

Statements made during the 15th Session of The United Nations
General Assembly

Algeria

Palestine

Mauritania

Colonialism

South Africa

By His Excellency

Mr. Ahmad Shkairy

Minister of State for United Nations Affairs

Prepared by the Saudi Arabian Mission to the United Nations

New York 1961

CONTENTS

ALGERIA

THE PALESTINE QUESTION

General Debate - September 30, 1960

Reply in the General Assembly to the representative
of Israel, Mrs. Golda Meir - October 11, 1960

The Palestine Refugees - November 15, 1960

The Palestine Refugees - November 30, 1960

MAURITANIA

COLONIALISM

SOUTH AFRICA:

Treatment of People of Indian and Indo-Pakistan
Origin in the Union of South Africa

PREFACE

His Excellency, Mr. Ahmad Shukairy, Minister of State for United Nations Affairs, once again led the Saudi Arabian Delegation to the Fifteenth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. In this historic session, several member countries were represented by their Heads of State. His Excellency, Mr. Shukairy, participated in each and every major debate before the General Assembly, as well as the Special Political Committee and the First Committee. Space will not allow the reproduction in extenso of each of the speeches delivered by the leader of the Saudi Arabian Delegation. However, the Saudi Arabian Mission to the United Nations is pleased to present herewith the speeches by Mr. Shukairy on matters of vital concern to the Arab World, e.g., ALGERIA, the PALESTINE QUESTION, MAURITANIA, COLONIALISM and SOUTH AFRICA.

The Saudi Arabian Mission presents this pamphlet as a public service to fill the requests presented to the Mission in consonance with its past practice.

Algeria ...

His Excellency, Mr. Ahmad Shukairy, once again delivered a speech on December 6, 1960 in which he advocated the right of Algeria for independence and sovereignty. The following is the text of the speech he made in the First Committee of the General Assembly:

Once again we are seized with the question of Algeria, at a time when Algeria itself is seized in the grip of war—a war of reconquest waged by France, and one of liberation launched by the gallant people of Algeria. For six consecutive sessions, the U. N. has been called upon to consider this burning problem, with the Algerian war entering its seventh year, since the 1st of November 1960.

At this session it is not our intention to place before the Committee the political, legal, national or international aspects of the Algerian problem. Important as they may be, these matters have become res-judicata, for long decided against France and in favor of Algeria. Nor do we find it necessary to discuss the nature of the problem or the U. N. competence for these aspects are well covered by the U. N. juris-prudence to make them final and conclusive. In the same manner we take the absence of France, regrettable as it is, as entirely immaterial with no bearing on the problem. The absence of France will not arrest the U. N. from discharging its responsibilities. The international character of the Algerian question is already established and the jurisdiction of the U. N. has become a fully recognized fact no matter who is absent or who is present. No doubt, with the presence of France we can have a fuller debate, but with her absence the challenge becomes greater. Indeed our determination to shoulder our responsibilities should stand more than ever unshaken, indomitable and unswerving.

I have used these three adjectives in relation to our determination, not as an exercise of synonymous enumeration,

but rather to bring home, I daresay to drive home, to our minds our obligations as an international organization dedicated to extend justice, maintain peace and insure the triumph of the fundamental freedoms and the rights of man. These adjectives I have stressed, to stress our responsibility, to emphasize our obligations and to recall our record on this question. After all, Algeria has now a record in the U. N., and the U. N. too is not without record in Algeria. Let us, therefore take a glance at the record.

On the 5th of January 1955, Saudi Arabia addressed a communication to the Security Council calling attention to the ruthless French military operations aimed at liquidating the nationalist uprising in Algeria and the obliteration of the national and cultural characteristics of the people of Algeria. In spite of the gravity of the situation, the Security Council received the information and took no action. The war in Algeria continued unabated.

On 26th January 1955, greatly disturbed by the situation in Algeria, 14 Afro-Asian State requested the inclusion of the question of Algeria on the agenda of the Tenth Session. The General Committee decided not to recommend the inclusion, but the General Assembly reversed the recommendation. Thereupon, France walked out of the Assembly and of its main committees. But succumbing to the sensitivity of France and for other unworthy considerations, the Assembly decided not to consider the question any further, and that it was no longer seized of the item on the agenda of the session. The war in Algeria continued unabated.

On the 12th of April 1956, with the situation in Algeria growing worse, 17 Afro-Asian States drew the attention of the Security Council to the dangerous state of affairs prevailing in Algeria, warning that the war in Algeria is endangering peace and security in the area, and that measures be taken to secure

respect to the right of self determination and the fundamental human rights. The attention of the Security Council was not drawn, and the war in Algeria continued unabated.

On the 13th of June 1956, again deeply concerned about the acts of repression in Algeria, 13 Afro-Asian States requested an early meeting of the Security Council to bring an end to the French colonial war. The request for inclusion was rejected by the Security Council, and the war in Algeria continued unabated.

On the 1st of October 1956, with the military operations continuing in Algeria, coupled with acts of torture and terror, 15 Afro-Asian States requested the inclusion of the question of Algeria in the agenda of the Eleventh Session. The item was inscribed and the question was thoroughly examined. The Assembly adopted a unanimous resolution, expressing the hope that, in a spirit of cooperation, a peaceful, democratic and just solution would be found, through appropriate means, in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the U.N. France did not heed the resolution. No solution, democratic, just and peaceful was forthcoming, and the war in Algeria continued unabated.

On 16th of July 1957, greatly shocked by the attitude of France, 22 Afro-Asian States, requested the inclusion of the item in the agenda of the Twelfth Session. The item was included and the question was thoroughly examined. The Assembly adopted a unanimous resolution which expressed grave concern over the situation in Algeria, took note of the offer of good offices made by the king of Morocco and the President of Tunisia and stressed the wish that, in a spirit of effective cooperation, pourparlers would be entered into, with a view to reach a solution in conformity with the purposes and principles of the U.N. Charter. France did not heed this resolution. No solution on the basis of the charter was forthcoming, and the war in Algeria continued unabated.

On 16th of July, 1958, again moved by the tragic developments in Algeria, 24 Afro-Asian States requested the inclusion of the item in the agenda of the Thirteenth Session. The item was included and the problem examined. A seventeen-power resolution was tabled, referring to the right of the Algerian people to independence and to the willingness of the provisional government of Algeria to enter into negotiations with the government of France. The resolution urged the two parties to reach a negotiated settlement in conformity with the Charter of the U.N. France made no progress whatsoever, and the war in Algeria continued unabated.

On 14th of July, 1959, last year, in a further to end the colonial war in Algeria, 25 Afro-Asian States requested the inclusion of the question of Algeria in the agenda of the Fourteenth Session. The item was included and the question was thoroughly examined. A 22-power draft resolution was adopted with a simple majority by the Political Committee, but instead, a more moderate and mild resolution was introduced in the General Assembly. Yet the draft resolution was defeated, and the war in Algeria continued unabated.

But because of a phenomenon unique, unparalleled, and unprecedented in the annals of the U.N. ever since its establishment, I should like to pause for a moment. I beg your leave, and the indulgence of the Committee to sum up that resolution.

In precis, Mr. Chairman, in its preamble, this draft resolution recalled two resolutions already adopted by the U.N., again recalled the first article of the Charter, and expressed concern over the continuance of hostilities in Algeria. In its operative part, the draft resolution recognized the right of the Algerian people to self-determination, and urged pourparlers to reach a peaceful solution on the basis of the right to self-determination, in accordance with the principles of the Charter.

Whether in substance or in form, whether in the preamble or in the operative part, the draft resolution is a re-spelling of the words of the Charter, and a recasting of the policy of France on Algeria as proclaimed by President de Gaulle.

Thus, the draft resolution is simple, straightforward and innocent. It contains no condemnation to France, not even a slight derogatory reference to France. In a United Nations inspired by the Charter and by the Charter only, such a draft resolution ought to be adopted by applaud. It should have been carried not by votes but by acclamation. Nevertheless, the draft resolution was defeated, simply to score a defeat against the U.N. and the lofty principles enshrined in the Charter of the U.N. The events, however, shall bear witness that it is a defeat in passing, for the ultimate victory shall be on the side of freedom, no matter how great the sacrifice may be and how long the struggle may be.

But what is more tragic is the manner in which the resolution was defeated. By a paragraph to paragraph voting, the General Assembly in a roll call, has adopted each and every paragraph by far more than the two-thirds required majority. Against the right of the Algerian people to self-determination there was only one negative vote. For the "holding of pourparlers to arrive at a peaceful solution on the basis of self-determination", the paragraph got eight votes more than the required two-thirds majority. But when voted as a whole, and here is the paradoxical dilemma, the resolution which was adopted paragraph by paragraph, was defeated.

Such a defeat, Mr. Chairman, is not only regrettable but condemnable and deplorable. In an official declaration, the French Delegation shortly after the voting claimed that the draft resolution was defeated as a result "of the strategy and collaboration between France and a group of the friends of France".

In problems which are of ordinary character, whether of a political nature or otherwise, it is conceivable for a member State to kill a resolution by any strategy or any tactics. The mechanics of voting are admissible and the procedural techniques are permissible, but in no serious international problems. This is the code of parliamentary rules and good behavior. But to employ techniques to defeat a resolution which imports a paragraph from the Charter, is not a worthy endeavor. And for France to defeat a resolution based on the policy of France, on the statement of its great President, General de Gaulle, is a strategy against the honor of France, and the dignity of the United Nations.

But the question should be asked, what was the background, how has an effort for peace been defeated and lastly how has an appeal for negotiations been rejected. Without being discourteous, Mr. Chairman, and without any commendatory language, I should like to say in all sincerity and candor that at the last session, it was the western powers, who led the U.N. headlong into the abyss of that regrettable situation. Instead of vindicating their claim for freedom, they have dealt a severe blow to freedom; and instead of championing the cause of democracy they have chosen to support a policy of hypocrisy.

The western powers-and there were some worthy and honorable exceptions, have pursued all throughout the debate a well defined and a clear-cut line of advocacy. There was an obvious regimentation of argumentation that could hardly come out as a coincidence. It betrayed all the symptoms of one strategy which the French Delegation has revealed after the strategy has realized its objectives - all well in accordance with plan. Let us, therefore, reflect back for a moment, to see where we stand at the present moment.

As presented before this Committee last year, our case for Algeria was simple and crystal clear. We took cognizance of the statement of President de Gaulle of 16 September, 1959, in

which he recognized the right of the people of Algeria to self-determination. In spite of few loopholes scattered here and there in that statement, coupled with some dangerous pockets skillfully guised in between the lines, the provisional government of Algeria has found in the statement a step in the right direction inasmuch as it recognized the principle of self-determination as an inherent right to the people of Algeria. The government of Algeria, also, expressed its readiness to negotiate with France the conditions and guarantees, cease fire included, which would enable the people of Algeria to decide freely their future destiny. Such a position on the part of the Algerian Government was exceedingly moderate. The Government of Algeria did not insist on immediate independence which is their right. They did not press for a recognition, de facto or de jure. They did not claim any political privileges. They did not suggest any particular regime, order, or constitution. On the contrary, they have declared in the most un-equivocal terms that the future of Algeria must be left to the people of Algeria to decide. In fact, the Government of Algeria has declared, the very day it was created, that the political destiny of Algeria will be shaped by the people of Algeria. Hence, it was designated by name as the provisional government of Algeria. That explains why the Government of Algeria has accepted the policy of President de Gaulle to offer a choice for the people of Algeria. Confident of the will of its people, the Government of Algeria has agreed to the choice. Should the people of Algeria choose independence, independence shall be their choice, should they choose integration with France, integration shall be the choice, and should they choose federation with France, federation shall be the choice. The Government of Algeria declared itself bound by the choice of the people of Algeria. All what they have demanded-and it is hardly a demand, that the choice must be free, exercised under conditions that would secure a complete freedom of choice. The Algerian Government, to create such an

atmosphere of freedom, have declared their readiness to negotiate with France, the necessary steps that should be taken in this direction, with a cease fire included.

That was the whole case of Algeria as declared by the Government of Algeria and as conveyed last year to this Committee through the Afro-Asian Delegations.

What was the French case? In the first place the case for France was presented behind the screen. As in this session, France has chosen to be absent. For the last six sessions France was wavering between absence and presence, between the inclusion and exclusion, between denying or acknowledging the jurisdiction of the U.N. Even after the opening of this session, President de Gaulle referred to this organization as the so-called U.N. France, it seems, needs to be reminded that this so-called U.N. includes France, and the France is a permanent member of the Security Council. We entirely agree with President de Gaulle that the U.N. has failed in more than one respect, at more than one time. But if we were to list the reasons for such a failure we must place the defiance of France at the head of the list. On the problem of Algeria, to mention only one instance, France has defied the U.N. Charter, and her obligations under the Charter. Algeria is not a novel problem. As a colonial issue the problem is 130 years old, with a war fifty years long. It is enough that in the last six years we have been engaged with France in this Committee on the three "tions"-pacification, election, and negotiation-which should be first, which should be second and which should be third.

Be that as it may, in the last session the strategy of France, as activated by the supporters of France, was most devastating, apart from being clumsy and awkward. The western powers have stressed that we give time to France to implement her policy of self-determination. In identical terms they have extended one appeal after another, not to antagonize France, not to arouse the

feelings of France, not to upset France the mother of democracy. Also we have been urged to have faith in France and not to disturb the balance of a delicate situation. That was the chorus all through the session. The United Kingdom, we recall, has advocated that even a hasty word might adversely affect the situation and that the only course to follow was to take no resolution. In her turn, the U.S. urged restraint and stressed a course of action based on inaction. Australia, in supporting a policy of no resolution, spoke of the dangers of the precision of any resolution on the matter, and declared that a resolution unacceptable to France would not be helpful. Italy, for her part, advocated that the U.N. should avoid taking any action which might jeopardize the chances of achieving a cease fire and an early solution of the problem.

Such was the general framework of the strategy of the N.A.T.O. powers in holding back the U.N. from worthy action into a bloody inaction. I say bloody inaction, for bloodshed is still the order of the day in Algeria. No solution was made, no cease fire was effected and the Grim Reaper of the war makes no discrimination-men, women, or infants-French or Algerian-military or civilian, all alike in this tragic harvest.

