those who care to learn from their own lessons.

#### BRITISH BELT AROUND THE ARABIAN PENINSULA

Two highly important questions remain to be placed before this highly esteemed organization. Allow me to begin with that I should call the British belt around the Arabian peninsula.

This is a big problem, which is itself the aggregate compound of a number of problems. I shall not refer to dates, causes and events. Any student of the history of international affairs is fully aware of the facts.

In a nutshell, the United Kingdom-or to be more accurate-the British Empire-had imposed at different times her domination all around the Eastern and Southern shores of the Arabian Peninsula. From Kuwait in the North down to Aden in the South, a belt of British rule, domination or influence, was tailored to fit British imperial interests. The pretexts were varied in accordance with the style of the day. At times it was to curb piracy. At other times, it was to defend the Suez Canal. At some other time, it was to protect imperial communication to India, the most precious pearl of the Crown.

This is how the belt was snatched from the Arabian Peninsula. Eventually this belt did not come out in one single territory. Today we witness some forty-five distinct units in the area. Just imagine forty-five separate entities for one and the same land, for one and the same people.

The matter, however, is not confined to this dismemberment. There is not a day without British aggression around the Arabian Peninsula. Some day, it is on Oman; another

day, it is on Lahaj, some other day it is on Buraimi or Aden, a succession of aggression by rotation.

I have raised this question only to whisper to the United Kingdom from this rostrum, that piracy exists no more, that India is not the pearl of the Empire any more and that the defense of the Suez Canal is no more the responsibility of the British Government. The march of history cries out that the United Kingdom should leave the land to its people and leave the people to their land.

But if the British hobby is to fashion belts here or there, they had better practice this hobby at home. They had better do it around their Islands-not around our Peninsula!

#### NEW APPROACH TO THE PALESTINE QUESTION

Last, Mr. President, comes the question of Palestine. I have wil-fully kept it to the end, not as a sequence of order, but precisely because I have desired to leave you with the impressions of a problem that stands out as the greatest of all Arab problems.

I shall not weary you with the history of the problem in the United Nations; with the arguments, with the counter-arguments that centered around the question, nor even with the volume of resolutions regarding the repatriation of the refugees and the internationalization of Jerusalem. You all know the tragedy from beginning to end, and the refusal of Israel to enforce those resolutions.

This time I have a new approach to place before you-an approach of a revolutionary character, but one that would relieve the international community of a problem that has more than once endangered world peace and security.

And the word problem, fellow delegates, in relation to the question of Palestine, should be the spark that must ingite our deliberations.

In 1947, Palestine became the problem of the United Nations. After a lengthy debate, a resolution for partition and the creation of Israel was adopted. As declared by the supporters of that resolution, it was meant to restore peace to the Holy Land. Partition was envisaged to make the problem cease to be a problem. In the words of the distinguished delegate of the United States, uttered in 1947, "partition offers the best practical opportunity of obtaining, in a future foreseeable now, a peaceful settlement in Palestine." Now we have reached that future.

Today, in 1958, we come to find the problem still outstanding as a United Nations problem and with more grievous dimensions. Partition was decided and Israel was created, but there is no peace reigning in the area. On the contrary, peace has become more remote than ever. The picture is simple and easy to present. A million refugees are still living in exile, and the Holy Land, with all its religious and sacred shrines has become the scene of destruction and desecration.

Yes, Mr. President, the problem you have attempted to solve is still the burning problem of the Middle East. Just consult the records of the Security Council in the last decade and you will find that the problem of Palestine is still the same problem you have endeavored to tackle.

Thus it becomes obvious that the assumptions upon which Israel was created have been vitiated not by one or two events, but by a lengthy line of tension, insecurity and instability along a whole decade. For what was the main object for the establishment of Israel? What was the premise upon which partition was decided? The United Nations has aimed at bringing a peaceful settlement of the Palestine question. The boundaries between Israel and the Arabs, as was forcefully argued in 1947 by the representative of the United States in defense of partition, "will be as freely crossed as the boundaries which separate the individual states of the United States".

This, fellow delegates, was the premise upon which Israel was founded. Now after ten years of United Nations efforts, there is still a great amount of talking for a peaceful settlement of the Palestine question. Well, this goes to prove that your 1947 settlement did not lead to a settlement. With this conclusion we are left to the only remaining alternative. The United Nations should reverse the course adopted by the United Nations.

Yes sir, it is only a policy of reversal which offers the only chance for peace in the Middle East and for the world as a whole. And reversal of is a healthy policy to avoid the evils of bad policy. In the United Nations reversal is provided for in our procedure as a rule to reconsider passed resolutions.

Doubtless, fellow delegates, we have reached the stage when the United Nations must reconsider its passed resolutions that gave rise to Israel. We have reached the stage where the United Nations should undo its own doing, for the whole experiment has proved to be a fiasco.

That it is a fiasco hardly needs any corroboration. Having received two billion dollars of assistance, Israel is still as unviable as it started. Israel has no frontier, the demarcation lines are still armistice lines. Recognition of Israel by the Arab States has not come and it is not forthcoming-now or for all time to come, even should Israel survive for all time to come.

Thus all the elements for a reconsideration of the creation of Israel are more than abundant. At a time a slogan had been coined for circulation in the Middle East, that Israel is there to stay. Nothing is so empty as this empty slogan. Israel is there not to stay and is not going to stay. In spite of the recent arms shipment provided by certain Western powers, Israel is not going to stay. The reason is simple-it is no action by the Arab States. It is rather action within Israel. Israel is undoing Israel; and here is where the United Nations' intervention is called for. The United Nations can help an orderly undoing of Israel, lest it should take place in no orderly manner.

The question, however, may be asked, how is this process of the undoing of Israel taking place. In answer to this valid question, the best I can do is to give the floor to a Jewish source that speaks from the heart of New York. Only a few days ago, as though meant to be addressed to this General Assembly, the Jewish Newsletter has revealed to the world this process of the undoing of Israel. I now read from the Jewish Newsletter:

"The Middle East crisis has obscured an important internal problem in Israel which would have occupied the front pages of the newspapers in normal time. Even now it is one of the big stories in the country and is the cause of anxiety among top leaders. A recent emergency meeting of the Department of Immigration of the Jewish Agency, attended by Premier Ben-Gurion, revealed official figures showing that immigration to Israel for the first half of this year had reached an all-time low."

The Jewish letter goes on to say, and I read -

"Not only do American, British, Canadian and other Jews who have homes in Western and overseas countries refuse to immigrate to Israel, but even those who plan to leave their homes do not go to Israel. Immigration figures published by HIAS (United Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society) and by the Canadian Jewish press show that there is considerable and growing immigration of Jews from all European countries to South America, Canada and the United States, while Israel, which is much nearer to these immigrants, is being studiously ignored, despite the free transportation and other inducements it offers."

Having said this, the Jewish letter proceeds to bring the most telling figures -

"The emergency meeting which discussed the critical situation of immigration to Israel also touched upon this problem. It was revealed that 6,000 Jews officially registered as immigrants have left Israel this year; 110,000 have left since the establishment of the State. A great many more, whose number cannot be ascertained, have left the country as tourists.

According to official information, the number of people expected to leave Israel this year will reach 30,000. At the Polish Consulate in Tel-Aviv alone, 6,500 immigrants have registered for emigration."

As to Israeli students, the letter states that -

"The most painful fact is that Israeli students who are sent by the government to study at foreign universities, as well as instructors and other emissaries, do their utmost to remain in foreign countries rather than return home. Of 3,000 students who were sent abroad at government expense, only 600 returned. In short, while practically all sources of new immigration have been closed, the flow of emigrants from Israel is steadily rising."

Finally, Mr. President, the Jewish letter ends by saying, and I quote:

"In short, the de-Zionisation of Israel has begun."

This is how the undoing of Israel, by Israel, is taking place, and this is how we can get hold of the master key to the problem. The solution lies in the de-Zionization of Israel. It lies in a return to the situation which existed in 1947, where the legitimate Jewish inhabitants had lived in a flourishing community as fellow citizens with the Moslems and Christians of Palestine. It is a return to a decade backwards, rather than to a three thousand years era of obscurity and wilderness.

This, Mr. President, is a most revealing situation. The graph that has marked immigration into Israel is now declining. There is now another graph drawn; it is a graph of migration from Israel, a process which must be supported by the United Nations to help Israelis go back to their former homes. It is on these lines that the United Nations should reconsider its resolution of 1947 which recommended the creation of Israel. To be more specific, and in the light of past experience, the United Nations should undertake the necessary steps which will lead to the following five basic principles:

- (1) The restoration of the geographic unity of Palestine as part and parcel of the Arab homeland.
- (2) The repatriation of Arabs and Jews-the Arab refugees to their homes in Palestine and the Jewish new-comers to their former countries.
- (3) The constitution of Palestine as a democratic state where all the inhabitants have equal rights and duties, Moslems, Christians and Jews alike.
- (4) The disarmament and demobilization of all troops, the demilitarization of the whole country and its neutralization, all guaranteed by the Security Council.
- (5) The appointment of a United Nations representative to report to the General Assembly on matters pertaining to the status quo of religious shrines and the free access to the holy places.

Mr. President, in putting forward this plan for the solution of the Palestine question, we are not led by passions or emotions, although all aspects of human life, the United Nations included, are lifeless without emotions or passions. We are guided by the natural, the normal and the healthy course of history. Palestine is an integral part of the Arab homeland, and such it has been since time immemorial. The Arab nation now on its march towards final liberation will not give up one single inch of their sacred territory. Let on one be mistaken on this matter. This is the final position from which we shall not recede, now and till the end of time. It is not only the million Arab refugees who clamor to redeem their homes, but with them shall strive each and every one of the eighty million Arabs to whom Palestine is home.

In conclusion, let me assure you, fellow delegates, that it is neither passionate nor extreme motivation that has animated the representations we have made before you in this august body. We have been guided by nothing except objective, independent and free thinking.

In particular, we have endeavored to elucidate Arab problems in their proper context, suggesting as we did solutions so clear-cut and so decisive, as to leave no room for alternative solutions.

This attitude on our part is no adamance. It is real realism. For there is only one road that leads to peace. It is true that all roads lead to Rome, but for peace there is one road and one road only. It is justice and nothing but justice. In the history of political settlements one major absolute truth has stood the test at all times. Solutions that were based upon justice have lasted and survived, but those that were devoid of justice have been short lived. Ultimately their end was failure and disaster.

Failure and disaster, Mr. President, are not our aim and purpose. Our aim and purpose is to seek peace based upon justice, and to seek justice based upon the real dictates of justice.

To this end, we are dedicated, and from this end we shall never be deviated.

So help us God.

Disarmament ...

On October 24, 1958, H.E. Mr. Shukairy expounded on the grave necessity of settling the problems of Disarmament. The following observations and suggestions on this important matter was delivered during the deliberations in the First Committee:

Before speaking on disarmament, allow me, Mr. Chairman, to disarm a current contention from its apparent, seeming validity. I propose to dispose of this preliminary point at the outset-for if we allow a certain prevailing tendency to dominate our deliberations-the present item would reach the point of liquidation, not by attainment, but rather by political bankruptcy. In all its phases and aspects, the question of disarmament would then belong neither to our Charter, nor to our organization. Indeed the United Nations would lose its parenthood of the very problem for which it was initially established. And peace-the dearest objective of mankind-would stand in vacuum as a destination beyond reach.

In each and every session, when we endeavor to grapple with problem of disarmament, we come face to face to confront the dilemic dilemma. There arises in our minds a big question with a big question mark. We are constantly asked: What can the United Nations do about disarmament? What role can the small states play in this gigantic topic? What contribution can the underarmed nations make to arrest this wild race of armaments? These questions and a host of others are not raised for academic pleasure. They are no luxury. They are the core of the problem. As a matter of fact, they are provoked by the very trend of our deliberations in this committee. Indeed these questions are reflected in the nature of an atmosphere that is being injected in our debate. It is no secret that on this highly crucial question, we are facing incessant and relentless efforts to bypass the United Nations, to belittle its competence, and to make this organizationj a show-room for consumer goods, manufactured, finished and ready for delivery.