Reflecting upon the course of our debates last year, but with a live conscience and a receptive mind, all of us must regret this policy of inaction to which the U.N. was led, or speaking with candor, to which the U.N. was misled. I do not call for repentance, because repentance will not bring a resurrection of the thousands of those who have lost their lives, whether they be French or Algerians. We do grieve the death of the French too, for they are too our brethren in humanity, and what is more saddening is that they have died for no worthy cause.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, were it not for this obstinacy-this adamance of the N.A.T.O. powers in support of inaction, the problem of Algeria could have been solved. The year 1960 could

have been a year of peace, instead of being now as we see it, as we live it a year of war, with all its misery, bereavement and destruction. On November 1, 1960, just five weeks ago, the Algerian war has entered its seventh year. On that occasion, Ferhat Abbas, the Prime Minister of the government of Algeria, spoke to the people of Algeria in these historic words:

"Tomorrow, November 1, 1960, the war in Algeria will enter its seventh year. The fight for liberty and independence will continue with its inevitable wake of suffering and sacrifice ... The Declaration of September 16, 1959, could have constituted the basis for a peaceful solution of the conflict, and 1960 could have been the year of peace". I have made this quotation from the speech of the Prime Minister of Algeria, not to place the guilt where it belongs, but only to import into our record that for Algeria, this the year of 1960 is not a year of peace, but rather a year of war. This is only because the U.N. retired to a policy of inaction-because you have abdicated your duty-because you have resigned your responsibility. But what is most important at present, is to draw from the past a lesson for the future - a lesson that should make of 1961 a year of peace-not another year in the calendar of war.

In speaking with vigor and with passion on this matter I have no apology to make. This is not a political question of an ordinary character. The war in Algeria is the only war now in the world in the age of the U.N. The war is in full swing, and the threat to world peace is in store. For years, human suffering in Algeria is beyond imagination. In 1945, on V.E. Day, when a group of Algerians staged a peaceful demonstration demanding that the principles of the Atlantic Charter be extended to Algeria, the French campaign of repression which followed led to the massacre of 45,000 Algerians. France did not deny the massacre but claimed the figure was not precise. At present, there are now over a million and a half Algerians, forcibly resettled by the

French army in camps, facing the menace of starvation. As to the war toll, up to date, military experts have estimated that the total French casualties are 100,000, while the Algerians are much more. On the financial level, the cost of the war to France is admitted to be more than three million dollars a day. Viewed through French political stability, the Algerian war was a crushing blow. Since the outbreak of the war, France has had seven governments, two republics and two constitutions. And on the economic side, the war of Algeria has led to a number of undeclared devaluations and unpronounced bankruptcies. I adduce these facts, for all of us to ponder. In particular the friends of France, should make every effort to pull France out of this devastating war, if they are really anxious about the future of France.

But unfortunately the friends of France, the N.A.T.O. powers, have engulfed themselves in a paradox. In the U.N. their policy was one of no resolution-no action. Outside the U.N. their policy was one of resolution and action. Within the N.A.T.O. every form of assistance has been extended to France to carry her colonial war-a war of reconquest, a war to defeat the cause of freedom, for which the people of Algeria are offering the bud and flower of their generation.

To speak of the role of the N.A.T.O. in the war of Algeria, we should not be confined to generalities. The U.N. should be well conversed about the facts of such assistance, for the obvious reason that the N.A.T.O. should not be allowed to defeat the sublime objectives of the U.N. The facts are too simple to state.

With the three divisions she placed at the disposal of N.A.T.O. in Europe, France, has been able to equip itself with N.A.T.O. material before being sent to the theaters of operation in Algeria, with the consent of the Atlantic powers. Thus the Algerian people are being fought by two divisions in the east of their country, and one division in the west. These are the

Motorized Infantry Division of the 7th Rapid Mechanized Division and the 4th Motorized Infantry Division.

Almost all war material in Algeria, including the equipment of the French units and the hospital material is of N.A.T.O. origin. American military instructors reside in Algeria. The spare parts and repairs are American. Part of the training of the French pilots who operate in Algeria takes place under the N.A.T.O.

On June 25, the N.A.T.O. accorded priority to France in the supply of helicopters of the Sikorsky type, destined for the operations in Algeria.

In March 1956, the French Government ordered 50 helicopters from the United States and in the words of Le Monde "evidently destined for helicopter operations in Algeria". These helicopters with double propellers, called "flying bananas" or "work horses" are designed by the matriculation number H.21 in the American army and navy. The first delivery took place in June 1956.

The purchase of armaments by the French Government from the United States for the years 1957 and 1958, particularly for air operations, was evaluated at approximately 500 million dollars.

In June 1959, the United States agreed to sell the French army in Algeria 25 heavy helicopters and an unlimited number of fighter planes of the T.28 type needed by France for use in Algeria.

In January 1960, 60 planes T.28, were given to France by the United States. Recently, 96 other planes have been ordered.

In the course of the war of Algeria, France in violation to international maritime law, has in 1959 halted 41,300 ships, searched 2,565 and derouted 83, thanks to the support of the N.A.T.O. The American navy, on patrol in the Mediterranean

permanently offers its radar facilities to France in these operations.

In addition, American seaplanes lend their support to France in the Mediterranean. Also, two aircraft carriers of American origin weighing 11,000 tons, have been placed at the disposal of France and are engaged in the war of Algeria. It has been disclosed that the bombardment by France of Sakhiet-Sidi-Youssef on February 8, 1958, which was examined by the Security Council, was carried out by American B-26 airplanes.

Even Mr. Douglas Dillon, Former United States Ambassador in Paris, declared that "the use of American material against Sakhiet was hard to excuse".

With regard to the arms used in this massacre, Mr. Douglas Dillon admitted also, that some were part of the military supplies furnished by the United States to France within the framework of N.A.T.O., others were direct acquisitions of the French Government.

In a report submitted to the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, the General Accounting Office gave details concerning American and Atlantic participation in the hostilities against the Algerian people. Sections of this report declared that "substantial quantities" of American arms had been sent by France to Algeria.

All this, Mr. Chairman, has been going on with the full knowledge of the N.A.T.O., and I would say with full complicity. In a communique dated March 27, 1956, the North Atlantic Council said as follows:

"The North Atlantic Council has been constantly informed of the deduction effected by France on the forces put by it at the disposition of N.A.T.O. The Council has examined the situation in Europe resulting from these movements. It has taken note than France considers it necessary, in the interest of its own security,

to increase French forces in Algeria which is part of the zone covered by the North Atlantic Treaty. The Council recognizes the importance for N.A.T.O. of the security in this region".

With regard to the financial support extended to France by the N.A.T.O. and particularly by the U.S., it is sufficient to note that the expenses of the war in Algeria are counted as part of the French contribution to the "common defense". This is a fact of major importance which establishes the grave responsibility of N.A.T.O. in the Algerian war. The military expenses for the hostilities in Algeria are in all respects N.A.T.O. expenses.

It is worthy to note that on January 30, 1958, the U.S. has granted 655 million dollars to France and certain N.A.T.O. countries. In their memorandum, the French Delegation which had come to Washington to obtain this aid, strongly stressed the financial repercussions of the war of Algeria.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, we can safely say that the war in Algeria was the only achievement of the N.A.T.O. since its establishment. In all fields the N.A.T.O. was a failure. The military plans of the N.A.T.O. for the defense of the North Atlantic community, have been reported to be a failure. The wrangling is still going on where should nuclear stockpiles be piled, who can fire them, and when should they be fired. In the field of economic cooperation, no progress has been made because of clashes of interests and rivalries for markets and raw materials. The only success scored by the N.A.T.O. is the prosecution of the colonial war in Algeria. This is because, in the words of Andre Fontaine, the well-known columnist of *Le Monde*, "The N.A.T.O. has become a union of nostalgies of colonialism-a union of those whose only dream, despite their humanitarian proclamations, is to defend their privileges and extend them further".

France, however, conceives her alliance in the N.A.T.O. through Algeria, and through Algeria only. In accordance with

the French thesis all N.A.T.O. members should support the position of France on the question of Algeria, unequivocally, unconditionally and unquestionably. French Premier M. Felix Gaillard, thinks it is a betrayal on the part of the N.A.T.O. members, should they fail to support France on the question of Algeria. In his words "one could not be an ally here, without being one, at the same time and every where". These words, Mr. Chairman, are reminiscent of the Nazi philosophy, although France was its first victim. At the main gate of one of the Nazi concentration camps in World War II, there was engraved "Recht oder unrecht, Mein Vaterland", My country, just or unjust. So is the N.A.T.O. for France-support France, just or unjust.

The simple truth therefore, is that loyalty to the N.A.T.O. has become paramount, just or unjust, whatever the situation may be. Even loyalty to the N.A.T.O. is to have priority and preeminence, and the U.N. comes last. When Greece and Iceland bravely voted in 1955 in favor of the inclusion of the question of Algeria in the agenda of the U.N., Mr. Henry Spaak, the Secretary General of the N.A.T.O. almost rebuked Greece and Iceland for their behavior in the U.N. In an interview with "Le Peuple", Mr. Spaak declared "my conception of N.A.T.O. is that the members must at least try to coordinate their foreign policy ... I do not believe that today one can conclude an alliance to fight together in a war, if one cannot manage to live together in peace". This is a very serious attitude indeed. It amounts to saying, if we cannot vote together how can we fight together.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, the problem of Algeria, strips naked the N.A.T.O., its charter, its activity, and the behavior of its members. I should say that some of its members have detached themselves from such evils. They deserve our warm tribute and admiration. The N.A.T.O., as the Algerian situation has shown, proved to be subversive to the U.N. Loyalty to the N.A.T.O. is being measured by the conduct of its members in the U.N. Your

vote in the U.N. must fall in line with the policy of the N.A.T.O., or else you are rebuked, you may be subjected to excommunication. And nowadays, excommunication means not expulsion from the church, but exclusion from military and economic assistance. Such a situation is a direct threat to the U.N., a menace to its proper functioning and a serious frustration of its noble mission to maintain international peace and security.

I would go even further to say that, by pursuing such a policy in Algeria, the N.A.T.O. is defeating its declared objectives. The N.A.T.O., it is claimed by its founders, is designed to defend freedom, democracy and liberty. The war in Algeria has shown that the N.A.T.O. is waging a war of aggression against freedom, liberty and democracy in Algeria. Again, it is often asserted, that the N.A.T.O. is intended to defend the free world. But the actual deeds, rather than the ringing utterances, have attested that the N.A.T.O. is an aggressive organization, and that the free world is really free but from freedom. When the project of the North Atlantic Pact was first conceived, President Truman, in order to sell the idea to the U.S. Congress, spoke as follows: "We are helped by all those who wish to govern themselves and who wish to have a voice in the direction of their own affairs ... our allies are the millions of people who hunger and thirst for justice." This is how the N.A.T.O. has been first conceived, an alliance of justice, bringing together all those who hunger and thirst for justice. The history of the U.N. in this decade has shown how true, how sincere and how genuine are the declared objectives of the N.A.T.O. In all the colonial issues, with which we were seized, and the question of Algeria at the top of the list, the N.A.T.O. has figured as the friend number one of colonialism, and the enemy of freedom, second to none. It is true that in the N.A.T.O. there is hunger and thirst, as President Truman wished, but it is a hunger for colonialism and a thirst for imperialism. The Algerian question stands in testimony, should testimony be required.

It is because of these reasons, Mr. Chairman, reasons that pertain to the national sovereignty of Algeria, and to international peace and security, that the provisional government of Algeria has decided on August 14, 1960, to denounce the inclusion of Algeria in the Atlantic Pact, and to declare null and void all the engagements taken by France in the name of Algeria. As the government of Algeria has declared, Algeria is not a zone covered by the Atlantic Pact. In a statement issued by the Algerian Premier declaring a policy of non alignment, Algeria served a note of warning to the N.A.T.O. powers in the following terms: "As of now, the provisional government of the Algerian Republic considers all participation by the Atlantic organization or by its members in the war of colonial reconquest and extermination waged by France in Algeria as an act of aggression against the Algerian people." It is our policy to place on record this declaration on behalf of the government of the Republic of Algeria.

I have dealt at length, Mr. Chairman, with this aspect of the Algerian question, simply because it is the core of the problem. This colonial war is waged by the N.A.T.O., by N.A.T.O. forces, by N.A.T.O. equipment, by N.A.T.O. political and economic support. As long as such a policy continues, the war is bound to continue, and the moment such a support is withheld, the war is bound to continue, and the moment such a support is withheld, the war stands abated, and the chances for a peaceful solution become wide open. It is not out of any bias that we introduce the question of the N.A.T.O. into the problem of Algeria. The N.A.T.O. is right in the heart of the question of Algeria. It is my humble and sincere submission that the time has come for the N.A.T.O. to disconnect itself from Algeria, and the Algerian question. Too much suffering has been inflicted-too much destruction has taken place-too much blood has been shed, and too much injustice has been perpetuated. The powers of the N.A.T.O. powers, I suggest, should regret their past conduct by

switching their assistance to the government of Algeria in its sacred war of liberation. If they do not heed the call of the Charter, they should heed the call of blood in Algeria, the sorrows of war and its miseries and bereavement. The N.A.T.O. powers are called upon to reverse their policy in Algeria, and here in the U.N. Instead of aiding and abetting France in a colonial war, in La Sale Guerre, it is more honorable to aid and abet a war of freedom-no less glorious than the American revolution, the French revolution and the English revolution-all generously making their contribution to the great fund of human liberty and freedom.

In addressing myself in this manner, I hope I am not judged exceedingly platonic or excessively idealistic. This is no idealism. This is the present trend of French realism, and you cannot be pro French more than the French themselves. France nowadays is overtaken by a wave of liberalism, and France has a glorious chapter of liberalism. The leaders of France, the prime of its intellectuals, are making a revolutionary approach to the problem of Algeria, and I daresay a new school of political thinking. The war in Algeria, to their considered judgment, is one of aggression against the people of Algeria. As such, the intellectuals say, French soldiers are not duty bound to participate in the Algerian war. Should the French soldiers resort to desertion, it is no crime against the State. That is the drama which is now thrilling France, down to the heart of France; and when the heart of France is set in motion, history ushers in a new chapter of renaissance and enlightenment.

The matter, however, did not rest with theory. French soldiers, touched off by the injustice of the French colonial war in Algeria, have started deserting. It is a desertion across the lines of colonialism into the battlefield of freedom. Many of them are now standing their trial before martial courts in France. From this Assembly we extend to them a warm tribute, as heroes striving to

finish the unfinished tasks of the French revolution. Yet, in the defendants dock, they do not stand alone. With them are being tried their Algerian accomplices. In truth, they are not accomplices, they are their brethren united in the common struggle for liberty and sovereignty.

This position of the French soldiers, I should warn, is not one that was only instigated by passion and emotion. It is a position taken after a cold judgment, and by whom-by philosophers of France, its professors, statesmen, journalists and men of all walks of life. In a manifesto signed by 180 of the cream of France's political and intellectual thinking, it has been declared that desertion in the war of Algeria is no betrayal on the part of the French soldiers. On the contrary, such desertion was declared worthy of respect. At the end of their manifesto, those great dignitary signatories have declared the following:

"-We respect and consider justified the refusal to take up arms against the Algerian people.

"-We respect and consider justified the conduct of those French-men who, on behalf of the French people, feel it is their duty to give aid and protection to the oppressed people of Algeria.

"-The cause of the Algerian people, which contributes decisively to the total destruction of the colonial system, is the cause of all free men.

I have recited, Mr. Chairman, these portions of this statement, known as, The Declaration on the Right of Insubordination in the Algerian War, simply to say that France itself has started to assist the Algerian people in their war of liberation, that France itself is asking its soldiers not to prosecute this colonial war, and that France itself is setting an example for the U.N. to follow. This declaration of insubordination shall go down as historic as the Magna Charta, and will even be

remembered as the declaration of human rights. Yet if the intellectuals of France are taking this stand, if the French soldiers are deserting their units, if French officials are resigning their posts, all in support of the cause of freedom, what should the N.A.T.O. powers do to help bring the war in Algeria to an end.

The N.A.T.O. powers, I suggest with all seriousness, should do as the French do. I appeal to the N.A.T.O. powers to commit the honor of desertion from the Algerian battlefield, so that they stand acquitted before the bar of history. Should they accede to the cry of freedom and liberty, it would be a great service to the cause of peace. It would be a greater service to the cause of peace should they divert their assistance to the people of Algeria and to the cause of Algeria. This is a worthy cause to assist, as many are doing, Africans, Asians, Europeans and others. This assistance, and I am urging all to extend, could be everything, Anything. We urge military assistance, economic assistance, contributions to the refugees, clothing to the children, and medicine to the sick. Those who have nothing to offer, are implored to do the minimum, to declare a day of prayer for the victory of Algeria.

I make this appeal, Mr. Chairman, not because we are addicted to war, nor because the Algerian people are war mongers. The people of Algeria have been forced to this war after 130 years of French colonialism. They have resorted to war after all peaceful means have failed. With the declaration of war on the part of Algeria, there was a declaration for readiness to negotiate a peaceful settlement on the basis of the principle of self determination. Again with the declaration of the establishment of the provisional government of Algeria, there was a declaration for readiness to arrive at a just and democratic solution through direct negotiations on the basis of self determination. The principle of self determination, declared by President de Gaulle in his statement of September 1959, was the

same principle for which the Algerians are fighting, and for which the Algerian Government was clamoring. Yet the offer of the Algerian Government for negotiations was rejected by France on more than one flimsy ground. In 1956 in March, April, August and October, there were many contacts between the Algerians and representatives of the French Government to arrange for formal negotiations. On one occasion, October 1956, in an aerial piracy France has kidnapped the Algerian leaders in the course of their peace mission. On more than one occasion the good offices of the King of Morocco and the President of Tunisia have been frustrated. There were many world leaders, whose names need not be disclosed, who have expressed their readiness to undertake conciliation formal or informal. In October 1958, in answer to the "peace of the brave", the provisional government of Algeria proposed a peaceful and negotiated solution, and declared its readiness to designate its representatives to start negotiations with the French Government. In June 1959, Premier Ferhat Abbas, once again offered to arrange a meeting with France to seek a peaceful solution to the problem. In September 1959, in answer to General de Gaulle's speech on self-determination, the government of Algeria declared itself ready to designate emissaries to contact the French Government to discuss the conditions for the application of self-determinations. In October 1959, the provisional government of the Algerian Republic, through the intermediary of the King of Morocco, has endeavored to start negotiations. In November 1959, in response to General de Gaulle's public declaration, the provisional government of Algeria named five Ministers to begin preliminary contacts.

In February 1960: The provisional government of the Algerian Republic conveyed a request to General de Gaulle personally to determine whether he was disposed to receive an emissary with a personal message from Premier Ferhat Abbas. In June 1960: The last attempt following the speech made by

president de Gaulle on June 14, 1960, the provisional government of the Algerian Republic sent two emissaries to Melun in order to prepare for the arrival to France of an Algerian Delegation headed by Ferhat Abbas.

This last attempt, Mr. Chairman, has proved more than ever that France does not mean peace, but is seeking a reconquest of Algeria.

The Algerian envoys, Boumengel and Ben Yahya are here in this committee room ready to tell you formally or informally of the mockery of Melun. They had been treated as prisoners of war. The Melun talks were no talks. In plain words, they were an ultimatum, as though Algeria was seeking conditions of surrender. The official French communique published on June 29 by the French Government has bluntly stated that "the representatives of the government made known the conditions under which the pourparlers could be organized". The Algerian envoys were told how Ferhat Abbas, the Prime Minister of Algeria, should behave upon his arrival to France. He is to stay where he is asked to stay, to do what he is asked to do, to meet no one, to speak to none. He will not even see President de Gaulle except after signing the cease fire.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, it is an honor to see President de Gaulle, a great liberation hero, but Ferhat is eager to see the liberation first and the hero second. Neither Ferhat Abbas nor any Algerian is a hero worshipper. The people of Algeria worship liberty in their worship to God. They will not cease fire before they are sure of their liberty. But if the Melun talks failed, our deliberations in New York must succeed.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, the real success and the real solution for the question of Algeria lies in the independence of Algeria. Full sovereignty, complete independence and territorial integrity is the only solution for the question of Algeria. We should be really amazed that the people of Algeria are denied

their independence. Algeria is the only territory in North Africa without independence. No independent state in North Africa is more entitled to independence than Algeria. All these countries- Morocco, Tunisia, Libya and the U.A.R. were under foreign domination. They achieved their independence. What is wrong with Algeria that it has to resort to war to achieve her independence. At this session, we have the most compelling event that should leave no room for hesitation. I submit, that the right of the people of Algeria is and has become undeniable and debatable. At this session, this historic session, this session of Africa, no less than fourteen African States were declared independent and admitted as members of the U.N. We greeted them, and no one questioned their right to sovereignty. Why is it, that Algeria should be regarded different. Why should not Algeria be independent and admitted to the U.N. We would like seriously and sincerely to know the secret, if one has the genius to tell us the secret. In a recent editorial the New York Times stated the case as follows: "With fifteen former French African colonies newly independent this year it manifestly makes no sense for Algeria, for better developed than any of them, to be denied the self-determination that General de Gaulle promises. It also makes no sense for de Gaulle, the supreme pragmatist, to act as though this were not a matter of international concern and to refuse even to discuss the problem at the United Nations".

I would not say with the New York Times, that Algeria is better developed than many of the African States that were admitted to the U.N. No one is more delighted than the Algerian Government, and the independence of African States is a jubilee for the Algerian people. But as the New York Times has rightly observed it makes no sense to deny to the people of Algeria what has been recognized for their brethren in the same continent. What is the cause, what is the reason.

It has been said that in Algeria there are huge French interests and a large French minority. Let me deal with these counts one by one.

French interests, Mr. Chairman, are there in Algeria, as all colonial powers have been able to establish in their colonies. I do not wish to go into the origin of these interests, nor to say that they are valid or invalid. I should like only to say that no colonial power, France included, is without interests in the dependent territories. Yet those interests were never an impediment in the way of independence. India was the great pearl in the British Crown, but Britain has recognized the independence of India, preserving the legitimate interests they have. Colonial interests, particularly those that are legitimate, can only be saved through the recognition of independence. But when independence is denied, the colonial people rise to arms, and those interest become subjected to total destruction. We need not advise France on this matter, for France has a better and bitter lesson in Indo China, if France heeds the lessons of history.

Nevertheless, the Algerian Government was mindful of the question. Time and again Algeria has declared its readiness to respect the legitimate interests of France. Independence, to the Algerian Governments, is not isolation, but a prelude to free cooperation with all the nations of the world, and France included. In an official Algerian declaration it was stated that, "The Algerian people are not the enemy of France. Their only enemy is colonialism. "We envisage friendly cooperation with France. We place this within the following context: France, on the one hand, and the 'Maghreb' - free and united on the other. In the Maghreb, France could have a 'place of choice' in the economic sphere if France accepted a negotiated solution of the Algerian problem."

However, we must not forget that, it is through negotiations that these interests could be respected and protected.

But should the war continue, I am afraid it is going to be another Indo China, where France was driven out of the country, and her interests entirely destroyed.

Yet in examining the question of the European minority it is necessary to refute certain misrepresentations and dispel misapprehension. The problem becomes easy to understand and easy to tackle.

The major misrepresentation in connection with the European settlers, is their number and character. To manufacture a case against independence, France has always multiplied their number and their strength. At times France has put the number at over a million and a half. The truth of the matter is that this figure has been multiplied by two. In the *Annuaire Statistique d'Algeria*, the Europeans are estimated at 850,000 in a population of 10 millions. What is amusing, France includes with the French settlers the 150 thousand Algerian Jews. But the Jews of Algerian are not settlers. They are Algerians. The great majority have been in Algeria for two thousand years. Together with their Algerian compatriots the Jews of Algeria are struggling for the liberty of Algeria. They, too, have been victims of French discrimination on more than one occasion. In the battlefields, in the jails and in the military tribunals the Jews of Algeria are sharing with their Algerian countrymen the common destiny of one people striving for liberty in one and the same battlefield.

Another aspect to be noted is that the 850,000 Europeans are not French. They belong to different nationalities. When duties are in issue, France counts them French, when rights are at stake they are not. This is how France handles their status. In an official publication entitled "*La Cohabitation en Algerie*" it has been established that those Europeans are a mixture of all Mediterranean people who came to Algeria at different times. The earliest arrivals were the Spanish, settled in Oran, the Italians concentrated in the region of Constantine, and the

Maltese mainly established in the East. The great French authority, Raymond Aynard, writing in the "Bulletin of information of the Governor-General of Algeria", estimated that of the total of the Europeans, only 21 percent are of French origin. A Swedish writer has observed that "in the province of Oran the people speak far more Spanish than French." This fiction, therefore, about the French settlers in Algeria falls down shattered on the ground. To France, these settlers are no more than a catspaw to perpetuate the domination of Algeria.

But whether they are French, Spanish, Italian or Maltese why should they be a problem. What matters even if they be all French down to the core. Their status raises no difficulty. A free choice of two alternatives is freely open before them. First, they can choose to be Algerians and this is their right. They are Algerians. They are born in Algeria. They are entitled to all the rights of Algerian citizenship without discrimination on any ground whatsoever. Second, they can choose to remain French citizens, to be residents of Algeria and to exercise freely every lawful activity and enterprise in any of the fields of Algerian life.

But no matter what the choice of the Europeans may be, one important fact should not escape our attention. There shall be no discrimination in Algeria, on any ground whatsoever. There is no reason for the Europeans to be a minority. They can be Algerians in every respect enjoying the independence of Algeria to the contentment of their heart, just as the Americans of French, Italian and Spanish decent. Of course they will not be entitled to any special privileges in an independent Algeria, just as the Americans of French, Italian or Spanish origin. Equality before the law and equality of chances shall be the standard of life in independent Algeria.

These assertions, Mr. Chairman, are not my own. This is the position of the Government of Algeria declared on every occasion.

On April 16, 1956, a Declaration of the F.L.N. stated:

"In a free Algerian State, the European minority will enjoy full equality of the rights and responsibilities, with no discrimination of any sort".

In a resolution adopted by the F.L.N. in August 20, 1956, it was declared that:

"... The Algerian Revolution is neither a civil war, nor a religious war. The Algerian Revolution wishes to set up a social and democratic republic guaranteeing a real equality between all the citizens of a common country, without discrimination".

On September 26, 1958, in the First Policy Statement of the Provisional Government of Algeria, Premier Ferhat Abbas declared:

"It is certain that Algeria, freed of colonialists, will have neither first nor second class citizens. The Algerian Republic will make no distinction due to race or religion among those who wish to remain Algerians. All legitimate interests will be respected".

The Algerian Government has spared no effort and missed no occasion to reaffirm its policy on the question of the Europeans of Algeria, or the French in Algeria, if you please. Recently, on February 17, 1960, Premier Ferhat Abbas has extended to the Europeans a moving appeal in the most moving terms. He declared:

"Algeria is the patrimony of all. For several generations, you have called yourselves Algerians. Who denies you this title?"

"Algeria for all Algerians, whatever be their origin. This formula is not a fiction. It translates a living reality, based on a common life ..."

"... In the Algerian Republic which we shall build together, there will be room for all, work for all ... We want you to participate in this construction".

After these solemn declarations, Mr. Chairman, after this most democratic stand of the Algerian Government, what more are the people of Algeria expected to offer. This is the most generous and chivalrous stand that could ever be taken by a responsible government. I say generous and chivalrous, for I do not wish to unfold the sad chapter of French expropriation and dispossession to which the people of Algeria were subject. With independence granted, this chapter can stay closed, and closed forever.

In this regard I must say we should not pay the slightest attention to the rioting and opposition of those who are described as the French ultras in Algeria. They are an insignificant minority. The rest of the Europeans wish to live in peace in Algeria-and peace, no doubt shall be their lot. But these ultras are simply spoiled by the protection of some militant circles in France. When independence is recognized to Algeria, these ultras will behave well. They will hope no more for privileges and distinctions, and no more will those privileges and distinctions be protected. In the independent and fully sovereign State of Algeria shall reign the great motto of France: "Fraternite, Egalite et Liberte".

But in order to close this sad chapter forever, the United Nations should play its role to open a new chapter to be bright forever. The United Nations cannot behold a war and sit back, legs stretched and arms folded. The United Nations cannot witness the calamity of a whole people and stay in a tower of indifference or resignation. The destiny, the dignity, the whole life, present and future, of ten millions of your brethren is at stake. Peace and tranquility of the region is at stake too. Let us

see what is the role of the United Nations in 1960-a role which should exclude the problem of Algeria from our Agenda in 1961.