Indications that betray this tendency, Mr. Chairman, are too many to be set out in detail at this moment. But two salient features that point to the red light cannot escape our attention.

In the first place, we cannot fail to note that recently the item on disarmament has almost fallen out of memory. While the world crisis was at its peak, disarmament stood at the brink of abeyance. Were it not for the initiative of our Secretary-General, disarmament would have been an orphan topic, denied by all, and received by none. Thanks to our Secretary-General this question was placed on our agenda this year. We owe it to Mr. Hammarskjöld that we are now meeting in this committee to discuss disarmament. The problem has been ranked in our Charter as a supreme, if not the supreme responsibility of the United Nations. It has been on our agenda as a perennial item ever since the creation of our organization. Nonetheless, no one cared this year to request its inclusion on the agenda of the present session. By itself, this phenomenon tells the gist of the story. It reveals diligence on the part of the Secretary-General, and it betrays negligence where negligence should belong.

In the second place, the United Nations is confronted at this session with an ultimatum. One line of action, and only one, is made open before the Assembly.

In the course of the debate, the Honourable Representative of the United Kingdom has described the position of the Soviet Delegation as being one of ultimatum. In his turn, the Honourable Representative of the Soviet Union answered back that the position of the Western powers on disarmament is itself an ultimatum! I do not propose to express an opinion on the charges. Accounts of this nature can best be settled by the parties themselves; and we are not equipped to intervene in this duel. One central fact, however, is self-evident. It is the United Kingdom that has served an ultimatum on the General Assembly. In fairness, we cannot deny that the statement of the distinguished Representative of the United Kingdom, although

lacking validity, is an example of ability and clarity. It is indisputable that the general theme of his argumentation underlies an adamant ultimatum. Although richly couched in terms of exceeding refinement, the statement of Mr. Noble breathes ultimatum. In explaining the seventeen-power resolution, Mr. Noble has emphasized that vis-à-vis the Geneva Meeting on nuclear tests due to take place on 31 October, the best that the General Assembly can do is an expression of encouragement. The Honourable Representative of the United Kingdom went even further. At the end of his statement, he felt rather not satisfied with confining the Assembly to a simple role of encouragement, and went out of his way to explain how this encouragement is to be shown. In his concluding words, Mr. Noble has stressed that the various sections of the seventeen-power resolution are intended to show the Assembly how this encouragement can best be expressed.

Well, Mr. Chairman, this is nothing except a position of ultimatum thrown at the door of the Assembly. The premise upon which Mr. Noble has proceeded boils down to this: "Take it or leave it, and yours is an encouragement role and no more". In essence, this is the essence of the United Kingdom position—a position which we cannot accept in fairness to the sanctity of the Charter, and the dignity of the United Nations.

This is not, Mr. Chairman, a matter of procedure, or a question of approach. Neither is it a way of thinking. Here in the United Nations, we stand ready to be open-minded. We must be prepared to receive all sorts of ideas. But ideas which rob the United Nations of primary responsibility are unreceivable. We cannot abdicate our duties or surrender our rights. We cannot accept to resign and just observe and encourage—as bystanders do in a football match. We refuse to sit back, arms folded, simply extending idle blessings on a questions which underlies the greatest curse for the human race. Our encouragement for an agreed solution is always there. You need not search for it; you need not urge for it. All along the decades before the League of

Nations and after, the encouragement of the peoples of the world for an effective solution of disarmament never ceased with the rattling of weapons. In the lifetime of the United Nations, encouragement was never withheld in spite of the stockpiling of hydrogen bombs. Encouragement has never been lacking. What was really lacking was genuine agreement by the great powers for an effective plan for disarmament.

It is to conceal this failure, Mr. Chairmans, that arguments are being marshalled with a view to divesting the United Nations of its primary responsibility. Maybe this is the reason why the Secretary-General in his memorandum of 30 September 1958 has stressed that "the attainment of balanced world-wide disarmament through the United Nations must remain a primary objective of the organization". And I invite your attention to the expression "through the United Nations", for the Secretary-General means every word and each letter of his statement; and the idea of "through the United Nations" is the vein of emphasis that runs through his memorandum.

Yet to cover retreat from the United Nations, smoke-screen tactics are being applied. We are told the General Assembly cannot make decisions on the subject matter before negotiations between the great powers can take place. This contention has been forcefully argued by the Honourable Representative of the United Kingdom. In his statement before the Committee, his advocacy was as follows, and here I quote his words:

"The solution of disarmament problems must be the result of agreement. Agreement, in turn, must be the result of negotiations and of the free meeting of minds. It would be unrealistic to try to commit the nuclear powers to a particular course of action before they have had fully opportunity for negotiations among themselves."

With this statement, as embodying a general proposition, we do not quarrel. It is a sound statement that raises no controversy. No agreement can be achieved without previous

negotiations, particularly so on a question as crucial and vital as disarmament. The General Assembly no doubt has no statutory authority to force the big powers to follow a particular course of action. Nevertheless, the General Assembly can enunciate general principles for disarmament, control, verification and what not. The General Assembly can recommend to the states concerned suspension and prohibition of test explosions of nuclear weapons. The General Assembly can recommend the prohibition of nuclear weapons, outlawing of atomic warfare and the destruction of hydrogen stockpiles. The General Assembly can call upon the powers concerned to agree upon a coordinated plan of disarmament. Finally, the General Assembly can, in its wisdom and discretion, urge the great powers to follow a particular course of action, more so when the course they have thus far followed yielded nothing but failure and disastrous failure. All these and other allied matters can be decided by the Assembly. They fall within the ambit of the United Nations jurisdiction, and no amount of eloquence can defeat this truism.

However, to a layman entirely ignorant of the history of the disarmament question, this plea for negotiation offers a great deal of inducement. Surely, Mr. Chairman, the argument put forward by the distinguished Representative of the United Kingdom that disarmament cannot be solved without an opportunity of negotiation, is most luring-but to whom? It may be luring to a guest who may be here in the United Nations on a visit from one of the nearby planets; for our usual guests who come to the United Nations from this planet of ours cannot be swayed by such arguments!

#### DISARMAMENT IN TWELVE SESSIONS

After thirteen years of relentless efforts, of heated discussion and of contested debate, how dare we say that the great powers need an opportunity-just an opportunity-to negotiate. Set aside the efforts of the Peace Conferences decades ago, and set aside the endeavors of the League of Nations. What

have we been doing in the United Nations all along the past twelve sessions, weary with negotiations and accommodations. Between 1946 and 1951, the great powers were negotiating all aspects of disarmament in two organs: the Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission for Conventional Armaments. Having failed to achieve agreement, these two organs were dissolved in 1952, and a new Disarmament Commission was established-a unified machinery set up to provide further opportunities for negotiations.

Thereafter, the great powers entered again into endless negotiations. But again in 1953, due to a deadlock in the work of the Commission, the General Assembly recommended the establishment of a sub-committee to offer the great powers a further chance for negotiations. This sub-committee held its meetings in 1954, 1955, 1956 and 1957 changing the climate from New York to London and vice versa. All along those tedious years, the work was one of negotiation. No stone was unturned, no avenue was left unexplored and no ground remained unearthed. The volume of the minutes of the Commission-old and new-is beyond imagination. They are a fleet of records in an ocean of negotiations. And here we come to hear the United Kingdom pleading for an opportunity for negotiations.

So much for the machinery established to conduct negotiation. But the action taken by the Assembly each and every session, the debate unleashed each and every year, and lastly the resolutions adopted in each and every meeting, are most revealing and most telling. It is worthwhile to see what they reveal and what they say.

In the first session-the very first of the General Assembly-an Atomic Energy Commission was established. Without delay or hesitation the General Assembly urged the Commission, *inter alia*, and I quote: "To proceed with the utmost dispatch ... to make such recommendations for the elimination from national

armaments of atomic weapons and all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction".

In the very same session, a second resolution was adopted, where the General Assembly-and I quote:

(1) recommends that the Security Council give prompt consideration to formulating the practical measures ... for the general regulation and reduction of armaments and armed forces.

(2) urges the expeditious fulfillment by the Atomic Energy Commission of its terms of reference.

(3) recommends that the Security Council expedite consideration of draft conventions for the creation of an international system of control and inspection, these conventions to include prohibition of atomic and all major weapons adaptable now and in the future to mass destruction ...

(4) recommends to the Security Council that it give prompt consideration ... to such practical and effective safe-guards in connection with the control of Atomic Energy and the general regulation and reduction of armaments."

(5) recommends the Security Council to accelerate as much as possible the placing at its disposal of the armed forces mentioned in Article 43 of the Charter.

It becomes obvious, Mr. Chairman, that our first session was one of commotion and emotion-a year of high hopes and ideals. This explains why the General Assembly has employed all synonyms the English language can offer for "speed". Hence, the resolution has used with emphasis and in succession, the phrases of "the utmost dispatch", "prompt consideration", "the expeditious fulfillment", "expedite the consideration", and finally "to accelerate". This was a natural behavior in the aftermath of war and the miseries of war. It was a session held in the wake of affliction with the wounds of humanity still fresh and bleeding-a session convened under the shadow of the debris of fire and

destruction-a session which cried heart, soul and mind for action and speedy action.

The second session was of a different climate, a climate of inaction. It was 1947, not a year of idleness but one of diversion into other directions. In that year, the General Assembly deviated from the field of disarmament only to succumb to pressures for another form of disarmament, political disarmament. That was the monstrous year for the partition of Palestine. At that time, the Assembly was murmuring under crushing pressure to elicit a majority vote against the majority of the people of the Holy Land. That year, there was no room for disarmament. The General Assembly was engaged in no honourable effort of different disarmament-to disarm the people of Palestine from their inherent right to determine their future.

The third session, with its two resolutions, had met with little success. While approving "the general findings, recommendations ... and specific proposals ... for establishing an effective system of control of atomic energy ... and for the elimination ... of atomic weapons", the General Assembly expressed "deep concern at the impasse which had been reached in the work of the .... Commission". Facing the failure, the General Assembly requested the Security Council to pursue its study for the reduction of conventional armaments, urged the Commission to proceed with its assignment and finally appealed to all nations for cooperation. The year of 1948 was a year of impasse.

The fourth session also adopted two resolutions on the question; the first dealing with the international control of Atomic Energy and the second with the regulation and reduction of conventional armaments and the armed forces. In substance, the General Assembly has called upon "governments to do everything in their power to make possible, by the acceptance of effective international control, the effective prohibition and elimination of atomic weapons". Further, the General Assembly

has approved the proposals of the Commission for full information to be submitted by the Member States on their conventional armaments and armed forces, with a request to the atomic powers "to continue consultations ... to explore all possible avenues and to examine all concrete suggestions" that will lead to agreement on disarmament. What is of significance is that the General Assembly has recommended that all nations should join in a mutual agreement to limit the exercise of their individual right of sovereignty in the control of atomic energy. Thus, that session of 1949 could be marked as the session for the principle of openness of information, and the limited sovereignty on atomic energy.

At the fifth session, the President of the United States, addressing the General Assembly, proposed the coordination of the work of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission for Conventional Armaments. The General Assembly, upon lengthy deliberation decided to establish a committee of twelve, consisting of the eleven members of the Security Council with Canada, to study the question. With this idea in mind, that year of 1950 could be termed as one for coordination.

The sixth session, moved by anxiety and the continued race of disarmament, made a new start. Responding to the report of the Committee of Twelve, the General Assembly decided to dissolve the Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission for Conventional Armaments. In their place, the General Assembly created the Disarmament Commission with generous terms of reference to prepare proposals for reduction of armaments and armed forces, for effective control of atomic energy and for the prohibition of atomic weapons. Having enunciated a set of guiding principles, the General Assembly proceeded to declare that a conference of all states should be convened to consider a draft treaty of disarmament as soon as the work of the Commission permitted such a course of action.