In the course of our deliberations on this question for the last six years, I do submit, Mr. Chairman, that we must have learned a great deal. I pray that we are guided by what we learn, moved by what we yearn and profit by what we earn. I contend, and rightly so, that we have gained no little experience about the political and psychological attitude of France towards the problem of Algeria. We cannot deny that President de Gaulle has crossed the Rubicon as no one before has done. But the bridge he has laid is swinging in all directions, and it is for the United Nations to establish a solid bridge where freedom and democracy can travel safe into Algeria-and this is where the United Nations' role lies. We may be reminded that President de Gaulle is putting the whole question before France to decide. A referendum is underway.

Here in the United Nations we can only take note of this fact. The French referendum is a domestic affair which should have no bearing on our deliberations, nor should it influence our line of action. Feeling that he is challenged at home, President de Gaulle seeks to secure the confidence of France, or if you choose, to ascertain the wishes of France on the question of Algeria. The masses in France, we believe, just as all the masses in the world when left to their instinct. Are in support of freedom. But no matter what the outcome of this referendum may be, the right of Algeria to self determination stands unchallenged. The right of the people of Algeria to independence does not stem from the wishes of France, nor is it influenced one way or the other by the referendum of President de Gaulle. Of course, we will rejoice if France turns out to be in support of the independence of Algeria, but we will not be deflected from our objectives or arrested from action, here in the United Nations, if France chooses differently. It is the choice of Algeria, in full freedom, which counts. That is

the criterion, the sole criterion. The United Nations therefore, should undertake a plebiscite in Algeria to ascertain the wishes of the people of Algeria, under conditions of liberty, tranquility and regularity.

I have suggested a United Nations plebiscite simply because we have to be fair to all. We must administer justice to all, and to all we must extend equity. France is a party, the warring party, and it is inconceivable to place the destiny of Algeria in the hands of France. Algeria is at war because of France, and it is flagrantly unjust to let the Algerian Plebiscite fall under the mercy of France.

In the second place, the whole administration in Algeria is entirely antagonistic to the people of Algeria and hostile to their national aspirations. It is a colonial administration, and since when has a colonial administration been fair and just to the colonial people.

In the third place, the French army and security forces in Algeria are deeply indoctrinated with hate to the principle of self determination. In a message addressed to the Commanding General of French forces in Algeria, the Minister of War in France stated: "Once the political future of Algeria is regulated, the army will remain in Algeria in order to assure its permanent mission-the common defense of France and Algeria." With such a message extended to the French army in Algeria how can we be confident that a plebiscite under France, would possibly be free.

Again, it is a fact that every French soldier who goes to fight in Algeria is given a booklet, on the front of which there is a statement to say that Algeria is not entitled to independent nationality but rather that Algerians are French citizens. With such teachings how can we be confident, Mr. Chairman, that a plebiscite under France would possibly be free?

In the third place, the government of France itself is sworn at heart to combat the principle of self-determination. In his directives addressed to the Delegate General in Algeria, Mr. Debre, the Prime Minister of France, gave the following instructions: "The essential point ... is to work every possible way so that the choice of minds will be made against secession for the triumph of a close union with France". With such directives, by the Prime Minister of France, how can we hope, Mr. Chairman, that a plebiscite under France would possibly be free.

In the fourth place, which is most important, President de Gaulle, has a special concept, a particular definition and a typical application of the principle of self determination-factors that strip self determination from its flesh, bone and nerve. In his statement of September 1959, President de Gaulle spoke to the Algerians as "individuals". He denied the historic fact of the Algerian unity and sovereignty. He threatened the choice of independence with poverty, chaos, slaughter and a communist dictatorship. He held rewards to a choice of Federation. He promised partition to the French through regroupment. He envisaged the slicing of the Sahara because of its oil.

In subsequent statements President de Gaulle has revealed further definitions of the Principle of self determination. In a message addressed to the armed forces in Algeria, President de Gaulle declared: "At the Present time ... it is necessary ... to give Algerians ... every moral and material reason to want to be united with France". In one of his tours, President de Gaulle proclaimed "we wish peace in Algeria first, to maintain France in Algeria, but obviously in different condition". With these statements by president de Gaulle, how can we be confident that a plebiscite under France, would possibly be free.

Even in the course of this session, Mr. Chairman, President de Gaulle has given the most conclusive evidence, that a

plebiscite under France, by the nature of things, would be devoid of freedom and pregnant with illegality. In an address dated November 4, 1960, only a month ago, President de Gaulle stated "we would take the measures necessary in order to safeguard, on the one hand, those of the Algerians who would like to remain French, and on the other hand, our interests". Does this not, Mr. Chairman, betray the partition of Algeria.

In addition, President de Gaulle, has referred to the government of Algeria as "the rebel chiefs who have lived outside Algeria for six years", and that they are taking the position as if "they had been appointed beforehand, and appointed by me, as the rulers of Algeria". This is not a fair statement Mr. Chairman, neither to the government of Algeria nor to the glorious record of General de Gaulle as the head of the liberation movement of France. General de Gaulle himself was away from France for a number of years, leading the French liberation movement from London and from Africa. That was a grace no a disgrace for General de Gaulle. On the other hand I must say that the Government of Algeria did not seek, and never will seek to be appointed as the rulers of Algeria. Ferhat Abbas and his colleagues would wish to be chosen by their people and not appointed by President de Gaulle. Their aim is the independence of their country whether they are chosen by their people or not just as President de Gaulle has struggled for the liberty of France without at first being chosen by France. Had Ferhat Abbas and his colleagues been concerned only to be appointed as rulers of Algeria, they would have not led the Algerian war. There is a shorter cut at a cheaper cost: to be quislings or vichists. But they have chosen to be Algerian patriots, and in the French term, de Gaullists striving to emancipate their country from the last vestiges of French colonialism.

Further in his speech, President de Gaulle speaks of an Algerian Algeria. But it is evident, from his references, that what is at the back of the mind and heart of France is a special Algerian Algeria. It will be another vichy government on Algerian soil ready by her vote, as worded by President de Gaulle, "to turn the defacto situation into a dejure situation. This situation is one of an Algeria which, I believe with all my heart and with my mind, would choose to be united with France". These are the very words of President de Gaulle, not as translated from French by me or by the New York Times. This is the text that was mailed to our Delegation, by the Ambassade De France, Service De Press Et D'information, 972 Fifth Avenue, New York. With such a statement by President de Gaulle how can we, Mr. Chairman, be confident that a plebiscite under France would possibly be free.

For all these considerations, Mr. Chairman, the Algerian Plebiscite must be directly under the United Nations. If France is sincere, and we hope she is, there should be no objection to the United Nations under taking the plebiscite. If France harbours certain plans, as some of us believe, this is the more valid reason for the United Nations to step in, for this is the only guarantee for the freedom of choice.

In this regard I am authorized by the provisional government of Algeria to say on their behalf that they accept the result of a free plebiscite in Algeria organized by the United Nations-a plebiscite free from the pressures, the inducements and the threats of every thing French in Algeria. If the outcome is integration or federation, we will accept the choice. If the outcome is independence, as we are sure it will be, France is bound to accept, and bound to leave the people of Algeria go free.

I must stress, however, that there should be no reason for France to resist a United Nations plebiscite. The term plebiscite

itself is borrowed from French. In the days of Napoleon III it was applied in the case of Savoy and Nice, and in the duchies of North Italy. The Peace Conference of 1919 proposed the taking of 17 plebiscites. The plebiscite of the Saar of 1935 resulted in its return to Germany. In the 1947 plebiscite, the Saar voted to return to France. Such plebiscites were run internationally, not nationally, and under international machinery.

There is however, more reason for an United Nations plebiscite in Algeria, for Algeria was never French, and never will Algeria be French. 130 years Francization has failed to make a French Algeria, and the time has come to admit the historic fact that Algeria was and will remain an Arab country, part and parcel of the continent of Africa.

In stressing the necessity for a United plebiscite in Algeria, I should like to remind you that in his statement of September 1959, reaffirmed in his statement of November 1960, President de Gaulle said he would invite representatives of information media from all the world as observers to witness the validity of the plebiscite. Well, this is the more demanding ground, for the plebiscite to be carried by the United Nations. If you accept the newspapermen as observers, why don't you accept Mr. Hammarskjold to conduct the operation. Mr. Hammarskjold has the confidence of France, the government of Algeria, the States of Africa, and the United Nations.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me conclude with the words of one of the greatest of living men. He is a great, great leader, about to make history. If you fail to guess, I shall give you his name at the end.

Speaking on Algeria the great leader said, "the most powerful single force in the world today is neither communism nor capitalism, neither the H bomb nor the guided missile-it is man's eternal desire to be free and independent".

Urging his people to combat imperialism, the great leader said: "On this test, ... (our) nation shall be critically judged by the uncommitted millions in Asia and Africa ... If we fail to meet the challenge ... of western imperialism, then no amount of foreign aid, no aggrandizement of arms ... can prevent further setbacks to our security".

Speaking specifically on Algeria, the great leader said "There are many cases of the clash between independence and imperialism in the western world. But again, one, above all the rest, is critically outstanding today-Algeria".

Speaking about the N.A.T.O., the great leader said "the war in Algeria, engaging more than 400,000 French soldiers has stripped the ... forces of the N.A.T.O. to the bone."

Stating the evils of the Algerian war, the great man said "It has affected our standing in the eyes of the free world, our leadership in the fight to keep that world free, our prestige and our security ...".

Referring to the impact of war on France, the great leader said, "The war in Algeria has steadily drained the manpower, the resources and the spirit of one of our oldest and most important allies ...".

Stressing with anger the international character of the problem of Algeria, the great leader said, "No. Algeria is no longer a problem for the French alone-nor will it ever be again".

Correcting the common error about the number of the Europeans in Algeria, the great leader said, "The French population is considered as being a million, if they were counted strictly, the number might be found to be as low as 700,000".

Referring to the question of negotiations, the great leader said, "In my opinion ... France should carry on negotiations with the nationalists on the basis of (independence).

Filled with anger because of American military assistance to France, the great leader said, "Instead of contributing our efforts to a cease fire and settlement, American military equipment-particularly helicopters, purchased in this country ... has been used against the rebels ...".

Condemning the record of the U.S. on the question of Algeria, the great leader said, "This is not a record to view with pride as Independence Day approaches ... The record of the U.S. in the case of Algeria is a retreat from the principles of independence and anticolonialism".

Mindful of the tolerance of Algeria, the great leader said, "I do not believe that when the settlement is made, any French there should be driven out or should have their property expropriated".

Addressing a word of counsel to France and the western nations, the great leader said: "Whether France likes it or not, admits it or not, or has our support or not, their overseas territories are ... eventually going to break free and look with suspicion on the western nations who impeded their steps to independence".

Advocating the independence of Algeria, the great leader said, "No amount of politeness ... should blind either France or the U.S. to the fact that if France ... (is) to have an influence in North Africa ... then the essential first step is the independence of Algeria along the lines of Tunisia and Morocco".

This great leader, Mr. Chairman, is the President elect Mr. Kennedy. The quotations I have recited are taken from a speech he made in the Senate, on July 2, 1957, and as lengthy as my speech of today. I seize this occasion to pay our great respect to the great leader for the great support he extended to the cause of Algeria.

But I have not made these quotations simply for an ordinary recital. I have read them to demand of our colleagues of the western powers to support the independence of Algeria. I say demand, for, having heard the forceful statement of Mr. Kennedy we are fully entitled to demand of you to support the freedom of Algeria.

I am addressing myself at this moment to the western powers, for in the words of Mr. Kennedy, it is the western states who are impeding the independence of Algeria. In stressing for the independence of Algeria some of you might say that we are extremists, harsh and brutal. But here is before you the statement of Mr. Kennedy which speaks in the same tone and in the same language, and the time has now come for that statement to be translated into action.

I did not address myself to the Soviet bloc, because ever since the United Nations became seized of the problem of Algeria, they have supported the cause of Algeria without any reservation. Such a support, with motive or no motive is admirable and praiseworthy. What is worse for you is to be on the side of colonialism, when you claim to be the free world.

I make this challenge so brutally, if you please, because the sufferings of the people of Algeria are unspeakably brutal.

In this challenge which I place before the west, face to face, at point blank, I should like them to remember that your great leader, the leader of the western powers, has squarely placed the issue before you to choose. Your choice is either for independence or for imperialism.

It is my prayer, Mr. Chairman, that the choice of the west led by the U.S. would be on the side of independence.

This course, Mr. Chairman, is worthy for the United Nations, for the cause of peace and for the cause of human dignity.

That is our hope, our trust and our prayers.

Palestine ...

The chairman of the Saudi Arabian Delegation referred to the Palestine Question in his main speech during the general debate in the General Assembly on September 30, 1960. He intervened, thereafter, three times on this matter. Mr. Shukairy exercised his right to rebut the arguments advanced by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Israel, Mrs. Golda Meir, on October 11, 1960. He delivered his main speech on that item on November 14, 1960 in the Special Political Committee. Finally, Mr. Shukairy made a statement in which he elaborated on various points that were raised in his previous speech in the Committee.

The following is the text of the portion of Mr. Shukairy's general debate speech pertaining to Palestine:

Permit me, Sir, to turn now to another cause of justice and self-determination. It is the problem of another people striving to restore their national life, to live in dignity in their homeland, and to exercise their inherent right of self-determination. The homeland is Palestine and the people are its lawful and legitimate nation.

This session, Mr. President, offers a commanding-a-demanding occasion, to state the Arab position on the question of Palestine fully, frankly, and to the last point of finality. I propose to undertake this task for many reasons.

In the first place, this is a unique meeting of so many heads of governments that, in the interests of peace, the case of the people of Palestine should be presented in full. The Palestine case is still misrepresented, and the Zionist forces are never tired of distorting the truth.

In the second place, the admission of new members has brought into this organization new nations that shook off the shackles of colonialism. In a short while, the United Nations

would embrace one hundred state members, thus doubling its membership.

It would become a new United Nations, quite different from the United Nations of 1945. It would be a United Nations impregnable to group pressure, and immune to power politics. The United Nations of 1947 which had written the Palestine catastrophe into the annals of history, will exist no more. Today, we have a United Nations that is ready not only to do justice, but to undo injustice.

The second reason, Mr. President, which calls for the presentation of the Palestine problem, apart from the continuity of its tragedy, is to be found in the statement made from this rostrum by His Excellency, Dr. Nkrumah, the President of Ghana.

This statement, Mr. President, on the part of President Nkrumah, has made it imperative that the crucial issue in the Palestine question be placed squarely before the Assembly and before world public opinion. President Nkrumah is a great national hero, whose impressions on the Palestine question do call for a frank statement on the matter—a statement of solid fact, that takes care of the merits, of the justice, and of the equality of the cause.

I shall not, Mr. President, dig deep into the archives of the history of the problem. I do not propose to tell you of the illegality of the Balfour Declaration of 1917 under which the British had promised to offer the Jews a country which none of them did own, and neither did possess. In the same manner, it is not my desire to speak on the Mandate of Palestine of 1922, which was designed by the League of Nations as a sacred trust of civilization to prepare the people of Palestine for independence as in the case of the other Arab countries, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq and Jordan, who won their sovereignty and independence. In the same manner, I shall not attempt to put the United Kingdom in

the dock, to address to Sir Harold Macmillan, a question, a devastating question, where is the independent state of Palestine whose creation was entrusted to Great Britain as a mandatory power by the League of Nations.

Neither will I advance the irrefutable argument that the United Nations in 1947 had no right to partition a country against the will of its people, any more than the United Nations now has any authority to partition the Congo or any other territory. Nor will I refer you to the seventy-five resolutions so far passed by the United Nations dealing with various aspects of the question of Palestine. Likewise, I shall not invoke the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly, that urged the repatriation of the refugees-resolutions which Israel has resisted time and again.

Nor will I place before you a whole file of extracts from the reports of the United Nations mediator, Count Bernadotte, and the Palestine Conciliation-all disclosing the defiance of Israel and her refusal to abide by the United Nations Resolutions-a defiance attended with adamant ingratitude and rebellion.

All this history, Mr. President, I shall discard for a moment. I shall confine myself to one major fact which will dispose of the whole issue, a fact which I hope will commend itself to the mind and heart of Dr. Nkrumah as a hero of a heroic people.

I stress people, for people is not an expression. It is not a term. It is a concept of life, a concept of human existence. It is the highest embodiment of human society-indeed, the most sacred.

Again, I stressed people, precisely because the Palestine question is a problem of people; a whole people, clamouring to live in dignity in their homeland, just as the people of Ghana are

living in dignity in their homeland, and enjoying their joys, at home under the leadership of their hero, President Nkrumah.

Let us, Mr. President, brush aside resolutions and records-although they do support our cause-let us set aside the charter-although its principles are on our side-let us leave aside all the dictates of law, justice and democracy, although they all corroborate our cause. Leave that all, and let us speak in human terms-in terms that even a man in the street can easily understand, fully comprehend, and readily grasp.

Here is a case of a people-who have lived in their land of generations and generations, since immemorial time-Palestine is their home, just as Ghana is the home of its people, and just as any homeland is the home of its people-adored in love, worshipped in affection, and consecrated in sacrifice.

This people, the people of Palestine, have lived their lives in their homeland. They built their mosques and churches and synagogues-they established their towns and villages. They have made great fortunes and accumulated treasures of possession. In their country, they breathed their hopes and aspirations. They admired their glories-they wailed their defeats-they sang their joy; and to the graveyards they carried their fathers, their grandfathers and all those they have loved. In a word, they have made history when many a country was not on record in the annals of history.

These people of Palestine, Mr. President, are now living in exile for more than a decade, away from their homes, dispossessed of their properties, and what is more, beholding thousands and thousands of Jewish immigrants occupy their houses, seize their farms, usurp their towns and villages, and lay hands on incalculable possessions-the toil, the sweat and the labour of generation after generation.

If we are to face the realities of the situation, then, gentlemen, this is the real situation. This is the tragic situation, which must capture our minds and our hearts.

No one, Mr. President, with a clear conscience and with a minimum of feelings of human brotherhood can deny to the people of Palestine the right of repatriation-the right to go back to their homes-to live their lives in their homeland.

Many of you, gentlemen, have been refugees, or political exiles, away from your homeland, longing, in agony-in anguish, to go back home. So you know what it means to be a refugee-to be in exile. It means nostalgia at the climax. It means despair eat the peak. It also means hate, and the right to human hate. It means war, and the right to war-in defense of your fatherland and what your fatherland stands for.

The matter is not to seek measures to guarantee no attack between the Arab States and Israel, as suggested by President Nkrumah. In the main, the problem is one that belongs to the people of Palestine. It is true that the Arab States are one in support of the cause of Palestine. But the main party are the people of Palestine themselves.

It is they who are to decide for themselves. The people of Palestine are not a flock of sheep that could be ignored so lightly-neither could their existence as a nation be dismissed so easily. The people of Palestine, an ancient Arab nation, are with no little contributions to world civilization. As part of Arab awakening, they have started their national movement long before many nations represented in this organization had stood on their feet. They have fought the British with bravery and chivalry, for a period of 30 years, to achieve their independence.

They have sent their delegations to London and to Geneva under the League of Nations to express their national aspirations. They have been represented in the United Nations. A number of

resolutions on Palestine passed by the General Assembly and the Security Council, have been addressed to the people of Palestine. Their peoplehood has been recognized and their national existence has never been denied.

This is, Mr. President, the case of the people of Palestine in its virgin simplicity, and in its real reality. It is the case of a people and their right to their homeland-let no one dare from this rostrum deny to the people their existence as a people their undestructible right-their imprescriptible right-to their homeland. Let us speak not, if we cannot speak justice.

I shall not, however, leave the matter without looking at the other side of the picture-which was made the other side of the picture.

The plea is often advanced that Israel is a sovereign state, and can admit any or exclude any. This is fallacious.

The people of Palestine have pre-existed the existence of Israel-and no sovereignty can be exercised to bar the people from their country. To exclude a people from their homeland is no sovereignty-it is banditry.

Another argument put forward is that the security of Israel does not permit large scale repatriation of the Arab refugees. Again, this is ridiculous and blasphemous. No state is justified to secure its security by the exclusion of the people. A state that can only maintain its security by the denial of the right of the people to their homeland, is not worthy of survival; neither can it possess the status of sovereignty. Such a state is not worthy of statehood.

All these and similar arguments fall to the ground. There is nothing in the charter, nothing in the grey-haired international law, and nothing in the recorded precedents of the history of mankind which justifies the exclusion of a people-a whole people from their home-land. And we beg of President Nkrumah, with

his vast knowledge of international affairs to point out one precedent, just one single precedent, to this effect.

The proposal to guarantee non-attack between the Arab states and Israel is prima facie daring and attractive. But only to those who do not know, or those who are immune to know. Nevertheless, when they begin to know they will realize the magnitude of the problem-they will sound its depth; they will sense its stirrings, and feel its agitations. And it is only when you feel it profoundly, that you can judge, and judge judiciously and equitably. Let us take one instance-without making a finding in respect of its merits.

In his statement before the Assembly, President Eisenhower has referred in the most moving words to the imprisonment by the Soviet Union of two of the crew of the American aircraft that was shot down last July. President Eisenhower referred to this episode as one of the problems "troubling" the United States and the nations of the world.

Well, this is a contrast for us to consider-to ponder. If the imprisonment of two crews should be of great concern and should so disturb the United States as to compel President Eisenhower to bring the matter before the notice of the United Nations-how much more perturbed, inflamed and tormented should be the Arab feelings to see a whole people of their kith and kin, lead a life of exile in misery-in hardship-in distress, and in isolation. And here we come to be told that we should face the political realities of the situation.

Thus, Mr. President, before we speak of non-attack, let us attack the problem down to the root. Let us talk plainly. Let us apply our minds properly-let us think conscientiously. We cannot simply be asked to recognize the political realities without scrutiny and without balanced evaluation. To recognize the political realities, I am afraid, is a colonial expression. Rather, it

is a colonial philosophy which has inadvertently crept into our minds.

We should not be misled by such a maxim which does not take account of the justice of a cause. An aggression can be a political reality. A violation of the Charter, of the Human Rights, and of the fundamental freedoms can establish political realities. Colonialism and imperialism after gaining root do give rise to political realities and how often they did.

Should we then accept aggression, abide by violation, and bow to colonialism? We cannot accept a situation which is the culmination of injustice. We cannot accept a situation, the fruition of aggression or a flagrant denial of inherent rights-God-given rights. This is too dangerous a stand, to accept, or to defend.

We must warn all the small nations-they must be on their guard. They should be on the lookout lest they fall victim to political realities. We, the small nations, survive not through our might, but through our right. We exist by justice, not by expedience or convenience. So let us not waiver-let us not defeat the very principles that gave rise to our being. This is a world of wonders and surprises. A small nation, any small nation, could be overrun by aggression. Its independence may become in danger. The integrity of its territory may be threatened.

How could such a situation be resisted if we are called upon to recognize it as a reality. Colonialism and imperialism have coined many phrases-many arguments to defend their position. "We must recognize the political realities" is one such argument. Colonial powers are in the habit of falling back on such a line of defence. They take refuge behind such a slogan when they are not at their pleasure to do justice or to undo injustice. This has become the habit of the colonial powers-let us not develop their habits. Let us not speak their language. We, the

small nations, who are sworn to defend the cause of freedom, should not harness justice to such slogans.

Of similar danger, Mr. President, with reference to the Palestine question, are the statements uttered from another rostrum by Vice President Nixon and Senator Kennedy, the two candidates for the United States election.

Messrs, Nixon and Kennedy, although at variance on a number of matters of foreign policy, have made public pledges to Israel in identical terms. The difference is only one of degree and of tone. Hence, no matter who wins, we can take these pledges to be the cornerstone of the policy of the U.S. with regard to the Palestine question. In fact, they reveal nothing basically new, except that the U.S. has not profited from the bitter experience of her policy in Palestine-a policy which has alienated the feelings of the Arab world and which, if continued, is bound to lead to an irreparable damage.

In substance, Mr. President, Kennedy and Nixon have declared that he who succeeds to occupy the White House will not hesitate to support Israel. They have stressed that the Suez Canal should be open to Israeli shipping. They have praised the efforts of Israel in every field of political and economic life. They have spoken of industry thriving-of agriculture progressing-of the desert blossoming and the rest of the Zionist propaganda. Hearing all this, Mr. President, one is led to think that Nixon and Kennedy are running for Israeli elections-for Israeli Presidency, and not for the Presidency of the United States.

From these statements, it seemed, Mr. President, as though the whole world is Israel, and Israel is the whole world.

The Arab peoples, eighty million, with their material and spiritual power, occupying as they do their strategic sub-continent, mean nothing to the U.S. To Vice President Nixon and his rival it was sufficient to declare that Israel is there to stay, and

that is all-that is enough. They did not, for a single moment, deem it proper to declare that also the people of Palestine, are there to stay and to stay in their homeland. Yet we are bound to ask what is meant, when the saying goes that Israel is there to stay? Does it mean that Israel is there to stay-to usurp Arab lands and properties, to entice the millions of Jews of the world to migrate to a country which they have never known? Does it mean that Israel is there to stay, to commit aggression of all sorts and expansions in all directions? This is what it means for Israel to stay. Israel, with the Zionist programme inherent in her basic policy, is dedicated to aggression, and pledged to expansion. In fact, the establishment of Israel, was the culmination of aggression and expansion.

Yet the question may be asked, what is the solution? What is the way out?

This is a pertinent question, that should be answered honestly and seriously. I say seriously, for the issue is one of peace or war, not only for the Middle East but for the world at large. And should testimony be required-suffice it to recall the Israeli war in 1956, which had virtually placed the world right at the brink of war. So what is the solution?

If we are, Mr. President, to take the present situation as a starting point, I have no solution to offer. Neither will there be any solution, and let things go-let events drift to their destined destiny. But if we are here to make peace with justice, as strongly voiced by President Eisenhower, then the solution will commend itself, by itself to the U.N.

The master key to the solution, lies in repatriation. The refugees must go back to their homeland. This is the inherent, unassailable right which has been recognized and reaffirmed in all the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly in each and every session.

On the other hand, we have to remember that thousands and thousands of Jews, now in Israel, have discovered that they have been deceived. They are not at home, for Palestine is not their homeland. Israel has proved to be, for them, a lamentable deception.

The Jews in Israel are at last finding the truth themselves. By instinct and experience, the Jew in Israel has made many conclusions. To him this experiment of creating Israel in spite of all colorful paintings has proved to be a failure. Israel lacks viability-Israel cannot survive indefinitely through outside assistance and grants-in-aid. Politically, economically, and socially it is impossible for Israel to fit in within the pattern of the Middle-East. Israel, a mass alien infiltration, is not Asian, nor African, any more than the aliens who set foot on the soil of Africa or Asia with the advent of colonialism. The Arab States did not and will not recognize Israel. This is their sovereign right. And neither will they have any dealings with Israel in any manner. The creation of Israel has doubled manifold the very same evils which it sought to avoid. The whole experiment has failed.

That is how the ordinary Jew in Israel is thinking. He is right, by all means. He has become eager to go back home. He, to, wants repatriation. Israel to him is a life of exile. These are his conclusions. No less than 170,000 Jews have left Israel in the last few years. If it proves anything, this Jewish migration from Israel does certainly prove that 170,000 Jews have reached these conclusions, and the number is rising-all in the direction of repatriation-outside Israel.

With this in mind, Mr. President, conditions can be seen to move towards the natural direction-with the Jews of Israel allowed a free exit from Palestine, the situation would go back to normal. There would only remain those Jews who are the legitimate citizens of the country-not the aliens.

The choice would, then, be open for peaceful co-existence. We emphasize peaceful co-existence, for with Zionism there cannot be peaceful co-existence. With aggression and expansion there cannot be peaceful co-existence—a principle which can only be applied when the existence is legitimate and lawful. For who can co-exist with an aggressor? The Palestine Problem is not a question of ideological conflict. It is the homeland which is at stake—which is the whole issue. When the very existence of your people is the question, there cannot be peaceful co-existence. Self-defence becomes over-riding and paramount.