That session of 1951-1952 was for a new effort, a new machinery and new terms of reference, with an international conference for disarmament as an immediate target.

The seventh session was dedicated to the examination of the report of this new organ, the Disarmament Commission. The report was a comprehensive survey of the statements and proposals of the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and France, but no decisions were reached. Thus the General Assembly had nothing to do except take note of the Commission's report, reaffirming its past resolutions and requesting the Commission to continue its work. That year of 1953 was one of reaffirmation and reiteration.

The eighth session, again receiving a lengthy report detailing the disagreement of the Disarmament Commission, has affirmed the earnest desire to reach agreement on a comprehensive and coordinated plan for disarmament. The Assembly, while taking note of the report, requested the Commission to continue its task, and the major powers to intensify their efforts to reach agreement. The Resolution of the Assembly concluded by suggesting the creation of a sub-committee which would seek in private an acceptable solution. Thus, the year 1953 was for an approach in private. Privacy might be a way out. And that too has been tried.

The ninth session was convened after the historic nineteen meetings of the sub-committee held in secret at Lancaster House in London. In the course of those meetings, the sub-committee (1) examined the proposals of the Soviet Union for strengthening peace and security, and for the prohibition of atomic weapons. (2) A United Kingdom memorandum concerning weapons that should be covered by a Disarmament Convention. (3) A United States working paper on implementing disarmament programs and controls. (4) A joint memorandum by the United Kingdom and France for compromise proposals. Finally, the Disarmament Commission reached a unanimous disagreement, and, as the

report claimed, has expressed "hope for the fruitful consideration of the question of disarmament". Under the circumstances, the General Assembly had nothing to perform except to reaffirm its previous pronouncements, to request the Commission and its sub-committee for further efforts and to report accordingly. Although the Assembly, at that time, was cognizant of a proposal made by the Prime Minister of India for a stand-still agreement on test explosions, yet no worthy action was taken. Thus, the year 1954 was one of a stand-still disagreement.

The tenth session, as we all know, was convened under the umbrella of the Geneva Summit Conference of July 1955 that gave rise to the Geneva spirit. The General Assembly had before it the report of the Commission and its baby committee which had held 28 meetings in London and 18 meetings in New York. There was an avalanche of memoranda, working papers and draft proposals; but as the General Assembly has noted, "agreement has not been reached on the rights, powers and functions of a control system which is the keystone of any disarmament agreement". Furthermore, the General Assembly has noted the report of the Commission, urging that priority be given to early agreement on the plan of President Eisenhower for aerial inspection and the plan of Prime Minister Bulganin for establishing control posts at strategic centers. Also, the General Assembly suggested to the Commission that account should be taken of the proposals of the Prime Minister of France for information on military expenditure, of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom on matters of inspection and control and of the Government of India for suspension of experimental explosions and an armaments truce. That was an exciting session indeed. Giant proposals were made, debated and finally conveyed en bloc to the Disarmament Commission. There was a great deal of zeal and enthusiasm. It was the Geneva spirit. For a time, it was generated-later it evaporated. Nineteen Hundred and fifty-five was the year of the spirit that later lost its spirit.

At the eleventh session, driven by the force of inertia of the preceding session, the General Assembly was seized, in addition to the reports of the Commission and its committee, with a wide variety of proposals submitted by Canada, Japan and Norway, by France and the United Kingdom, by the United States, by the Soviet Union, by India, and by Yugoslavia. Under the impact of this shower of proposals the General Assembly was left spellbound. But thrilled with a promise of hope, the General Assembly invited the Disarmament Commission to consider the convocation of a special session of the General Assembly or a general disarmament conference to dispose of the problem. Thus, the year 1957 was heading towards a disarmament conference.

The twelfth session, our very last session, received the report of the Disarmament Commission which outlined the narrowing of differences as a result of extensive negotiations amongst the major powers. With this encouraging indication, the General Assembly proceeded to set out the priority for the various aspects of disarmament with particular reference to the immediate suspension of nuclear weapons tests, to the cessation of the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes, to the reduction of nuclear weapons, to the reduction of armed forces and armaments, to the progressive establishment of open inspection to guard against surprise attacks, and lastly to a joint study of inspection systems designed to ensure the exclusive use of the outer space for peaceful and scientific purposes. These priorities have embraced the whole field of disarmament so much so that they can hardly be described as priorities. Be that as it may, the problem of disarmament with all its entirety, has fallen into the abyss of the well known General Assembly resolution which enlarged the membership of the Disarmament Commission by the addition of fourteen members. Further, the General Assembly has decided to transmit the records of the proceedings of the twelfth session to the Commission did not convene, and the year 1958 was a deadlock. It is at the peak of this crisis that there came the abortive efforts to hold the summit meeting for

which the world was waiting with profound hope and burning expectations.

And this is the history of disarmament negotiations, cast in miniature for our distinguished colleague of the United Kingdom to refresh his memory.

Mr. Chairman:

This is a survey of the action taken by the General Assembly in the last twelve sessions on the question of disarmament. We would not say with Shakespeare "much ado about nothing". Rather it is much ado about everything, but yielding nothing. After these lengthy years of hard labor, disarmament comes to us now, not as critical as it was twelve years ago, but multiplied tenfold in gravity, intensity and complexity. It seems as though we have aimed at exactly the opposite goals, and that the objective of our Charter was no disarmament. Had our Charter called for an armaments race, our response would not have been more faithful or more abiding.

Without dwelling on figures or details, the picture is crystal clear in its gloom and darkness. Control of atomic weapons has become a decontrolled production of hydrogen bombs. Reduction of arms and military budgets has been translated into more arms and more expenditure. And the rise is still rising. Each year we appeal for disarmament agreement-only to find a disarmament disagreement. Each resolution calls for continued efforts to achieve a coordinated plan of disarmament, only to witness a coordinated plan to step up disarmament. And while we were concentrating on disarmament in the inner space, we suddenly find ourselves gripped by incalculable dangers in the outer space. This is the progress thus far realized. It is a progress in every direction, in every field and every horizon but on rearmament, coordinated and intensified to limitless and endless bounds.

**BRITISH ULTIMATUM**

And to give this sad story its finishing touch, the disarmament question, comes to the United Nations, for the first time in its history with no report, and indeed with no substantive proposal. The emphasis has shifted to matters, although of significance, which are really on the margin of the margin. So far, discussion has centered around nuclear tests and the like, but disarmament, the nucleus of the problem, has been set back to the background. The United Kingdom, for instance, has almost ignored the question of disarmament in its cardinal, and focussed on its marginal. It seems the United Kingdom was too much occupied to think of disarmament. The United Kingdom, for instance, has almost ignored the question of disarmament in its cardinal, and focussed on its marginal. It seems the United Kingdom was too much occupied to think of disarmament. The United Kingdom is deeply engaged in selling arms, submarines, airplanes to Israel; and there is little time to ponder disarmament. We should not, however, pass hasty judgments. The United Kingdom may have its own reasoning. Reinforcing the military build-up of Israel may be interpreted by the United Kingdom as one form of disarmament. Surely, such an interpretation does not stand to question; for the British are admittedly masters in the art of interpretation.

#### REDUCTION OF MILITARY BUDGETS

With disarmament, Mr. Chairman, we have the question of the reduction of the military budgets of the four powers. As a matter of fact, both topics are one and the same-with no line of demarcation in between. A reduction of arms and armed forces irresistibly leads to a reduction of military expenditure and a reduction of military budgets brings about reduction of armaments. This is an axiom that stands self-proven.

Up to this session, the question of the reduction of military expenditures has been discussed as one of the many aspects of disarmament. On various occasions, the General Assembly and the United Nations organs have examined the implications

involved in the question. But it is at this session that the matter has been included on the request of the Soviet Union in the agenda as an independent item. The problem, however, is not without history in the annals of the United Nations. The allocation of funds from disarmament for assistance to underdeveloped countries was put forward by President Eisenhower in a public address on 16 April 1953. The Soviet Union, in the Disarmament sub-committee, proposed in 1954 a one-third reduction of military budgets. In 1956 and 1957, the Soviet Union proposed a 15% reduction. In 1955, the question was raised by the French Prime Minister at the meeting of the heads of state in Geneva.

It was this French proposal which was referred to by the General Assembly in its resolution at the tenth session calling "upon the states concerned ... to study the proposal of the Prime Minister of France for the allocation of funds resulting from disarmament for improving the standards of living throughout the world, and in particular, the less developed countries".

Two years later, at the twelfth session, the General Assembly took up the question again. Upon lengthy debate, the Assembly finally decided to invite "the states concerned ... to consider the possibility of devoting out of the funds made available as a result of disarmament, as and when sufficient progress is made, additional resources to the improvement of living conditions throughout the world and especially in the less developed countries". Compared to the resolution of 1955, the resolution of 1957 is two years backwards! The latter resolution injects conditions and qualifications that never existed in the former. The second resolution did condition and time the question with, and I quote, "as and when sufficient progress is made". Well, this is an amusing proviso. You say you will reduce military budgets when progress is made in disarmament. But no progress on disarmament can be made unless and until you reduce expenditure. Such a formulation helps neither disarmament nor reduction of military budgets, should these two

aspects be anchored to one another. Reduction of military expenditure brings about reduction of armaments and vice versa. It is futile to quarrel when first things must come first. By such an exercise we revert to the ancient riddle-which comes first-the chicken or the egg!

Yet, Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to dwell at length on the question. This is a delicate matter which involves the feelings of the have-not's-and the reactions of the have's. We must it to be understood that the have-not's are not coveting resources of the have's. We pray for the day when the big powers cut down their military expenditures without extending any assistance to the less developed countries. Let the great powers reduce their military budgets; let them keep those resources to themselves, and the small countries will take care of themselves. For it is peace, not economic assistance that mainly brings prosperity to the underdeveloped peoples, and to the whole world at large. However, the allocation of funds resulting from disarmament to small countries must be preceded by a necessary step. It is one of right and not one of grace. Certain small countries are suffering from unlawful restrictions which arrest their development schemes. Those countries have considerable assets frozen in foreign countries for no legal justification. Of particular mention, oil producing countries on the eastern extremity of the Arabian Peninsula have huge accounts in London which are frozen too. All such accounts and the like should be released. They should be invested at home and in the countries of the Middle East. To arrest such assets when they can finance development projects in the area is a pure act of economic genocide.

#### CESSATION OF NUCLEAR TESTS

I turn now to the question of cessation of nuclear tests. I do not think the committee need be reminded of the clamoring of public opinion on this question all over the world. People of all walks of life, of all political complexion and of all creeds, have strongly expressed themselves in favor of cessation. Since the

days of the Bandung Conference, strong and respectable agitation for the prohibition of nuclear tests has been gaining momentum in every corner of the globe. Scientists of different shades of opinion have warned against the dangers to human life of the continuation of nuclear tests. It is our sincere conviction that on this question, it is safer and wiser to accept the most pessimistic findings, for what is at stake is the survival of the human race. When our survival is involved there is no room for gambling. These tests may prove to be a slow and gradual extinction of mankind. Continuation of tests becomes a war without military operations, but waged against humanity. Nonetheless, France has found it convenient to reject the idea of suspension of tests even should the other powers reach an agreed solution. Obviously it is easy for France to continue her tests, for it is not French skies which become contaminated. It is in the continent of Africa where France can saturate the atmosphere of the Africans with the poisons of radiation.