After repatriation, the legitimate people of Palestine, Arabs and Jews, could, then, start a life of peaceful co-existence. In fact, before Zionism, Arabs and Jews have lived in peaceful co-existence long before this principle became a political terminology, let alone a political concept.

With such an approach, Mr. President, conditions would be brought back to normal. The people of Palestine, the Arabs and Jews determined to live in peace together, would establish the independent state of Palestine, worthy to occupy its seat in the United Nations—a state representing not aliens, but the legitimate citizens of the country. Moslems, Christians and Jews alike. The Holy Land, sacred to the three great religions would become again the land of peace, the land that has given the world the message of peace.

Let me turn now, Mr. President, with all alertness to the colossal problem, which cuts through each and every international problem of any dimension. Without much to say, it is the question of the general international situation, regarding which we have a proposal to make.

I have made it my intention to deal with this problem at the end of my statement, because in this vicious circle which is holding the international situation in strangulation, the end and

the beginning can be at any given point. You need only to break through.

Mr. President, without being unduly pessimistic the present international situation seems to us to engender tension, suspicion, and anxiety. This is our fifteenth year after World War II, but the hopes and expectations for a world peace have not been realized.

It is true that we are not at war, but it is tragically true that we are not in peace. The world is simply held under the shadow of an armed armistice, broken in flames that flare up every once in a while, here or there.

On the questions of the prohibition of atomic weapons and disarmament, no progress has been made, except the voluminous literature of plans and counterplans, arguments and cross arguments, and acrimony versus acrimony.

Similarly, Mr. President, the explosive political problems of the world stand today unsolved as ever. The question of Germany and Berlin, the Far East and the Middle East are growing in magnitude and complexity.

At present we have something more. Africa has been thrown into the Cold War. And we have been told from this rostrum of the danger of war by miscalculation.

This is, Mr. President, too intolerable a situation for the peoples of the world to tolerate. The U.N., in spite of its success in some political, economic and cultural matters, has failed in the great issue of war or peace.

The U.N. is torn in this East and West conflict. The issue of war or peace cannot be decided by votes-by a majority or minority. We have to look for another pattern in another framework where this issue, the burning issue, can be resolved.

Surely, Mr. President, the Summit is the way out. But what Summit? What kind of Summit?

In the past, we had a Summit meeting which generated the Geneva Spirit, only to be evaporated before the great four got back home. Again, the Camp David meetings between Eisenhower and Khrushchev were very, very cordial and pleasant, but subsequent events have proved that the warring David of the Bible did not leave Camp David in Peace.

Again the Paris Summit which had raised high hopes was closed before it was opened. It is no use examining the causes. At the present moment, bygones are bygones, and if a condemnation be passed, it will be futile.

Today, the idea of a Summit is gaining ground, particularly so when many of the leaders have come to the U.N. They are at hand, here in New York.

We stand for a Summit Meeting-but in what manner?

I ask in what manner, for it is the manner which was a major reason for the failure of the past Summit, and will continue to be for any future Summit, should we continue in the same manner.

So far, Mr. President, the Summit is conceived in one shape-and one shape only. The participation of the Big Four, the U.S.S.R., the U.K., the United States, and France. Such a composition is a failure, it has been a failure and shall be a failure. It will lead nowhere. I dare say, it will lead to a fiasco, in continuity and perpetuity. The Big Four, being what they are, cannot agree. Three of them are on one side of the table as a majority, with superiority complex. And the fourth, on the other side of the table, is a minority with a minority complex, too. How can we hope for the Big Four to agree? This is no time of miracles, or magic making. The Big Four cannot agree in their air tight division.

The Western Big Three are in fact the United States, and the United States only. This is a vibrant reality which it is no use to deny; neither is it a shame to admit. The United Kingdom and France, with all due respect, have little to say when the United States is in the Summit Conference. The two giants, the United States and the Soviet Union, can talk to each other with full authority as representing two dramatically opposed worlds.

But the two giants should not be left alone, since the chance for agreement is meager-and poorly meager. We have to look to another force. The vital issue of war or peace is not the monopoly of the mighty, and the powerful. There are other nations whose contribution is immeasurable, and highly called for.

With Eisenhower and Khrushchev, there must be in the Summit Conference some other leaders who have distinguished themselves not only as national heroes but also as international figures, dedicated to the cause of justice and peace. We propose that the Summit should include those leaders who have preached and practiced the policy of positive neutrality. At the present moment I shall not propose their names. They are too well known. At this stage we should concentrate our efforts to bring the proposal home to the Assembly. Once that stage is reached the Assembly will have no difficulty making the choice. This will not be a problem.

With President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev, the participation of the leaders of positive neutrality in the Summit will not only bring a new approach, a new outlook, but will be a coordinating, a stabilizing, and a mediating force, able to compose the differences of East and West in the best interests of peace-peace with justice.

Such, Mr. President, would be a balanced Summit-the world in miniature. Such a Summit, Mr. President, with such a

participation marks a new chapter in the history of international relations.

Indeed, Mr. President, we can embark on a new era-an historic era which we pray will lead mankind on a high road of peace-peace to those living, and to those unborn-to the present generation, and all generations to come. Thus make it, God.

Mr. Shukairy's response to the Foreign Minister of Israel's speech is hereby reproduced:

Yesterday, the statement of the representative of Israel has shown that the term "right of reply" is too modest a term to invoke and too flimsy a norm to employ. We exercise a right of reply to answer a misrepresentation, to impeach an argumentation, to straighten out an inaccuracy or to defeat a testimony, but when a statement is a total falsity, a wilful distortion and an entire subversion of truth, the term "right of reply" does not measure up to the situation. We must then look for another term, another remedy, and this is what the statement of Israel calls for. It calls not for a right of reply, but for a right of erasion, a total erasion from the United Nations records, if we are to keep our records in order and in dignity.

This is not a sweeping statement or a pronouncement of verbal exaggeration. Let us take the Israeli statement, one distortion after the other. In presenting her case, the lady from Israel raised the issue of war in Palestine. Mrs. Meir claimed that severn Arab armies have marched across their boundaries with the proclaimed purpose of destroying Israel, its villages, its cities, and its population. I do not wish to go into the records of history. This is a heart-breaking story to tell here in detail after fifteen years of tragedy and catastrophe, a tragedy that has uprooted a whole people from their homeland.

Mrs. Meir is right when she asserts that the refugees are a victim of war. It is true that there was war in Palestine and the

refugees are its victims, but the war was waged by Israel. It was a war that started with terror by Israel in 1940 and which ended in the creation of Israel in 1948. The Jewish armies were not virtually unarmed, as claimed, as phrased, as eloquently worded by Mrs. Meir. They were armed to the teeth, and their tactics were pillage, plunder, destruction and extermination.

Let me rush straight to the facts, facts that were reported not by Arab sources, but by an official, independent organ. I refer to the Anglo-American Commission which was despatched to inquire into and report on the distorted situation of Palestine. What were the findings of that Commission, Mrs. Meir? This is the answer for you, if an answer can be provided. These findings were a devastating rebuttal of the statement of the lady from Israel. The Anglo-American Commission of Enquiry found:

"Palestine is an armed camp with a revival of mass, illegal Jewish immigration on a large scale. The organization of the Haganah, the Israel military force, the Jewish army over 60,000 strong, well armed, procuring its arms since a number of years".

This army which Mrs. Meir claimed to be virtually unarmed was, in fact, unarmed, but from the code of war and from the true traditions of war. It simply spread terror, destruction, fire and committed acts of lawlessness in the Holy Land. No Arab town, no Arab village was spared, open and undefended as they were. Brutal acts were committed without discrimination between men and women, young or old.

The Anglo-American Commission has narrated all these shocking incidents in the most graphic terms. I shall not read the details; permit me only to read the titles of some of the acts committed by the Jewish forces in Palestine: "Large thefts of arms and explosives by the Haganah"-please remember that Haganah is the Hebrew word for the Israeli army; "Tampering with St. George's Cathedral in Jerusalem in an attempt to assassinate the High Commissioner"; "Attacking the Department

of Immigration of Palestine"; "Bombing police head-quarters"; "Broadcasting station attack"; "Government offices bombed"; "Attempted murder of the High Commissioner and his wife"; "Police buildings attacked"; "Lord Moyne, British Minister of State in the Middle East, assassinated"; "Palestine railways attacked"; "British soldiers murdered in cold blood"; "Officers kidnapped"; "King David Hotel bombed, with ninety killed and scores injured"; "Bombing of police trolley"; "Mass Killings by explosives in Haifa"; "Abduction of a judge from the Court"; "Attack on oil refineries"; "Red Cross Clinic bombed"; "Derailment of trains"; "Attack on Arab towns and villages"; "Explosive letters to Mr. Churchill, Mr. Attlee, Mr. Bevin and Mr. Herbert Morrison and other British leaders"; "Field ambulance blown up"; "Setting fire to Arab cinema"; "Bombing Arab quarters"; "Mining naval welfare centre"; "Blasting Arab Simiramis Hotel in Jerusalem"; "Attacking Arab villages"; "Rolling barrels of explosives on Arab quarters"; "Storming Court buildings"; "Kidnapping and killing Polish Consul and a newspaper man".

These are only brief headings of those incidents, barbarous and savage as they were, committed by the Jewish Israeli forces in Palestine. And here comes the lady from Israel to claim that Israel was an innocent lamb, helpless, defenseless, unarmed. And what a poor lamb Israel is. But the lady from Israel is premeditatedly forgetful. She is forgetful even of the declarations of her Prime Minister, Mr. Ben Gurion, on the issue of war. During the course of World War II when the United Kingdom was engaged in a war of life and death, it was Mr. Ben Gurion who declared war as follows-and these are the words of the Prime Minister of the lady who comes from Israel: "We shall fight our war as if there were no war".

Mr. Ben Gurion's declaration of war was put into effect. The Zionist forces waged a war in Palestine. At the close of

World War II the Jewish army command declared: "V-Day for the world would be a D-Day for us". The British Commander-in-Chief in the Middle East, in an official communiqué, declared: "The Zionist forces in Palestine are directly impeding the war efforts of Great Britain and assisting its enemies".

These are the unarmed Israeli military forces who have been described to the Assembly by the lady from Israel. Mrs. Meir might suggest that these Zionist military operations belong to a history long past. This is not a clever argument.

The truth is that this war of aggression, of horror, of terror was started in 1939, continued throughout World War II, and was continued further until 1948, to culminate in the emergence of Israel, the usurpation of the Arab homeland and the exodus of its people. The intervention of the Arab armies, which was referred to by Mrs. Meir, was only for the purpose of containing a war, a Nazi war already started by Israel. I say a "Nazi" war as a reminder for the lady from Israel.

When the British Minister of State, Lord Moyne, was assassinated by the Zionist forces in November 1948, Mr. Churchill addressed to the House of Commons the following words:

"If our dreams of Zionism are to end in the smoke of assassins' pistols and our labours for its future are to produce a new set of gangsters worthy of Nazi Germany, many like myself will have to reconsider the position which we have maintained so consistently and so long in the past. Those wicked activities must cease and those responsible for them must be destroyed, root and branch".

Mrs. Meir has spoken with emotion and anger of the Nazi atrocities against the Jews in Germany. We too condemn the Nazi atrocities. We shiver as the mere memory of those innocent victims, our brothers in humanity, the millions of Jews who were

massacred by Nazi Germany. But the Nazi action has led to a similar Nazi reaction. Nazi Germany has passed away in Germany, only to be revived in Israel in the Middle East. It is enough that Churchill has passed the verdict. And as the peace of Europe has necessitated the surrender of Nazism, the peace of the Middle East and the world at large calls imperatively for the surrender of Zionist Nazism in the Middle East.

It was not only Churchill who passed the verdict. Mr. Toynbee, the great historian of our age, has condemned Israel's Nazi atrocities. Mr. Toynbee said:

"The evil deeds committed by the Zionist Jews against the Palestinian Arabs, that were comparable to crimes committed against the Jews by the Nazis, were the massacre of men, women and children at Dier Yassin on the 9th of April, 1948, which precipitated a flight of the Arab population in large numbers from the districts within range of the Jewish armed forces ...".

This statement of Toynbee goes also to refute mercilessly the assertion of Mrs. Golda Meir that the refugees left as a result of the call of Arab leaders. What a ridiculous and fantastic allegation to make. These are facts of history which I have quoted from a distinguished historian, and if history is to be consulted, it is Toynbee, not Mrs. Meir, who is to be consulted.

Let me again refresh the memory of Mrs. Meir with another set of facts and declarations. When in 1948 this United Nations of ours was discussing the various resolutions in Palestine, it was not the Arab armies but it was Mr. Gurion who challenged the United Nations. Mr. Ben Gurion did not challenge through political pronouncements; it was a challenge of war. In an address to the Central Committee of Israeli workers, Mr. Ben Gurion declared to the United Nations as follows:

"Force of arms"-I repeat, "Force of arms"-"not formal resolutions, will determine the issue".

This is how Israel was addressing itself to the General Assembly in discussing the Palestine question. They simply warned the United Nations that it is the force of arms and not your resolutions which will decide the issue. Thus, the resolutions of the General Assembly to Mr. Ben Gurion were nothing; it is the force of arms. I wonder whom we are to believe. Are we to believe the Foreign Minister in her address to the Assembly or the Prime Minister in his warning to the United Nations? Are we to believe the Foreign Minister or the Prime Minister? I dare say this is a prime distortion, foreign to our Organization.

In fact, the creation of Israel was not the peaceful implementation of a United Nations resolution. Israel is the culmination of force, of brutal force; it is the fruition of war, a war of aggression. When the future of Palestine was under international inquiry, the Israeli command, the command of the Jewish forces, declared its readiness to enforce a Zionist solution at the tip of bayonets, by the force of arms. These are the words of the Israel command.

"There is no doubt that the Jewish force is superior in organization, training, planning and equipment. If you accept the Zionist solution but are unable or unwilling to enforce it, please do not interfere, and we ourselves will secure its implementation".

This is the language of force, uttered by the command, the Israeli command.

Again, when the United Nations, seated at Lake Success- and every-one out at Lake Success will bear testimony-was considering a United States trusteeship plan for Palestine instead of partition, the Israeli command addressed to the United Nations the following warning:

"Our battles serve as additional evidence for Lake Success diplomats who are studying the American plan, that the decisive step would be taken in Palestine".

I can go on endlessly to quote Israeli authorities. But this much is sufficient to convince the Assembly that the charge placed at the door of the Arabs is nothing but a fictitious fiction. It is enough to know that it is an Israeli fiction.

Be that as it may, the Israeli statement of yesterday, has proved the very same charge we have been advancing against Israel for years.

Our assertion has always been that Israel is the embodiment of imperialism and colonialism. Through Jewish immigration under British bayonets, the Jews of Palestine have risen from 50,000 in 1919 to 750,000 in 1948. This is an alien infiltration of masses who have never known the country-owned nothing, possessed nothing, neither themselves, nor their forbears, should they be able to trace their ancestry three thousand years old. As a little illustration let me assure you that each and every member of the Israeli delegation now seated in the Assembly, including the lady from Israel, are not, and have never been citizens of Palestine. But, they find enough courage to challenge the right of the citizens of Palestine to go back to their home, their ancestral home, their immemorial home.

The lady from Israel has also spoken the language of imperialism and colonialism. Describing the situation in Palestine, Mrs. Meir declared in her statement:

"... rocks, desert, marshes, malaria, trachoma-this is what characterized the country before we came ..." (A / PV. 897, pp. 78-80).

I ask our colleagues from Africa and Asia to pay attention to this quotation from the statement of Israel. This is the language of imperialism, the philosophy of colonialism. In

Africa, in Asia, what did the colonial Powers say? They said the very same thing as the lady from Israel has said. The colonial Powers have claimed that they have come to Asia and Africa to convert the desert, to drain the marshes, to combat malaria, to battle with trachoma-exactly the very same words used by the lady from Israel. This is no coincidence. Israel and imperialism stem from the same trunk. It stands therefore to reason that Israel should meet the same destiny. Imperialism is fading, withering, retreating, and so it is with Israel. And there is no force on earth that can halt the defeat of imperialism and all the creations of imperialism.

This imperialism of Israel, however, is of a unique character. As claimed by Mrs. Meir, it stems from the antiquated association of the Jews in Palestine. Call them what you call them, such associations are to be found in the archives of history for any territory and for any people. There is not one single span on our earth without association for this people or that. Should we follow the philosophy of Mrs. Meir-or rather, the lack of philosophy of Mrs. Meir-any people can claim any territory, and none could be with a homeland. A ridiculous conclusion; but the conclusion is her's, not mine.

Mrs. Meir goes on in her statement to say:

"Every mountain, every valley in our country, as mentioned in the Book of Books, tells of our belonging, of our being there". (Ibid).

I am afraid I cannot speak on this matter without sarcasm. The lady from Israel wishes the Assembly to be wandering in a wilderness of imagination and legendary, travelling back into the avenues of antiquated history. Should we accept the statement of Mrs. Meir seriously, we will have to reconstruct this world of ours in the same pattern that existed at the time of the Book of Boks. Then no nation represented in this Assembly would be in

its present homeland, and no homeland would be occupied by its people.

Indeed, we would have a different United Nations entirely, only to fit the taste of Israel and the lady from Israel.

Yet, when we speak of mountains and valleys, let us not forget the vibrant reality, the reality of life and of history. Let us not make an excursion into the imagination. These valleys and mountains have been possessed and occupied by the people of Palestine in continuity and in perpetuity since time immemorial. On these mountains and in these valleys they have built their towns and villages; they have planted their vineyards and orchards; they have established their farms and factories; they have constructed their mosques and churches; they have dug gently and peacefully their graves. This is what makes a homeland dear, sacred and deserving of every honourable sacrifice. These are the true teachings of the Book of Books, if only Mrs. Meir cares to apply her heart and mind to the Book of Books.

Even in terms of individual property and ownership, Israel had nothing in Palestine, and the Arabs had everything. The United Nations Committee which inquired into the question of Palestine has reported to the General Assembly that Jewish ownerships comprised only 6 per cent of the whole area of Palestine, and nothing more. The Book of Books does not permit banditry or robbery, whether it be individual or international. The Book of Books pronounces: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour". If the lady from Israel relies on the Book of Books, then Israel should hand over to the refugees their properties, their possessions, their farms, their dwelling houses and, indeed, the entirety of their homeland.

I come last to the chorus of peace-I say "chorus" because it was nothing but a chorus-which was raised so loudly by Mrs. Meir: "Let us sit down in a free, not preconditioned conference to

discuss peace". This is the call of the lady from Israel. The call "to discuss peace", to those who do not know, is quite enticing; but those who know cannot be deceived so readily by such slogans of peace.

Let us ask: to discuss what? Are we to discuss the recognition of the usurpation of our country? Are we to discuss the exile of our people? Count Bernadotte was assassinated in Jerusalem by the Zionist forces while on a mission of peace in Palestine-the free peace for which Mrs. Meir is now clamouring so eloquently here in the General Assembly.

The conciliation Commission, in its fifteen progress reports, has stated that Israel has not repatriated one single refugee nor compensated one single refugee. The fifteen resolutions of the General Assembly calling for the repatriation of the refugees have been completely defied by Israel. The resolution of last year, which was passed unanimously by the Assembly, with the abstention of Israel, reaffirmed repatriation. The lady from Israel said yesterday that these resolutions were misquoted. Tell us how they are to be quoted. We know that they are resolutions of the General Assembly calling for repatriation of the refugees. The truth is that they are ignored by Israel-resisted and denied. So what are we to discuss with Israel?

This call for peace comes from the lady who has recently put the following question to Jewish mothers here in the United States: "Would it be too much to send 1,000 of your sons and daughters to live in Israel?" That is what peace is to Mrs. Meir: our sons and daughters should stay in exile while American sons and daughters are urged by Mrs. Meir to leave their homeland in America, destroy their loyalty to the United States and live in Israel.

After all, what is the record of peace of this Israel that clamours for peace? Condemned by Churchill and Toynbee as a Nazi institution-that is not all for Israel. Israel was condemned by

the Security Council for the massacre of Kibya-a whole village destroyed, soul and stone. Israel was condemned by the Security Council for the slaughter of Nahalin, another Arab village, soul and stone. Israel was condemned by the Security Council for the outrage of Gaza, killing refugees while they were sleeping in their camps. These are condemnations of the Security Council. Lastly, Israel was condemned for the tripartite aggression of Sinai, traces of the conspiracy of which were displayed yesterday in the ferocious clapping by the French delegation in support of Israel, a comrade in arms.

I can count scores of condemnations by the Security Council and the Mixed Armistice Commission. I will confine myself to one, because of its bearing on the issue of peace. On 16 February of this year, the Mixed Armistice Commission passed the following decision with regard to the destruction of a whole village by Israel:

"Having considered that this attack has resulted in the almost total destruction of the aforesaid village, in violation of elementary humanitarian principles,

"Condemns the Israeli attack against the village of Khirbet-Altawafiq".

This answers the call for peace-committing an act which resulted in the total destruction of a whole village, which has been described by the Armistice Commission as a violation of the most elementary human principles. This is the record-only part of the record-of Israel, which clamours for peace. Israel has extended a hand of peace, but it is a hand soaked with the blood of the innocent, a hand that had up-rooted a whole people from its homeland. This is no peace. This is a surrender to the aggressor. The people of Palestine would choose to die, all in all, rather than abandon their homes and their homeland.

The proposal has been made to President Nasser and other Arab leaders to meet Mr. Ben-Gurion to make peace. What a ridicule-what an irony of fate-what an affront to peace-what a travesty of justice, to advance such a proposal and, I would say, such a heresy!

In contrast, the lady from Israel has referred to the proposal for a meeting between Eisenhower and Khrushchev. The comparison is blasphemous. Both great men have refused such a meeting. Khrushchev claimed an apology, and Eisenhower stressed the release of two United States fliers. In our case, Israel's evils cannot be remedied by an apology. Neither are the rights of the whole people of Palestine to be compared to the liberty of two fliers. But still the two great leaders have refused to meet.

Yet, over and above, the matter raises a greater issue. The disagreement between Eisenhower and Khrushchev, with all its gravity, does not involve the loss of a homeland. Had the Soviet Union been occupying the State of New York, Eisenhower would be the last man on earth to accept to meet with Khrushchev. And had the United States been occupying the Ukraine, Khrushchev would be the last man on earth to accept to meet with Eisenhower.

In this context, President Nasser is our Eisenhower and our Khrushchev, and so are all the Arab leaders. And never will they meet Ben Gurion; nor any Arab leader will conceive of meeting Israel, neither now, nor in any time to come. So let it be known. The role of President Nasser is not the surrender of the Arab homeland. He is up for a great and noble cause. So are the rest of the Arab leaders. President Nasser strives to emancipate, to liberate, the Arab homeland, but not to surrender it to imperialism or Zionism, or to all the creations of Zionism or imperialism.

Nevertheless, I should not leave the Assembly in an atmosphere of despair and bitterness. Peace is our goal-our dearest and most sacred-for the homeland is ours, not theirs. And the child of Solomon is ours, not theirs.

Peace in the Holy Land can be realized. Other countries and other peoples have attained peace. It is only through the same way and through the same means that peace can be attained in Palestine. India and Pakistan achieved peace after imperialism was relinquished. So it was in Indonesia. And thus it was attained in Africa. In Ghana and Guinea the people were freed in their homeland and imperialism pulled out, and peace reigned.

With Israel it is the same. There are now thousands and thousands of Jews who are clamouring to get out from this tyranny and misery which is called Israel, if they are only given an exit visa. If Israel challenges my statement, I would ask here and now that a United Nations commission be set up to proceed immediately to Israel to inquire into the wishes of the Jews, and I challenge Israel to accept this referendum.

This is the real challenge of peace. When the alien Jews are allowed to quit the country, the situation will go back to normal. There will be no one in Palestine except its legitimate inhabitants-Moslems, Christians and Jews, all alike. They will constitute the Independent State. They will be admitted to the United Nations, and their delegation, composed of Moslems, Christians and Jews, would occupy their worthy seats here in the Assembly hall.

This is how peace can be realized in the land of peace, and this is what we are endeavouring to achieve.

So help us God.

The text of the Chairman's speech before the Special Political Committee delivered on November 15, 1960:

Since this is my first intervention before the Committee, permit me, Sir, to extend to you my warmest congratulations on your election as our Chairman to preside over the deliberations of this Committee. We have known you as an eminent diplomat and the area we covered so far in our work has justified the faith of the Committee in your ability and impartiality. Your vast knowledge of international affairs added to your integrity makes of your Chairmanship a source of guidance in the difficult task that remains before the Committee. We trust that under your talented leadership our work will be crowned with success.

Our heartiest congratulations go also to your colleagues in the Bureau. The Vice-Chairman and the rapporteur have rightly earned our respect and admiration. Both of them are well-known for their vast experience and to them I extend warm tribute.

Mr. Chairman, Fellow Delegates:

The report of the Director of the United Nations Agency for the Palestine Refugees, now under the consideration of the Committee, is a factual document characterized with an objective presentation. From cover to cover, the report is an impassionate narration of facts and a cold enumeration of figures. Yet the drama, the most tragic drama, is there. It is there to be read in those shocking facts-in the trembling figures. And how disastrous are the facts-how catastrophic are the figures.

Quoting in fragments, here are fragments of the drama.

On the origin of the problem, the Director reports in the following words: "The Palestine refugees problem came into being in 1948 when hundreds of thousands of Palestinians fled their homes and took refuge in the surrounding areas-".

On the United nations activity in facing the problem, the Director reports in the following words: "After a period of emergency aid administered by voluntary agencies ..., the General Assembly in December 1949 established the United

Nations Agency ... to assist in the care of the refugees. The Agency's mandate originally envisaged as covering a limited period of international assistance to the refugees, has been specifically extended on three occasions and presently runs until 30 June 1963".

On the attitude of the refugee, the Director reports in the following words: "In their minds the promise made in Paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194 (111), passed in December 1948 and re-affirmed annually thereafter, continues to be the one acceptable long term solution to this problem, and they are embittered because it still stands unfulfilled ..".

With regard to the number of the refugees, the Director estimates the total to be, 1,120,889, with an average net increase of 30,000 per year.

On the present and future outlook, the Director has this to say to the United Nations, and I quote his words, "Resolution 194 (111) has not been implemented and the outlook for the Palestine refugees is for a continuation of conditions, similar to those of the past twelve years ...".

On the solution of the problem, the Director states that "no quick solution to the Palestine refugee problem is in sight ... The agency itself cannot solve the refugees problems. Any general solution to the complex Palestine problem, of which the refugee problem is a part, will be brought about largely by forces outside the UNRWA which will govern and shape the future of the Middle East ...".

On the responsibility of the U.N. the Director states as follows: "To the Director it appears certain that some responsibility for international assistance will continue for a decade or longer ... The Palestine refugees problem has a bearing on the stability and peace of the Middle East and hence on the stability and peace of the world. It is in this broad context

that the Director requests the General Assembly to make its decision".

These findings of fact, Mr. Chairman, as stated by the Director of the Agency, do invite in our minds and hearts a set of staggering questions, particularly so, when the Arab refugees enter their fourteenth year away from their homeland, and what is more when the Director discloses that no quick solution of the problem is in sight. Simple as they are, these staggering questions impose themselves on the United Nations, with a pressing demand for an honest and brave answer. Each and every delegate is duty bound to ask very loudly and indeed with vigor and anger. What is this human tragedy that caught in its grip a million refugees? What is its nature, what is its background? How in the age of the United Nations can a people be uprooted from their ancestral home? And, lastly, what is the end-how can we bring this tragedy to an end?

These are not academic questions, fellow delegates, nor are they posed simply to reveal a paradox, to arouse bewilderment, or to disclose a dilemma. Truly a paradox these questions are, a bewilderment they are. But over and above, these questions involve human existence, worth, and dignity, not in the abstract but in actual terms of living reality. The item before us refers to a people, a whole people. It pertains to a land holy to millions upon millions of believers all over the world. The problem has caused a regional war in 1948, and was about to unleash a global war in 1956. Last, but not least, these questions present the central questions: Is the United Nations a debating forum devoted to the arts of rhetoric and dialogue, or an international organization to establish peace, maintain law and order, preserve human dignity, do justice, undo injustice, and cherish the principles and objectives enshrined in the charter of the United Nations.