We are fully aware, however, that cessation of nuclear weapons is not a direct measure of disarmament. This point has been made amply clear in the statement of our distinguished colleague of the United States. Ambassador Lodge, with his usual ability and clarity of mind, has elaborated this idea to the utmost of satisfaction and conviction. In his words, and they are worthy to be quoted, "the suspension of testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons is not, in itself, a measure of disarmament nor a limitation of armament." This is a wise caution. Suspension of tests is mainly a confidence-building measure; and we should not rest with the thought that suspension is disarmament, nor with the recent trend to focus on suspension at the expense of disarmament. Yet, continuation of tests is bound to lead to catastrophic results. Apart from scientific knowledge, tests will necessarily lead to the constant development of nuclear weapons. No doubt the result is progress but to achieve maximum destruction at a minimum cost. The outcome would be wholesale killing and devastation at the cheapest price and on the largest

scale ever known in the history of man. Moreover, Mr. Chairman, as our deliberations in this Committee have revealed, the continuation of testing is expected to transplant this abominable industry of nuclear weapons to more than one country in Europe. This would be transmitting this evil from continent to continent. It becomes the duty of the United Nations to set up a curtain, an atomic curtain, if you please, to prohibit entry of this industry of war into Europe-Europe which was the theater of two world wars. By itself, this is a vital ground for the suspension and cessation of nuclear tests which must call for our attention and action.

#### PROPOSED SETTLEMENT

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me turn to the star question: How best shall we dispose of the whole problem at this session?

There are already tabled a set of resolutions dealing with the different aspects of disarmament. First of all, we have the two resolutions submitted by the Soviet Union: One providing for the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests, and the other for the reduction of military budgets, with the resulting funds to be allocated for the development of the under-developed countries. Then, we have the seventeen-power resolution which deals with the suspension of testing, with measures against surprise attacks and with an indirect reference to disarmament in general.

Lastly, we have the thirteen-power resolution which provides for the suspension and eventual discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen tests. Without referring to amendments or other procedural motions, these are the lines of actions, thus far proposed in our Committee.

All these, Mr. Chairman, are excellent resolutions. They have many elements in common. They are at variance only in matters of degree or emphasis. But there is not one single resolution which attempts to deal with the present deadlock. For the first time since its establishment, the Disarmament

Commission did neither function nor report, the simple reason being that it did not convene. To our mind, this is the crux of the outstanding difficulty. It is no problem to propose good resolutions, and even to adopt them. In the last twelve years, the General Assembly has passed the best resolutions spelling out the best principles. At this session, we can add to the caravan another resolution. But the main question is how to reconvene the Disarmament Commission and how to end this separation. The distinguished Delegate from the United Kingdom has stated, and we agree with him entirely, that disarmament without the agreement of the Soviet Union cannot be achieved. But how can negotiations be resumed within the United Nations machinery? This is the question which should engage our thinking and invite our efforts. We believe, and we earnestly do so, that the suggestions cast in the Mexican resolution offer a way out from the impasse. I hope our colleague from Mexico will find it easy to make certain alterations. I do not intend to propose any amendments. They are simply suggestions for the Committee to ponder, and for our colleague from Mexico to think over. First, we believe the working group as suggested in the Mexican Resolution should be as small as possible. The Representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union, with the Chairmanship of our Chairman and the participation of the Secretary-General, would make a good team to consider the resumption of negotiations on disarmament and its procedures. With the United States as the leading Western power, we think that the participation of the Representatives of the United Kingdom and France in the working group, at least at this stage, does not help to cut the Gordian knot. It may complicate an already complicated situation.

Secondly, we have to decide how best we should deal with the resolutions and their pertinent amendments. It goes without saying that I refer also to the resolution of our distinguished colleague from Ireland, which has a great deal of merit. However, speaking frankly, we believe that on the question of

disarmament, resolutions-however forceful they may be-cannot activate disarmament, unless all the major powers sanction such resolutions by their collective efforts and translate them into genuine agreement. After a few days, two conferences will be held in Geneva: one to deal with the discontinuance of tests and the other with measures against surprise attacks. These two meetings may prove to be of historic significance. They may help unlock the age-old deadlock of disarmament. They may tend to break this vicious circle of how to start disarmament. Thus far, the stress has been on linking the different stages of disarmament one with the other. In a word, the dialogue has been going on like this: "We will not agree to this stage before you agree on that stage"-with the result that no stage has ever been achieved. Even this year, the distinguished Representative of the United Kingdom has linked cessation of testing with progress on disarmament. All along this decade, disarmament followed this course, although the General Assembly in its first resolution of its first session of 1946 declared, and I quote: "the work (of disarmament) should proceed by separate stages, the successful completion of each of which will develop the necessary confidence of the world before the next stage is undertaken." Now, the chance is offering itself in the Geneva Conferences, and a great deal of technical ground has been agreed upon. But what promise for progress, and what hope for success can we hold if the Assembly conveys to these conferences a divided opinion. Our primary duty is to formulate a unanimous stand from which the Geneva conferences can draw inspiration and guidance for a unified action and concerted effort.

This will bring me to a suggestion which I make informally, that a working group be set up for an endeavor to produce one single resolution containing all the helpful elements to be found in the various resolutions and their respective amendments.

This is the only course for action, if action on disarmament is ever destined to reach a fruitful solution.

## A WARNING TO ISRAEL

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me express our ardent hope and pray for an early settlement of this agonizing subject. As small states, we have no arms to reduce, no bombs to ban and no tests to cease. Yet with our collective will and behavior we can make a great contribution to the cause of peace. This is not a question upon which we are to back this side or that side. Small nations, whatever their ideologies may be, can assume a very leading role in the field of disarmament. The present grouping of West and East is very much below the heights of this gigantic question. To shoulder our responsibilities, we must rise above blocks and dislodge ourselves from our trenches. On this subject, if any grouping is allowed, it must be the atomic and the non-atomic; and as such, our position as non-atomic can be decisive and effective. It is a stand for a unanimous resolution-or no resolution.

By this, Mr. Chairman, we can be assured of the survival of man, and the salvation of our civilization and our dearest material and spiritual possessions on earth.

Before closing, Mr. Chairman, I should like to make this solemn declaration to be noted by the United Nations and conveyed by the distinguished Representatives around this table to their governments. The matter has a direct bearing on the peace of the Middle East and the peace of the world-as a direct goal for the disarmament question.

Yesterday morning, the New York Times carried a dispatch from its Cairo correspondent referring to the possibility of an Israeli attack against eastern Palestine that lies in Jordan.

This is not the first report of this character. In the last months there has been a growing mass of news pointing to a contemplated Israeli aggression.

I do not call for a denial, for aggression is never officially disclosed or admitted. But I simply wish to make it clear beyond

any shred of doubt, that any Israeli attack against Jordan will be treated as a direct attack against all the Arab States, and, as provided in the Charter, will call for all collective measures of self defense that are normally used to repel aggression and wind up aggressors.

I should like to assure you that this is not the stand of Saudi Arabia alone, but it is the common stand of all the Arab States-their governments, their armies, and their nation.

It goes without saying that, should Israel embark upon such an aggression, the peace of the world would be endangered and your books on disarmament would be closed.

## Cyprus Question

The debates in the United Nations created a favorable atmosphere which helped in resolving later on the Cyprus question and brought it to a satisfactory conclusion. Mr. Shaukairy's views on that issue were set in a speech he delivered on December 2, 1958.

Once again, the United Nations is called upon to pronounce itself on the question of Cyprus and its future destiny. In the past four years, the General Assembly has examined the various aspects of the problem in all its ramifications-political, legal and international. At this session, we have heard lengthy statements from the distinguished Representatives of Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom. Thus, the committee is amply conversed with the intricacies and delicacies involved. I shall, therefore, address myself to certain general aspects of the problem as briefly as possible.

However, from the very outset, I must make it abundantly clear that our intervention in this debate does not arise simply from our rights and duties as a member of this organization. It is true the question of Cyprus has become an international problem and hence provoking grave international concern. But, as one of the states of the Middle East, we have more than one reason to be particularly concerned in this problem. The Island of Cyprus, its history, its strategic potential, and its location in the eastern waters of the Mediterranean-all are determining factors which cannot be absent from our thinking. It is hardly necessary to remind the Committee that in the main, the shores of the Eastern Mediterranean are Arab coast lines. Starting from the Northern coasts of the United Arab Republic in Syria, right through the shores of Lebanon, Palestine and down again to the shores of the United Arab Republic in Egypt, all this lengthy coastline is part and parcel of the Arab homeland. Within this geographic pattern, the Island of Cyprus constitutes a very proximate tower overlooking our shores and our lands. Thus we cannot take a

negative or passive attitude on this question, nor can we merely watch the evolution of the problem with indifference. I do not desire to digress from the orbit of the present discussion, nor do I desire to be out of order. But I am just in order to remind the United Nations that it was from Cyprus as a military British base that an armed aggression was committed on our sister State known then as Egypt. That tragic episode has not only disturbed the peace of the Middle East, but it has driven the world right to the brink of war. I bring up this point, Mr. Chairman, not with any intention of condemnation. But the fact is relevant in two directions: First, it reveals the reasons for our ardent desire to reach a just and peaceful solution of the problem; and second, it provides a correct assessment of the policy of the United Kingdom on the question as presented to this Committee by Commander Noble.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, although we intervene in this debate as a natural reaction to our apprehensions, we have some other reasons to motivate our particular concern. From the points of view of history and geography, the Island is not far removed or detached from our national life. The States primarily concerned, namely Turkey and Greece, are neither remote to our lands nor foreign to our history. With Greece, and Greek civilization, the Arabs had a bright chapter in the history of mankind. It was through Arab scholars with our unique effort of translation, amalgamation, addition and innovation, that the Greek learning and Greek philosophy have been handed over to Europe to constitute a solid basis for the Western Renaissance which the world is enjoying even to the present day. With Turkey, our historic and human ties are too many to be recounted. It is enough to recall that Arabs and Turks have established together a bi-national empire that lasted for centuries, characterized by the brotherhood of faith, unity of culture and the comradeship of arms. At the end of the First World War, we separated but what remains now between our peoples awaits to

be revived and cultivated. And Turkey knows fully well how best it can be revived and cultivated.

It is because of these reasons, Mr. Chairman, that we have a legitimate concern to display and a role to play in this question.

#### A COLONIAL ISSUE

To approach the question, no matter what the approach may be, we must first and foremost apply our minds to two aspects of paramount importance. We must determine for ourselves the nature of the problem and the parties to the problem. Once these aspects are decided, the solution to the problem lends itself readily to our judgment.

On the nature of the problem, the picture is crystal clear. The issue should not be influenced by any artificial obscurities or ambiguities that are willfully injected into our debate. Setting aside for a moment the conflicting positions of Turkey and Greece on the one hand, and the diametrically opposed aspirations of the Greek and Turkish communities in Cyprus on the other, the issue in essence is one of colonialism, and to be more precise, is one of British colonialism. The dispute between Greece and Turkey, in spite of its gravity and tensity at present, is only one complication to the disease, but not the disease itself. In the main, the malady lies in the British occupation of the Island. It lies in the substance of the policy formulated and pursued by the United Kingdom. It is against this central fact that the statement of the United Kingdom Delegation must be examined. In his presentation of the British case, Commander Noble has anticipated the charge and proceeded to the defense. He set the target himself, but his attempts to pull the target down went in vain. On more than one occasion, he stressed that the problem "is one simply a colonial issue." This statement by Commander Noble betrays a state of mind. It discloses the innermost urge for one to defend himself even before he is charged. With some, the defence is manufactured immediately after the offence and long before the enquiry. To the United

Kingdom, this is only an immediate alibi to disprove the guilt before she is confronted. But those who offer the alibi prior to the indictment, are not aware that they are really proving their guilt. Thus, when the Delegation of the United Kingdom emphasizes that Cyprus is “not simply a colonial problem” – this simply means that the question is simply a colonial problem, and no amount of advocacy can change this simple truth. The Cyprus question is a colonial issue down to the core. It is because of its colonial character that the problem comes before us as a United Nations problem.

But Commander Noble has not limited himself to disfigure the real nature of the problem. He went further. He has adduced evidence, to prove good conduct, liberal behavior and the non-colonial character of the problem. Fortunately, such evidence has served to prove the opposite. It simply proved that the problem is deeply seated in the mud of colonialism. “History”, Commander Noble claimed, “will not deny that we have believed in freedom, not in repression; that we have practiced liberality, not domination.” To put it in gentle words, I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, this statement is a misstatement. I do not want to say that this plea, by Commander Noble, is neither noble nor commanding! History, any history, bears testimony that the colonial record of the United Kingdom is one of repression, and not one of freedom. The British have never granted freedom. They have never given freedom. They were forced to yield to the forces of freedom. It was only when it ceased to be a market or a source of raw material, or of strategic advantage that a territory was let free by the British. In his statement before this Committee, Commander Noble has declared that “many of the representatives at this table can bear personal witness to the liberal British policy.” We will be only too glad, Mr. Chairman, to accept the testimony of those witnesses to whom Commander Noble has referred. The colonial people, who have freed themselves from British domination, have not achieved their independence without uphill battles; neither have they come to

this organization on a high-road of roses. It was a long history of human struggle. As a single illustration, suffice it to read Mr. Nehru's book entitled THE DISCOVERY OF INDIA, to see what destruction, what misery and what repression have the British caused to the millions of the continent of India.

The problem of Cyprus, therefore, is an issue of British colonialism, and the colonial record of the British is conclusive to prove, not to disprove, the colonial nature of the Cyprus question.

This disposes of the nature of the problem, and I turn now to define the parties to the problem.

#### THE UNITED KINGDOM HAS NO SOVEREIGNTY OVER CYPRUS

The distinguished Representative of the United Kingdom has raised the question of sovereignty over Cyprus. "As the present sovereign power," Commander Noble states, "we bear the practical and moral responsibility for the welfare of all the Island's inhabitants." This position of the United Kingdom reveals two fallacies: sovereignty and responsibility.

On the plea of responsibility for the welfare of the inhabitants of the Island, this British conception is a misconception. Admittedly, the United Kingdom is lord and master for the welfare of the inhabitants of the British Islands. But the welfare of the inhabitants of Cyprus is neither the right nor the duty of the United Kingdom. No matter what grounds the United Kingdom can advance in support of her contention, it cannot be denied that the welfare of the people is the sole responsibility of the people themselves. The days have gone, long ago, when the welfare of the dominated people was a ground for domination. Today, in the United Nations age, it is a groundless ground! Should the welfare of any people be an issue or a subject of special concern, the task falls upon the United Nations collectively, and not on the United Kingdom individually. The mere establishment of the United Nations, the

creation of its Charter and the emergence of its principal organs have automatically erased those systems of protection of other peoples. Nowadays, attending to the welfare of other peoples is not justification for domination. It is an outmoded pretext not worthy of the spirit of our time. Should any people stand in real need of protection for welfare, no single state, or group of states, can undertake such a task. There is no room for an uncalled-for volunteering. It is the United Nations that can step in to extend its assistance or protection. For should we accept the British claims of the welfare of the people, we would have revised the defunct international system which preceded not only the United Nations, but even the League of Nations. Thus, this plea of the United Kingdom for the welfare of the people, must fall to the ground as obsolete, null and void.

As to the question of sovereignty, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the United Kingdom has no lawful sovereignty on Cyprus. I say lawful', for the British claim of sovereignty over Cyprus can be defeated by examining its legal character. The juridical grounds are too many, but I propose to deal with one-and only one.

Stating the case for the United Kingdom, Commander Noble has based the British claim for sovereignty on the provisions of the Treaty of Lausanne. I do not desire to go into a forensic analysis of the provisions of the Treaty that deal with Cyprus. Commander Noble has formulated his legal argument as follows: "Article 20-which is here in point, recognizes absolute British sovereignty over Cyprus. That automatically confers on the United Kingdom the power to make such dispossessions concerning Cyprus as may at any time seem desirable in the general interest of the inhabitants." This, Mr. Chairman, is a misinterpretation of law. I am fully aware that we are not pleading before an international tribunal. But this Committee can well take cognizance of the matter inasmuch as it relates to sovereignty.

It is a fact admitted by all that sovereignty over Cyprus up to the Treaty of Lausanne, belonged to the Ottoman Empire, and here we must be precise in our expressions. The Ottoman Empire is a state different from the Republic of Turkey. The former is one state and the latter is another. We should not confuse one with the other. Neither is the Republic of Turkey the successor of the Ottoman Empire. The Republic of Turkey is a modern state, with a territory, people and regime entirely distinct from the Ottoman Empire in its territory, in its people and its regime. Modern Turkey is only one fraction of the Ottoman Empire, in territory and population.

What happened in lausanne is clear and simple. The Republic of Turkey has transferred Cyprus to the United Kingdom. It is our submission that Turkey cannot in law confer sovereignty over the Island to the United Kingdom. To transfer, to invest, to bestow, and to confer, you have to have a title and a full title too, and this is the crucial point in the question. The Republic of Turkey cannot transfer the rights she does not possess, or does not fully possess.

It is the Ottoman State that can transfer sovereignty, and the Republic of Turkey was not the party vested with a right to transfer. Thus, the transfer claimed by the United Kingdom is void ab initio-void from the beginning; and the position of the United Kingdom in Cyprus becomes a pure military occupation that does not validate the invalid-nor legalize the illegal!

These flaws in the British case about the nature of the problem, the alleged responsibility of the United Kingdom and its baseless sovereignty have led to more serious flaws which led, in turn, to tension and anxiety. I have in mind the self-chosen role which the United Kingdom has assumed to determine the destiny of Cyprus. Starting from 1946 onwards, the British Government has endeavored on several occasions to frame a constitution, the last being Lord Radcliff's constitution, prepared in 1956. All these efforts were met with failure. To know why

they proved to be abortive, you need not examine the merits. One central factor is overwhelmingly convincing. A constitution cannot be worked out by the colonial power. What is enacted by a colonial power is a colonial legislation, it can never be a constitution. To be a constitution for Cyprus, it must be worked out by the inhabitants of Cyprus, Greeks and Turks alike. It is the collective will of these inhabitants that can make a constitution. The United Kingdom cannot act on behalf of the Greeks and Turks of Cyprus, nor can she exercise on their behalf the right of self-determination. The principle of self-determination belongs to the Greeks and Turks as the rightful citizens of the Island and does not belong to the United Kingdom. It is the citizens of the Island who are entitled to exercise their rights and discharge their duties, with nothing for the United Kingdom to do or say. The say, the final say, is what those citizens of Cyprus say.

But, having failed to bring about acceptable constitutions, the United Kingdom has proceeded to look for other solutions.

#### THE UNACCEPTABLE UNITED KINGDOM SOLUTION

On the 9<sup>th</sup> of June, the British Government announced the terms of a new policy, or what was described as a new policy. The term 'policy' could hardly be applied to this new solution; and the term 'solution' could hardly be applied to that policy! Indeed, it is neither a policy nor a solution. In the words of commander Noble it is "an interim solution," which is designed to last for a term of seven years. Thus, to break the deadlock, the solution suggested introduces another deadlock. As its name indicates, it is an interim solution, but leading to a blind alley. It is a transition destined to an unknown destination. It is an interim without an end in sight. It is a stage of seven years towards another stage of endless mystery, confusion and wandering. That, Mr. Chairman, is the gist of the solution as formulated by the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom has taken the trouble to put before the Assembly the details of the plan for that interim solution. We all can join in thanking the United Kingdom for this

courtesy. But we must tell our colleague of the United Kingdom that we are not here a Cyprus Assembly to make a constitution for Cyprus-interim or final. It is up to the inhabitants of Cyprus-the Greek and Turkish communities-to frame whatever constitution they chose. The United Nations can make recommendations of self-determination, independence and the like, but under no provision of the Charter are we empowered to draft constitutions or to promulgate legislations.

What is strikingly strange, however, is that the United Kingdom does not transmit the details of that interim solution simply for our information. The United Kingdom seeks our consecration and blessing. "We ask for your confidence ... in our intentions", were the words of Commander Noble to this Committee. In another appeal, he says, "it is our earnest hope that this Assembly should recognize the sincerity of our efforts which we are making ...". Normally, Mr. Chairman, we cannot turn deaf ears to an appeal made by a United Nations member. But it is too much to ask that the Assembly should recognize the efforts of a colonial power extending its domination for a period of seven years without even knowing the end. It is too much for a colonial power to ask for our confidence in a problem that calls for a vote of no-confidence.

Yet this strange appeal on behalf of the United Kingdom is attended with another strange situation. While the United Kingdom begs of the United Nations to recognize these efforts, she proceeds to serve a notice on the Assembly. In his concluding words, Commander Noble states, "We intend to persevere with out efforts. We shall go ahead patiently and unprovocatively with the gradual implementation of our plan." Commander Noble, I must now address myself to you directly. If you intend to go ahead with the implementation of your plan, why do you ask the Assembly to recognize this plan and take you into its confidence. This is nothing but facing the United Nations with a *fait accompli* and then begging the United Nations to bend before this *fait accompli*. It is at least on this ground alone that

we can neither endorse this plan nor take the United Kingdom into our confidence.

Nevertheless, on one count we are in full agreement with Commander Noble. In his statement before the Committee, the distinguished Representative of the United Kingdom uttered the most appealing words. He said, and not without emotion, "We ask you to express your condemnation of that violence which the United Nations exists to curb." In another portion of his statement, he reiterates that, "violence can settle nothing. It is wasteful, futile and contrary to every principle which the United Nations exists to honour." This appeal by Commander Noble, we can say, is noble and commanding. I say that with all sincerity. We fully concur with this appeal and we must condemn acts of violence, particularly against defenseless civilians. In this regard, we cannot but whole-heartedly support the appeal made by the United Kingdom Representative. We do that willingly, and against what we know of the general rules of equity as enunciated and applied in the United Kingdom. The English legal maxim, well-known to British barristers, decrees that he who seeks equity, must come with clean hands. Applied to the present case, the principle calls that he who condemns violence must not practice violence himself. He who declares that violence can settle nothing, that it is wasteful and futile, must come to the United Nations with clean hands. Unfortunately, those who make such appeals, come to us with their hands red hot with campaigns of violence committed against colonial territories. Still, it is our duty to accede to the appeal, for a humane appeal must be met even when it comes from those perpetrating wholesale violence.

#### SOLUTION

With this background, Mr. Chairman, I turn now to the solution of the question. I shall not at this stage define our attitude on the many resolutions that have been tabled before the Committee. I shall set out the general principles that should guide the United Nations in its endeavors to seek a solution.

In the first place, I must emphasize that any solution offered on the question of Cyprus must aim, first and last, at the realization of the purposes and objectives of the United Nations Charter. To place the emphasis on the purposes and objectives of the Charter may sound curious. But in this particular case of Cyprus, such a stress is definitely imperative, and has its reasons. It is the interest of the Charter which must be paramount, and no other interest should be involved. Whether the solution is based on independence, self-determination, canonization, federation, or communal administration-it must spring from the will-I would say-the harmonious will-of the inhabitants of the Island-Turks and Greeks. The solution must be an expression of their general will and a reflection of their common interests. To be more specific, the will and interests of the United Kingdom should neither dictate the solution nor influence in any manner, its implementation. In his second intervention before the Committee, Commander Noble has spoken of "preservation of stability in the Eastern Mediterranean" as one of the aims of the United Kingdom in its policy on Cyprus. "The United Kingdom's interests in the Eastern Mediterranean", Commander Noble continues, "are the interests of our friends and our allies also, strategic or otherwise". These interests have been best amplified in the New York Times in two consecutive articles on Saturday last. Mr. Hanson Baldwin wrote: "Cyprus is still of major importance to the British, to the West and to the North Atlantic Treaty powers as an airbase." The writer went on to say, "the Cyprus fields pay a ... strategic dividend. They provide a base for the quick application of power if it is needed in the troubled Middle East." Mr. Baldwin concludes by saying that "from the strategic point of view, the first essential in a Cyprus settlement is continued and complete control of the Cyprus airfields by the British." The next day, on Sunday, Mr. Hamilton, in the weekly review of the New York Times, expressed the same view in identical terms.

It becomes, therefore, abundantly clear that the solution of the Cyprus question is being sought within the orbit of the interests of Britain, of the NATO powers and of the Western world as a whole. This explains why the question has been the subject of discussion within NATO and a task of good offices for Mr. Spaak as Secretary General of NATO.

It is because of these considerations that I have emphasized that the solution must be in accordance with purposes and objectives of the Charter, and should only serve the interests of all the citizens of Cyprus and on one else.

In seeking a solution for Cyprus, the British interests should not be our concern in any measure, nor should the interests of NATO or the interests of the Western world. Here in the United Nations, we are not assembled to promote the interests of any state or a group of states. It is the United Nations, the Charter of the United Nations, and the interests of Cyprus for which we are assembled. We are not here to provide bases for the British or NATO. Likewise, we cannot accept the interests of the United Kingdom in the Middle East as a criterion for the solution of Cyprus. The interests of the United Kingdom in the Middle East are repugnant to the Charter and to the wishes of the people of the Middle East. British interests in the Middle East run counter to peace and security in the Middle East. Speaking for our Arab homeland, the British are striving to maintain their imperialist position in more than one area. British military aggressions against Yemen, Aden, the eastern fringes of the Arabian Peninsula, are being carried out or supported by British military bases in Cyprus. How can we endorse a solution that will make of Cyprus a base of aggression against our sovereignty and territorial integrity.

As to the interests of NATO and the Western world in Cyprus, here again the criterion is entirely inadmissible and unacceptable. This concept brings the cold war right into the area of the Middle East, an area determined to be detached from the

cold war, at all times and under all circumstances. Thus, it is the real interests of the Middle East, and not the British interests, which should guide our efforts for a solution. It is the United Nations, and not NATO, that should be the forum for this question, and lastly it is Mr. Hammarskjold, not Mr. Spaak, who must figure in any endeavour of conciliation.

These, Mr. Chairman, are the considerations that must dominate our deliberations on the question of Cyprus; and it is on the basis of this approach that we approach the various resolutions that we now have before the Committee. Any resolution, addressing itself to the United Kingdom, accepting its sovereignty and lastly allowing the continuation of British bases even by implication, can hardly win our support.

What remains for the United Nations, Mr. Chairman, is a noble task which this organization must discharge in all honesty and sincerity. Cyprus is torn and divided, and imperialism is making the worse use of a worse situation. Thus, it has fallen to us to live up to our Charter, to adopt a worthy resolution, and to extend to Cyprus a message of fraternity, equality and liberty.

Algeria...

The Algeria cry for independence was brought to the United Nations several years ago by the Saudi Arabian Mission to the United Nations . Since that time, every effort has been exerted to win through this august body, freedom for the Algerian Arabs. Mr. Shukairy's speech delivered on December 10,1958, reviews the situation and sets forth an honorable peace plan:

It is no mere coincidence, sir, that the first has become the last. At this session, the question of Algeria comes to us at the end of our Agenda. For our part, this is neither negligence nor inadvertence. The problem is one of liberation and a liberation war, and the issue is dear to all freedom-Loving people. It cannot, therefore, be left without a priority worthy of the sanctity of the cause, the dignity of the aim and the tensivity of the situation. In fact, if we were to determine precedence by importance, Algeria no doubt should rank first, and no other item is entitled to a higher standing in our deliberations. No doubt, the items we have been dealing with, international or regional, are very much on our minds and occupy a great deal, of our concern. But the question of Algeria will still be prior to all, and no other subject can claim precedence over a cause of sovereignty and independence.

Yet the question of Algeria was left to the end with full intention. We have not pressed for its worthy priority, but rather allowed it to slide down to the bottom of the Agenda. The reason behind this is no secret to disclose. France Republic was emerging, and it was the question of Algeria which contributed most to its emergence. General de Gaulle was starting a new constitution and planning a new policy, and the question of Algeria was the core of that policy. A referendum was envisaged, election was planned and negotiations were in the air. With these elements it was unfair to you, and unjust to the problem, to start a debate before the whole picture was given its

final touch and enclosed in its proper frame. It would have been premature to adjudicate on the problem when the referendum was still in the pot or when the elections were in the pan. Now, the referendum and the elections are no more in the pot and the pan. Every thing stands before us ready-made with nothing remaining. The referendum was concluded, elections carried out, and the policy declared. The whole picture is now before you, to see, to examine, and to judge. Thus, it was fair destiny that bring the question of Algeria before you at a moment when France has travelled the whole journey- when she completed the whole operation- and when France can release the usual communique:” The operation was successful and everything was effected in accordance with plan.” Fortunately, the problem of Algeria comes to you as thought at a rendezvous with the France plan, planned and executed, with the France policy conceived and disclosed and with the balance sheet of France brought to the last cent.

I have elaborated this point, Mr. Chairman, for if we look around this table, we find the seats of France vacant. This is regrettable. Even when the position of France on Algeria is empty, her seat in the United Nations should not be vacant. This attitude on the part of France is deplorable. To the United Nations it is a flagrant discourtesy; to France it is inconsistency; to the problem itself it is an injustice but to General de Gaulle, a great hero of war, it is no tradition of a soldier to walk out the field. And no matter how we judge it, this absence of France from our committee is not a worthy commencement for the Fifth Republic.

The absence of France, Mr. Chairman, is the more to be regretted particularly at this session. At this session, we are expected to report on the progress of the problem. It is a session to survey the past, examine the present and map out the future. It is one to settle accounts. In the last session France had made many promises, and it is the elemental duty of France to tell us here in the Committee what has become of those promises. In

the last session France spoke at length on cease- fire and negotiation; and it is the duty of France to inform the Committee of her efforts to secure cease- fire negotiation. France has failed to do so and has refused to participate in our meetings. Under General de Gaulle, it was our expectation that France would not walk out of the Committee but rather walk out of the territory. We thought France would come to this session with a report that they had left the people free in their homeland, and the homeland free for its people. To nourish such an expectation, on our parts, was no sheer imagination. With General de Gaulle, a hero of a movement of liberation, we have expected the Algerian liberation.

That was our expectation, Mr. Chairman. But de Gaulle the pre- mier has frustrated our hopes in de Gaulle the General; and here we come to discuss once more the question of Algeria and the war in Algeria.

There are, however, Mr. Chairman, certain aspects for which I shall not detain the Committee. They should not be our preoccupa- tion for they have become a settled jurisprudence of the United Nations, and well established facts.

I shall not, therefore, touch upon the question of Algeria, this plea is now an international fiction. The United Nations' competence to deal with the question has been firmly established with the voluminous argumentation which many delegations have adduced in previous sessions. Thus, the point of domestic jurisdiction has already been overruled. That was a stage we have already covered. It falls now very much behind, and we must not look backwards to state the ob-voius or to decide again what has been decided time and again.

For the same reason, I shall not recast the history of Algeria its statehood and sovereignty, its military occupation by France, its age old struggle for freedom and liberty, or its unshaken determination to realize its natural aspirations. These too, have been elucidated at length in the previous sessions. We

had amply shown that Algeria is not only vested with statehood as an inherent right, but also entitled to the restoration of its statehood a fact.

Nor shall I deal with the atrocities and brutalities of France in carrying out its military repression against the towns, villages and tribes of Algeria. The United Nations records are swollen with facts, data, quotations and reports condemning the French authorities in Algeria with acts of terrorism beyond human imagination. At this session, we do not intend to unfold this case. There is nothing new. The system is the same and the behavior is the same. What is new is only the continuation of human suffering.

With these matters unsaid, we can proceed to other matters that should be said-matters that belong not so much to the past, but to the present and future. But where should we start? Valid as it may be, the question is easy to answer. It is only fair and proper to start this year, from where we ended last year. It becomes therefore imperative to examine what we have decided, and what we thus far achieved.

After a full discussion of the question of Algeria, the General Assembly at its last session adopted a unanimous resolution containing certain directives worthy of special reference. The General Assembly took note of the offer of good offices made by king of Morocco, and the president of the Republic of Tunisia. That was the second operative paragraph of the resolution. In the third, the General Assembly expressed the wish that, "... pourparlers will be entered into... with a view to a solution, in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations."

The solution, thus, has set the aim and the means to achieve the aim. The aim was a solution in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and the means was the good offices of the Heads of State of Morocco and Tunisia, together with pourparlers, to be entered into. That is

the gist of the whole resolution. It is now exactly one year since this resolution was passed by unanimity, and by the concurrence of all the parties directly concerned.

Let us therefore see, Mr. Chairman, what has become of the aim and means as set by the resolution of the General Assembly. Let us see what progress was scored in the course of the past year.

On the question of good offices offered by Tunisia and Morocco, we regret to report to the United Nations that France has categorically rejected the offer with no valid justification. By taking note of these good offices, the General Assembly did not confine itself to a recording role. The general context of the resolution sets out an invitation to France to accept the good offices of Tunis and Morocco. But France has refused the invitation. As a member of the United Nations, France cannot without weighty reasons reject a procedure specified in the Charter for the specific settlement of international disputes, particularly so when the General Assembly has pointed out the way for such a procedure.

But the rejection was not the end! France has “bombed”, so to speak, these good offices right at the core. On 8 February 1958, two months after the United Nations resolution, France committed an outrageous aggression against the Tunisian territory. French planes bombed the town of Sakiet Sidi Yousef, causing wholesale destruction, and a loss of life to many, including children and women. Later in May, the French troops started further military actions of a serious aggressive character in the vicinity of Ramada. These violations by France were the subject matter of complaints lodged to the Security Council. After lengthy deliberation, the Council decided to ask the United States and the United Kingdom to use their good offices to settle the dispute between France and Tunisia. The paradox, thus, was striking. At a time when Tunisia was offering her good offices on Algeria, Tunisia herself was offered the good offices of the

United States and the United Kingdom in her dispute with France! The paradox indeed became a parable: The victim is to accept, but the culprit is to reject.

So much for the good offices of Tunisia and Morocco—what about the pourparlers which the General Assembly urged to be entered into?

I must admit, Mr. Chairman, that pourparlers is a French term that has crept into the books of the United Nations. Whatever its exact meaning may be, it means “talks”. This is a French term that was wedged in the resolution to meet the vanity of France, and France against its many glories has its many vanities. But no matter how far you slenderize the meaning of ‘pourparlers’, the expression implies two parties entering into parleys with each other. There must be two parties parleying to each other. It is only the insane who parley to themselves. The sane talk to each other, discuss with each other, and negotiate with each other. In Webster’s Dictionary, pourparlers is defined as “a preliminary conference to discuss some affair as preliminary to a treaty.” In Larousse, it is defined “conference a’ propos d’une affaire.” Thus the resolution has called upon France and Algeria to enter into conference. This is the wish of the United Nations. Of course, there are cases where negotiations are inadmissible. This is no time to give illustrations. Yet, if any one should refuse to negotiate, it must be the Algerians, not France. Backed by the well-known slogan of certain liberation movements, the people of Algeria are entitled to say, “No negotiation before evacuation.”

#### GENERAL de GAULLE’S WHITE FLAG

Nevertheless, the people of Algeria have always offered to negotiate with France all the outstanding differences with a view to arriving at a peaceful settlement. Before the establishment of the Algerian government, the FLN had in vain endeavored to persuade France to accept direct negotiation. France has plunged the issue into a stagnant pool of polemics, insisting on a

disorderly order: Cease-fire first, elections second and negotiations third. That was the formula of France, lacking all the elements of reason, logic and practicability. This formula was nothing but complete surrender that leaves nothing to negotiate. Under the offer of France, Algeria is to cease hostilities, Algeria is to accept a constitution not of her making and Algeria is to participate in elections, the objects of which she has not designed. Having achieved all this, Algeria is to negotiate the nothingness of what remains; and what remains is the nothingness of everything!

But with the establishment of the Government of Algeria, the idea of negotiation has taken an official and concrete shape. In its first statement of policy on the 26 September, the Algerian Government declared, "For its part, the Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic is ready to begin negotiations. To achieve this, it is ready at any moment to meet with the representatives of the French Government." Thus, on the question of negotiations the Algerian Government has taken the lead, has taken the initiative herself. That was an open, declared and official invitation for negotiation with France. And mind you, the negotiations proposed by the Government of Algeria, were neither attached to any strings, nor conditioned with any conditions. They are free negotiations with no prerequisites or any concessions in advance. Under these negotiations, everything can be discussed from cease-fire down to the last item in the agenda. The destiny of discussions is then left to final agreement or disagreement. Nothing could be simpler, more honourable and more practicable. Indeed nothing else could be more in keeping with the United Nations Charter and the resolution of the General Assembly. But what was the answer France offered to Algeria? France has ignored the Algerian offer. France has not responded to the Algerian proposal for negotiation, and nothing was forthcoming from Paris to unlock the deadlock.

It was not until the 23<sup>rd</sup> of October that Paris started to break all her silence, and the words fell from the lips of General

de Gaulle in the course of a statement made to the press. I say 'in the course', for de Gaulle's reference to negotiations was not part of his statement. Rather, it was an answer to a question. Whether the answer and question were in accordance with plan, remains to be a subject for guess and gossip. Be that as it may, General de Gaulle stated his views on the question of negotiations and this is what he said:

"Let the brave man's peace com, and I am sure that the hatreds will go. I speak of the brave man's peace. What does this mean. Simply this: that those who opened fire cease fire and return without humiliation to their work and their families. I am told: What can they do to end the struggle. I say: wherever they are, their chiefs in the field need only make contact with the local French command.

The General then continues:

"The old warrior's procedure long used when one wanted to silence the guns is to use a white flag for parleys. And I say that in this case the combatants would be received and treated honorably. As for the external organization of which we were speaking a moment ago, and which from outside strives to direct the fight, I repeat openly what I have made known: If delegates were designated to come and settle with the authority the end of hostilities, they would have only to address themselves to the French Embassy at Tunis or that at Rabat. Either one will insure their transportation to Metropolitan France. Their full security will be assured and I guarantee them the freedom to leave again." Compared to the proposal declared by the Government of Algeria, General de Gaulle's offer for negotiations is a complicated complexity. It can hardly be taken as a proposal for negotiations. It is simply an invitation to surrender, which no responsible Algerian would accept.

The Algerian Government has declared its readiness to negotiate with the French Government, with no conditions or qualifications. The Algerian offer is for a free round-table

conference to discuss everything, leaving ultimately to each party to agree or to disagree. On the other hand, General de Gaulle outlines a procedure which is not, to borrow his words, “the brave man’s peace”. This is a coward’s peace, and the Algerians are no cowards. Their fighting record in the liberation of France herself is only one chapter of their glorious history. That this is a coward’s peace can be inferred from the definition General de Gaulle has given to the brave man’s peace. “What does this mean,” General de Gaulle asked about the brave man’s peace, and General de Gaulle answered: “Simply this: that those who opened fire, cease fire and return without humiliation to their work and families.” The matter, Mr. Chairman, is not as simple as expressed by General de Gaulle. Those who opened fire on 1 November 1954, cannot so simply cease fire and go back to their work and families. General de Gaulle stresses that they go back to their work without humiliation, but this is the greatest humiliation they can suffer. Defeat is the second best. And what work should they go back to-their principal work is the liberation of their country-their families would not receive them unless and until they restore to their homeland, its sovereignty, liberty and dignity.

It is too much, Mr. Chairman, for a great soldier as General de Gaulle to offer such a peace. General de Gaulle, the war hero, would revolt against such a ‘brave man’s peace’-had he been confronted with such an offer when he was leading his country’s liberation during World War II. Would de Gaulle simply go back to his work and family without humiliation had he been asked to accept such a ‘brave man’s peace’? This is not an honourable offer, and de Gaulle, the statement, has really betrayed General de Gaulle, the hero.

Thus far, I have referred to the offer made to the Algerian fighters, but General de Gaulle has addressed himself to the representatives of Algeria in similar mistaken terms. “As for the external organization ... which from outside strives to direct the fight, I repeat openly what I have made known: If delegates were

designated to come and settle with the authority the end of hostilities, they would have only to address themselves to the French Embassy at Tunis or that at Rabat.” This is how General de Gaulle addresses himself to the Algerian Government. First of all, he asks the fighters to go back to their families and then asks their Government to go to Paris to settle with the authority the end of hostilities. I would simply ask, who on earth would cease fire, demobilize his forces, and then proceed to his political adversary to discuss the end of hostilities! That there is an Algerian Government in exile, described by General de Gaulle, an external organization, is no dishonour. During World War II, General de Gaulle himself started as a rebel, and was himself the French Government in exile. There is no disgrace about that. It is all the more reason to be gracious and glorious. The disgrace, really, is to accept General de Gaulle’s terms. The delegates of the Government of Algeria will not go to Paris to discuss peace with the authority, and what that authority means. The representatives of the Government of Algeria are ready to discuss with the representatives of the French Government, and not with the French authority. Only those naively naïve do not know what authority in France means in distinction to a Government. The people of Algeria are at war with France, with the French Republic represented by its Government. They are not at war with the authority in Paris. They are ready to talk with the Government and not with the authority.

General de Gaulle has referred to the old warrior’s procedure to use the white flag for parleys when one wanted to silence the guns. It is really painful for a civilian like myself to correct the General on warrior’s procedures. But it was rather Premier de Gaulle than General de Gaulle who referred to those faulty procedures. There is no white flag procedure involved in the matter. The Algerian people are fighting for their liberty-for their sovereignty. They are ready to silence the guns only when their birth right is recognized. The old warrior’s procedure, as referred to by General de Gaulle, does not demand of the

Government of Algeria to go to Paris and talk to the authority. On the contrary, warrior's procedures call for talks with the representatives of the Governments in a neutral land. This is the warrior's procedure. But France, it seems, has for long been subjected to different warrior's procedures-procedures that are applied against those defeated and vanquished. France speaks of those procedures simply because she was forced to hoist the white flag and forced to address herself to the adverse authority. But Algeria does not have to hoist the white flag. Her flag is an honourable and negotiated peace. The Algerian Government can meet the French Government at any level to negotiate an honourable and just peace. The Algerian people would gladly choose to perish to the last man and woman rather than to surrender in this humiliating manner.

This, Mr. Chairman, disposes of the means-the good offices and pourparlers as prescribed by our last resolution. I turn now to the aim as declared in the resolution, namely a solution in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

The question arises, how far did France respond to the resolution of the Assembly and what solution has France offered to settle the question of Algeria.

#### THE FALLACIES OF THE FRENCH POSITION

I must say outright, Mr. Chairman, that France is still in the vicious circle with which she is encircled. The vicious circle is that "Algeria is France". This is the fiction, the fallacy and the heresy which plagued the mind of France, which paralyzed the will of France and which sterilized the labours of France. As long as France wanders within this vicious circle, she will remain wandering in the wilderness with no hope to recover or perhaps even to survive. But, the moment France breaks this circle at any point, the moment France breathes the fresh air of our age outside the confines of this circle, this question of Algeria will find its normal solution, and what is more, the relations between

France and North Africa would enter a new phase of mutual understanding and respect.

After five years of war, with all the suffering and destruction of war, one would have expected France to listen to the counsel of reason and wisdom, to listen to the dictates of the Charter, to listen to the resolution of the General Assembly, and lastly to listen to the lessons written on the battlefields of Indo-China.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, one would have expected France to come to the United Nations at this session to report a solution of the Algerian question—a solution consistent with the Charter.

But what solution is France now designing for the question of Algeria—and I have applied the word ‘designing’ with full premeditation. For France is always designing; it is her principal occupation not only in the field of haute couture and perfumes, but also in the realm of politics. This is more notable in the question of Algeria where the role of France has always been one of designing. It is a pity that General de Gaulle, a great leader, should become at last simply a designer, and with a great deal of imitation.

Let us therefore see what are the general features of the solution of the Algerian question as designed by France.

### Integration

In the main, the French policy is based on the idea of integration. It is here where the nucleus of the fallacy lies. Integration is not a chemical process whereby two elements can be mixed to make a new compound. It is a historic, natural and human development that cannot be manufactured. It is self-making. In the case of Algeria and France, there is not one single ground for integration. They are two peoples in every sense. The Algerian people have a national being, a national consciousness entirely separate and distinct from the French people. The aspirations, the language, the culture, all are different, and no

force on earth can bring about their integration. Thus far, a century of effort, where France has employed all military, social and cultural means to transform Algeria into a French territory, has failed. Algeria has resisted unshakeably, and all French efforts have failed. The territory, now, is just as Arab as every other Arab territory; and those young Algerians who were bought up in French learning are the most adamant adversaries of integration. They are most eloquent when, in their beautiful French accents, they speak of this mockery called integration.

I have made particular reference to integration not as a matter of history, but simply because all French designing and French designers have been working on the basis of integration. The names may be different, and the fashions may be different, but the fibre, the material, the substance, has always been the same and is still the same. In easy times, it is bluntly called integration; at times of war, it is called pacification. Recently it was advertised as fraternization. But all these are synonymous terms for imperialism and colonialism. These “isms”, indefensible in the eyes of public opinion, are coined into fancy phrases to mislead the peoples of the world. But this terminology can hardly deceive even the most primitive illiterates. On fundamental principles such as freedom and liberty, there are no illiterates-the illiterates are literate-even in the most remote parts of the world. No one can accept the French policies in Algeria described as fraternization. Fraternization springs from freedom and not from domination. In French “Fraternite et Liberte” come one after the other, it never comes with domination. He who enslaves you, who dominates you, is not and cannot be your frere. Fraternization between the people of Algeria and the people of France is not impossible. France need not labour for the fraternity of Algeria. It can come when France leaves Algeria to its own people. It is then, and only then, that fraternity, not fraternization, will be forthcoming.

This explains why French solutions in the past have failed. They failed because integration was there at the base. The 1947

Algerian Constitution did not work for it ignored the separate nationhood of Algeria and because it took integration for granted. The experiment failed and has proved more than ever that the French policy of integration has fallen asunder into disintegration.

Again, the loi cadre policy which was advertised here in the United Nations by the French spokesmen as a great achievement has failed too. The loi cadre was based on integration and proved to be a travesty of democracy, justice and equity. The loi cadre has admitted the Algerian personality but denied Algerian territorial integrity. The loi cadre was exceedingly generous, beyond human generosity. It gave Algeria everything; do not be amazed. It gave everything; except matters of nationality, general security, defense, foreign affairs, civil laws, elections and institutional organizations, finance, justice, education, natural resources and public services. These are not my enumeration, Mr. Chairman, they are the enumeration of Article 9 of the loi cadre, which is in fairness to law, neither loi nor cadre! It is a mockery of democracy. With the emergence of the Fifth French Republic, one would expect the emergence of better understanding and reasonable policies. But the indications point to the contrary. The concept of integration with all its rot and rust is emerging again. France is still thinking in terms of integration and Algeria is still a French territory de l'autre mere. On 13 May 1958, the NEW YORK TIMES quoted Mr. Soustelle, the Minister of Information, as saying that there should be "only one kind of Frenchman from Dunkerque to Tamanrasset (in the French Sahara). If Mr. Soustelle still thinks of the Algerian people as Frenchmen after a liberation war that brought into the area half a million French soldiers, then Mr. Soustelle is a poor Minister of Information-he lacks a great deal of information!

It may be said, however, that one should not seek real information from a Minister of Information! In some countries, it's really a Ministry of Misinformation. So let us examine the policy of France from the statements of General de Gaulle. He is

now the architect of the new Republic, and what is more, it was Algeria which brought him and with him brought about the Republic.

Unfortunately, we have more than one reason to believe that General de Gaulle is another offshoot of the policy of integration. The General has praised the Algerians, declaring that, "I say without embarrassment that for most of them, the men of the insurrection, have fought courageously." This was the General, the soldier, who was speaking. When de Gaulle the statement was speaking, it is there and then that he fell into the iniquity of the antiquity of integration. In a speech in Algeria on 4 June, he lined up with integration, he said, "In all Algeria, there is only one sort of inhabitant. There are only ... full fledged Frenchmen ..." In de Gaulle's constitution, some form of choice is given to overseas territories for federation, integration or separation, but with regard to Algeria, no specific mention of any choice is made. On the contrary, a certain section of the French constitution considers Algeria an integral part of France. In another speech on 5 June in Bone, Algeria, General de Gaulle said he is "counting on the participation of the ten million Frenchmen of Algeria" in the September voting. This is exactly what the Algerians are up against. It is against their being designed as Frenchmen that the Algerians are fighting and against which they will continue to fight. General de Gaulle wants the Algerians to cease fire in order to become Frenchmen. He invites delegates from the Algerian Government-or call them what you will-to negotiate with France, to become Frenchmen. Well, if the Algerians are to accept being Frenchmen, what is the war for? Perhaps the idea is that a Frenchman is a superman and you have to fight to be elevated to such an elevated status. But whatever the merits may be, the Algerians are happy-happy to the contentment of their hearts, to be Algerians-and nothing but Algerians.

Thus as an answer to your resolution calling for a solution in keeping with the United Nations Charter, France has

responded to a solution in diametrical conflict with the Charter. General de Gaulle's solution was a five-year plan of what he described a "vast program of renovation", including public works, new industries, modernization of agriculture. On October 4, General de Gaulle, speaking in Algeria, made a policy statement on Algeria. In explaining the policy of France, the General posed the question to himself: "What is the future to which France calls Algeria?" The General answered his own question: "Algerians, men and women, I have come here to announce it to you-a five-year plan." These words are reminiscent of Shakespeare, "Friends, Romans, Countrymen-lend me your ears; I have come to bury Caesar, not to praise him." And surely de Gaulle did not come to announce Caesar, but to bury Caesar. General de Gaulle then proceeded with his statement explaining the five-year plan, and this simply means that France will continue burying the liberty of Algeria for another five years.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the solution which France places before you for the Algerian question. It is no solution worthy to be examined or defended, and this may be one reason for the absence of France from our deliberation. The five-year plan need not attract our attention, divert our search for a solution, or subvert our will to defend the cause of Algeria. We can rest assured, all of us, that France is not staying five years in Algeria. Long before the termination of this period, France will pull out of Algeria; and the Algerians themselves will plan, and execute their projects for their country. There is nothing more rewarding, more successful and more glorious than to serve your own people in all your mind, from the heart of your heart, and with all the joy of your soul.

#### Referendum

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, we must not forget that the French solution which General de Gaulle has outlined is not only defective on its merits; its very structure is defective too. The

referendum and the elections, the two pillars supporting the French policy, have fallen to the ground. They have collapsed in the course of construction. I shall not expose them at length, for they do not deserve more than a word in passing. They are too flimsy, awkward and ridiculous to deserve a detailed analysis. They are good for nothing, except as an amusing caricature, or as a typical illustration of badly cocked democracy. The referendum, with its 97 per cent results in Algeria, is a mixture of forgery and corruption. In the words of THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR: "It was a drama the outcome of which was known to all the participants before it started. No one in Algeria or in France had really doubted that this North African territory could vote anything but 'yes'." (October 2, 1958). THE WASHINGTON POST said: "It would be tragic if M. de Gaulle interpreted the heavy vote of approval in Algeria as a willing endorsement of continued French domination..." (September 30, 1958). Former French Premier Mendes-France condemned the referendum as "dangerous for civil peace, dangerous for democracy ... and will have no real value." M. Gaston Deferr, former French Minister of Overseas Territories, described the whole operation in the following terms: "There will be no choice, no referendum, merely a decision imposed... we can predict now that the results will be 'successful' by 90-100%." And Mr. Defferre's predictions came to be true. The result was successful, 97 per cent.

### Elections

As to the elections, it was a total defeat to the French policy and a total victory for Algeria and the Algerian Government. It was a wholesale abstention-and I need not remind you what is abstention, for beside being part of our procedure, it has become part of our habits. I might ask, therefore, how can you imagine a United Nations resolution with a unanimous abstention? It is no resolution. A resolution voted down by total abstention is not defeated only by a sense of refusal, but by an expression of contempt and disregard. And that

was the destiny of elections in Algeria, contempt and disregard by abstention. And what courage, what bravery and determination the people of Algeria have shown against the crushing impact of a military administration backed by half a million French soldiers. Verily, that was an acid test, a touchstone, a definite challenge to show where the heart of Algeria lies, where its loyalty belongs and what her aspirations are. Viewed from its proper angle, this abstention by the people of Algeria is a genuine vote for liberty, independence and sovereignty. Likewise, it was a vote against the whole French policy starting from 1830 down to the present day.

This is not, Mr. Chairman, a sweeping statement that stands without support. The elections of Algeria have been condemned by all neutral observers. It would be a laborious effort to place before you all the recitals on the matter. A few quotations are sufficient as an illustration: L'EXPRESS, on November 13 said: "The reality surpasses all fiction. The lists deposited form such a caricature of the 'democratic way' invoked and prepared by de Gaulle, that one can scarcely believe it". On November 20, L'EXPRESS said again: "The evident conclusion to be drawn from the organization of elections in Algeria: they constitute the first great defeat for de Gaulle. Furthermore, it is evident that in Algeria, as before, the authority of Paris does not rule." The NEW YORK TIMES, of November 15, said: "The Algerian electoral ticket is made up largely of reactionaries and their Mohammedan stooges..."

All this, Mr. Chairman, is the truth about the elections in Algeria, with the exception of one aspect. There are no Mohammedan stooges in the election, as the NEW YORK TIMES has reported. A "Mohammedan stooge" does not exist. A stooge is never a Mohammedan, and a Mohammedan is never a stooge. Islam, as its name denotes, is submission to God and no one else. It is the faith of Freedom, Peace and Justice.

So far and so much, Mr. Chairman, we have surveyed the French solution, the French referendum and the French elections. I stress French for every operation. Everything was French from beginning to end. The question arises, what have we come here for? Why has this item been inscribed? And finally: What solution do we suggest?

## INDEPENDENCE AND NEGOTIATION

We came here, to the United Nations, because there is still war in Algeria. It has entered its fifth year. Human suffering is continuing unabated. Whether it be French or Algerian blood, it is human blood which is being shed on the soil of Algeria. In his statement of the 23 October, General de Gaulle has put the losses in this war at 7,200 French officers and soldiers, and at 77,000 Algerians killed in action. I do not know what is the French formula in disclosing their war losses. It may be one tenth, less or more, I do not know. But the French are falling in thousands. As to the number of Algerian deaths, it may be greater than 77,000. Whatever the figure may be, for only God and the graveyards know, the toll of human life on both sides is tragically high and is continuing. Thus far, the war has been localized on Algerian soil. But nobody knows how long will it continue in this manner. War, any war, possesses the inherent potential of expanding into other fields. A few months ago, military clashes took place between Tunisia and France. Also, the Algerians have started a second front in France itself.

On the political level, many new developments have taken place which call for a speedy solution of the Algerian question—developments that should act as an alarm clock to the United Nations to wake up and shoulder its responsibilities.

In the first place, I should mention that national and interstate conferences have dealt with the question of Algeria. Between April 15<sup>th</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup>, the first Conference of Independent African States was held at Accra. The Conference adopted a resolution, while recognizing the right of the Algerian people to

independence, urged France to recognize the rights of Algeria to independence, to withdraw her troops from Algeria and to enter into immediate negotiations with the Algerian Liberation Front, with a view to reaching a final and just settlement. Of significance is the appeal made by the African States to the friends and allies of France to refrain from helping France, whether directly or indirectly, in her military operations in Algeria.

Between the 27<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> of April, the North African Tangier Conference was held and adopted a resolution, proclaiming the imprescriptible right of the Algerian people to sovereignty and independence, supporting the people of Algeria in their fight for independence and recommending the creation of an Algerian Government.

Between June 17<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>, the Tri-partite Conference was held in Tunis between the Governments of Tunis, Morocco and the Algerian Front of National Liberation. The Conference passed a resolution rejecting any French policy based on integration, and endorsing the right of the people of Algeria to independence.

This, Mr. Chairman, was an upsurge in the whole continent of Africa, in support of the cause of Algeria. It was followed by the creation of the Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic on September 26, 1958. That day was a landmark in the history of Algeria, for it marks a new phase, a new chapter in the liberation movement of Algeria. It is no more a rebel movement. It is an organized war waged by an organized army exchanging war prisoners with France. The Algerian Government has declared itself in a state of war with France, ready to fight to the end and ready to negotiate an honourable peace. The Algerian Government proclaimed its adherence to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, to the universal declaration of human rights and the provisions of the Geneva

Convention. It is on the basis of such declarations that a number of states have recognized the Government of Algeria.

The crucial question, then arises: what is the solution? The question is simple to answer, and the solution is simple to state.

Mr. Chairman, there is one solution to the problem, and only one solution. It is independence and sovereignty for the Algerian people. This is the only means to bring peace to the whole of Africa. It is the solution which permits the creation of a Magrib Federation for Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco, so that the relations of France with North Africa can be normalized and regulated. And lastly, it is the only solution which offers the hope, a bright hope, for friendly relations between France and all the Arab States.

Based upon independence, this solution is consistent with the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations; it responds to the national aspirations of the people of Algeria and reflects the general desire of the international community. The United Nations is therefore called upon to declare itself in support of such a solution, and I daresay in support of her own Charter. Independence, with negotiations to regulate relations between France and Algeria, is the only master key to the peaceful solution of the question.

#### CONSEQUENCES OF WAR

I say 'peaceful' for war and the continuation of war are bound to be the alternative. Algeria, the people and the Government are determined to go ahead with the war and to continue their sacrifices until the end; and the end is final victory.

But what are the consequences? The consequences are grave for France, for Europe, and for the Western world.

For France, it is more and more of human sacrifices of thousands and thousands of French soldiers whose lives should be saved for a worthy cause. War also means the economic and financial bank-ruptcy of France, which is already trembling

under the impact of war expenditure. The high cost of the Algerian war has depleted France's Foreign Exchange reserves. By late 1957, almost all of the unused resources in the French economy had been used up. In January of this year, France was compelled to borrow a total of \$655 million from the European Payments Union, the International Monetary Fund and the United States Government.

For Europe, apart from its impact on the European Common Market, war means the blocking of a bright prospect for the oil of Algeria. Former Premier Guy Mollet predicted in March 1957 that in ten years, Saharan oil would supply one half of Europe's power needs. This oil is the national wealth of Algeria and it will not be pumped to Europe except by the agreement of independent Algeria, and a fully sovereign Algeria. All prospecting, producing, refining or transporting of the Sahara oil must be agreed to by the Government of Algeria; and the companies doing otherwise are getting into a risky adventure. In fact, the Algerian army, on more than one occasion, has demolished the oil installations in Algeria, and as the war continues, oil establishments will continue to be a military target.

For the Western world, the loss will bring great repercussions. The continuation of war means the loss of France and hence the loss of European equilibrium. Should France pursue her losing war in Algeria, France would be lost herself. It was the problem of Algeria that brought an end to the Fourth Republic. It was the problem of Algeria that called General de Gaulle out of his retirement in the suburbs of Paris to save France from a civil war. And lastly, it was the problem of Algeria that led to the emergence of the Fifth Republic.

Should the Algerian question remain unsolved, what would be the outcome? Two definite results are bound to follow. First, the Algerian war of independence would come to its ultimate conclusion. Independence and sovereignty. Second, the total defeat of France is unavoidable as the decree of destiny. The

Fifth Republic would come to an end, the General de Gaulle would go back to his retirement to write the final chapter of his memoirs; and God only knows what would follow.

This is the picture as we see it: victory for Algeria and defeat for France.

But, Mr. Chairman, the way is still open for an honourable peace, a negotiated peace between Algeria and France. Algeria does not aim to defeat anyone. Algeria strives for her liberty and independence; and Algeria has declared her readiness for peace.

What remains for the United Nations is to make a decision in favor of peace against war, of independence against domination and of human dignity against humiliation. And France, we pray, will heed the voice of peace, justice and dignity.