As to the nature of the problem, let me state at the outset, and with no need for any preface, the refugee problem is not simply the outcome of the war that took place in Palestine in 1948. In time of war, any war, mankind had often witnessed multitudes of refugees seeking shelter from the ravages of war. These are war refugees. But this is not the case with the Palestine refugees. Their problem is entirely different. It stands unique, with a unique background, leading to a unique situations. In its very essence, deep at the deep root, the problem of the Palestine refugees is a colonial issue inextricably imbedded in the history of world imperialism.

To those, not familiar with the true origin of the Palestine refugees, imperialism may sound as a strange factor in the problem. But the truth o truth is that imperialism is the reason of reasons for the refugee tragedy. We all recall many colonial issues that have been inscribed on the agenda of the United Nations since its establishment. Let me assure you that the problem of the Palestine refugee, in its true perspective, is an issue of imperialism that should rally on its side all freedom-loving forces. The item now before you is a colonial issue that should capture the support of all justice-seeking peoples of the world.

The imperialism I have in mind, as the main cause for the Palestine refugees, is the movement known as Zionism, after the word Zion, the name of a small hill in Jerusalem. It was in the womb of imperialism that Zionism was conceived in the Nineteenth Century, giving birth in 1948d to two episodes: the creation of Israel, and the exodus of he Palestine refugees.

I do not desire to go into the history of Zionism. This is outside the orbit of the present item. Nor is it necessary to do so, precisely because the relation between Zionism and the problem of Palestine refugees is easy to trace. By definition, practice and conduct, it is sufficient to know, that Zionism is a movement

which has aimed at one single and central objective-namely, the ingathering of the Jews from all corners of the globe, an ingathering not only on the soil of Palestine but on its surroundings, as far as military power can set its boots.

This ingathering of the Jews, is of concern to us in our present deliberations because, I submit, it is the sole and direct cause for the exile of the Arab refugees. Ingathering for one side has led to the dispersion of the other. You do not need to explain why. It is too axiomatic to explain. Palestine is not vacant land, uninhabited, unpopulated, unpossessed. It is a country with a people deeply rooted in their land since time immemorial, possessing their economic, social and cultural life, vibrant with all national aspirations which are common to all peoples of the world. To launch a campaign of ingathering of the Jews in Palestine, is in effect launching a campaign to displace the Arabs from their homeland. War or no war, the problem of Palestine refugee is inherent in Zionism-imbedded in its plans. Indeed it is a natural outcome of its fulfillment. For every Jew "ingathered," there must be an Arab displaced. The process is not without a paradox, even if we take its assumptions to be true.

Zionism uproots an Arab settled in his homeland for generations, only to provide room for a Jew already settled in his country of domicile for centuries. Thus the refugee problem is not the making of a war-as always suggested by Israel. In simple truth, it is the making of a creed, a creed of aggression. To Zionism, Jewish life in the various countries of the world, is one of exile-an exile not of a decade or century, but one which is three thousand years old. And here lies the central reason for the creation of the problem of the Palestine refugees. To Zionism three thousand years' domicile of the Jews abroad is an exile. This is the Zionist philosophy. In the same manner Zionist logic, or to be more precise, Zionist illogic, dictates that the

immemorial possession of the Arabs of their homeland is no legitimate existence worthy to be respected and protected.

The net result, however, was not confined to a conflict of creeds, logic, or philosophy simply in the realm of theory. The outcome has led to the largest mass infiltration in the history of imperialism. Thousands and thousands of Jews led by deception, and misled by distortion, have been imported to Palestine against the will of its people.

These waves of migration have taken place between the first and second world wars. I use the term migration loosely and inadvertently. For this is no migration. It is an invasion. Immigration can only take place with the consent of the people of the land and subject to national control.

When this invasional migration had started, Palestine had then been, and for centuries before, preponderantly Arab. The Jews were a fraction. In Jerusalem, for instance, we are told by Obadiah of Bertinoro, a distinguished Jew of the 15th century, that the Jewish families did not exceed seventy in number. In its report to the British Parliament, the Royal Commission of Enquiry on Palestine of 1947, stated that in 1845 in the whole of Palestine there were not more than 12,000 Jews. At the end of World War I, the number of Jews in Palestine had risen to 70,000, hardly one tenth of the total population of the country. This is an insignificant fraction in proportion to the number of Moslems, or their Christian brethren, who in their fraternal aggregate do constitute the people of Palestine. Nevertheless, under the British mandate and under British bayonet, Jewish migration, public and clandestine has brought into the country a total of 700,000, Jews, who in justice and equity are 700,000 aliens, strangers-foreigners and colonizers-indeed the same category of colonizers who rushed in to Asia and Africa with the advent of Imperialism.

It is this large mass infiltration, this alien ingathering of Jews which marks the beginnings of the refugee problem. In fact, Mr. Chairman, the people of Palestine, as a whole, have been made potential refugees-right from the first moment Zionism has started the ingathering of Jews. It was a march on Palestine. I say march, for the Jews were able to set foot in Palestine in waves of thousands upon thousands, only against the protestations, and indeed in spite of rebellion of the people of Palestine.

Zionism, therefore, through this campaign of ingathering, long before 1948, has made the Arabs of Palestine eligible refugees. In 1920, the Jews were 10 percent of the population; in 1947 they became 33 percent. Conversely, the Arabs, in 1920 were 90 percent. In 1947 they became 65 percent. And the scene of this operation, we must remember, has taken place in a tiny little country, one quarter cultivable, one quarter hilly, one-half desert-all totalling 10,000 square miles, barely the size of Vermont, in the U.S.

In his report, the Director of the Agency speaks of the impact of the various forces on the solution of the refugee problem, and the Palestine problem as a whole. I submit that the emergence of Israel in 1948 has brought into play the main factor that militates against the rapid solution of the refugee problem.

After 1947, with the expulsion of the Palestine refugees, Israel has multiplied many fold the operation of ingathering. Large sums of money have been raised-mainly in the U.S.-world-wide organizations established and emissaries dispatched to every corner of the globe, to persuade the Jews at any cost to move speedily into Palestine. The result was most telling. In a decade the Jews in Israel have trebled in number-thus becoming about two millions.

This is no immigration-it is an act of conquest and invasion. Since man has started his first migration on this planet, no immigration has been on such a wild scale-no immigration

has ever taken place against the will of the people of the land, and never has migration led to the exodus of a whole people from their fatherland.

It is in this large context, Mr. Chairman, that we must view the problem of the Palestine refugees. It does not stand to contrast or comparison with any of the refugee problems that came in the wake of World War I or II. The problem of the Palestine refugees is a case, *sui generis*, with no parallel, and the equal of none. It is not the fruition of a civil war or strife. It is a colonial issue, an issue of imperialism, but the most ghastly form of imperialism and colonialism.

I have stressed this point, Mr. Chairman, for one valid reason at least. This session of ours has been rightly proclaimed as the Session of the African Continent. The central issue in Africa is one of freedom and sovereignty. Furthermore, the problem of colonialism in its major aspects is now placed on the Agenda of the United Nations. All throughout the evils of imperialism, problems of refugees, we must be reminded, rank first and foremost. They stand first, because of ghastly injustice. They are foremost, due to savage brutality. In Asia and Africa, imperialism, brought ruling classes, traders, bankers, farmers and industrialists, but practically causing no exodus of the native people. In sixteen new members of Africa seated in the committee are, with no exception, Africans, native Africans, representing their native peoples. In the same manner, the independent countries of Asia who had forced their way to this organization—are with no exception, Asiatics, native Asiatics—representing their native peoples. In all these instances, whether under the British or the French, the colonial rule in Asia and Africa has left the native people rooted as they were in their homeland. In Palestine, colonialism has followed a more monstrous course. The people, the native people, were literally displaced, by aliens. That is how we witness a refugee nation on

the scene-a whole nation uprooted from its homeland-to become now an item on the Agenda of the United Nations.

I must remark, however, that in establishing the relation of the refugee problem to imperialism, we have not employed any thread of exaggeration or a shred of imagination. Facts of history do betray this relationship. I shall let the facts of history speak for themselves.

We have it on record that as long ago as 1840, Lord Shaftsbury had proposed a scheme of Jewish colonization under international guarantee as a means of utilizing the "wealth and industry of the Jewish people" for the economic development of a backward area. With similar aim in view, the British have sent an expedition to explore parts of Sinai-the very same Sinai which was the scene of British, French and Israeli aggression of 1956. In 1903, the British Foreign Secretary, Lord Lansdowne offered the Zionists a tract of country in the highlands of British East Africa. In a statement published on the 8th of February 1920, Mr. Churchill said "If, as may well happen, then, should be created in our lifetime by the banks of the Jordan a Jewish State under the protection of the British Crown, which might comprise three or four millions of Jews, an event will have occurred-which would be especially in harmony with the truest interests of the British Empire". Nothing could be more conclusive than this statement by the last architect of the British Empire who lives now to witness the dissolution of the Empire. But the conclusion is irrefutable that Israel right from the very beginning was conceived an enterprise of imperialism, as a going concern of colonialism; and that the exodus of the Palestine refugees was the second part of the equation.

I say equation for the matter has almost proved to be an equation of algebra-Israel equals the expulsion of the people of Palestine-and the people of Palestine, left in their country, equals the non-establishment of Israel. This is the chain of action the

reaction-the relation of cause and effect-with the former leading to the latter. If this were to be an imagination or exaggeration, this honorable committee would not be now in session to examine for the fourteenth time the most tragic of all human tragedy.

All this, Mr. Chairman, will tend to explain with utmost clarity, the real meaning of the conclusion by the Director of the Agency, when he said that the Agency itself cannot solve the refugee problem and that any general solution to the complex Palestine problem, of which the refugee problem is a part, will be brought about largely by forces outside the agency.

Speaking of forces, we have come now to know that Zionism is one of those devastating forces that bears the main guilt for the refugees problem-its past creation-its present continuation and its future perpetuation. It is true, as the Director has observed, that the refugee problem is part of the Palestine problem. But the Palestine problem in its entirety, our colleagues should never forget, is the direct out-come of imperialism.

I hammered this point for the earnest consideration of the Committee as a whole, but addressed specifically to the distinguished representatives of Asia, Africa and Latin America-the peoples who have paid the dearest toll for their liberty and independence. The problem of Palestine refugees is not the outcome of a clash of two religions-two languages-two cultures-two political ideologies-two social orders-two economic regimes. Viewed against its historic perspective, the refugee problem, in its genesis, is the making of colonization in the age of imperialism. Due to its strategic importance on the crossroads to three Continents, its proximity to the Suez Canal and its central position in the British lines of communication, Palestine had become in the age of imperialism a target of imperialism. It is within this context that the idea of the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine was conceived, and it did not matter

in the least for imperialism that such a policy was bound to create a refugee problem. Humanitarian considerations are not in the fiber of imperialism, and the refugee problem stands now in testimony.

Amazing as it may be, you should not be amazed at this conclusion. To say that the problem of the Palestine refugee is an offshot of imperialism is not logic in the abstract. This is a conclusion supported by bleeding events and agonizing trials. First in these events and trials is the British Balfour Declaration of the 2nd of November in 1917. An instrument which has proved to be a malignant declaration for the dispersion of the people of Palestine.

I shall not go out of my way to discuss the details of this abominable declaration. I shall confine myself to its purport and impact only insofar as resulting in the catastrophe of the Palestine refugees.

In brief, the Balfour Declaration has promised the establishment of a Jewish home in Palestine with the understanding "that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non Jewish communities ...".

Even on the face of it, one can readily see the refugee problem deeply imbedded in the Balfour Declaration. The catastrophe runs in its veins. To establish a Jewish national home, in a home already occupied by its people, without their consent, is a flagrant injustice. The Balfour Declaration is the first official instrument that led to the refugee problem. It is true that it embodied an express condition to protect the civil and religious interests of the people of Palestine, but the absurdity, the preposterous absurdity is there.

How can you establish in Palestine a Jewish home without destroying the home of the Arabs. This dual obligation of

establishing a Jewish national home and the protection of the people of Palestine is incompatible, contradictory and indeed unworkable. If you mean to establish a Jewish national home, you are bound out of necessity to destroy the rights of the Arabs. On the other hand, if you mean to respect the rights of the Arabs you cannot establish the Jewish national home. But the British, the administering power has chosen to establish the Jewish national home, and the natural result has followed. It was bound to follow, and the refugee problem stands before you as the destined consequence.

It is necessary, however, to remark that before becoming refugees, the Arabs were the prophets to prophecy their disaster. When the people of Palestine knew of the Balfour Declaration they had expressed many a warning. They declared their resistance to a policy aiming at usurping their homeland and endangering their national existence. They warned that the Jewish National Home could only be established on the remains of the Arabs. They protested that the Balfour Declaration was not workable, compatible or consistent. In a word, they feared they would become refugees. It required no genius to arrive at such conclusions. The wording of the Balfour Declaration was sufficient to disclose such dangerous repercussions. It was only after thirty years of repression, and having admitted into the country 700,000 Jews, that the British government have confessed to the Unscop in 1947 that "the mandate has proved to be unworkable, and that the obligations undertaken to the two communities in Palestine have been shown to be irreconcilable."

This confession is most tragic even if it were made by a boy in the kindergarten-no matter how stupid he may be. You promise to give a boy the pencil of another boy, without prejudice, without injury, without dispossession. How fantastic and ridiculous can such a promise be. And this is what happened in Palestine. The Balfour Declaration was irreconcilable ab initio,

and was bound to end irreconcilable. But why attempt the experiment, why make the trial. The end was what we have foreshadowed-what we are witnessing now. It took the British thirty years to find the irreconcilable, the inconsistency, the unworkable, but after what?

It was only after the tragedy of one million refugees, that Britain has seen the obvious and witnessed the daylight in a day glowing with light.

That it was obvious was also recognized by the Unscop. In its report to the U.N. it declared that "the terms of the mandate include provisions which have proved contradictory in their practical application".

I must however, stress the fact that the refugee problem was disguised so to speak, in the willful vagueness of the terms of the Balfour Declaration. It was not an innocent vagueness with innocent intentions. The whole undertaking was maliciously willful. In analyzing the meaning of the Jewish National Home the Unscop said the following: "The notion of the National Home has provoked many discussions concerning its meaning, scope, and legal character, especially since it has no known legal connotation and there are no precedents in international law for its interpretation. It was used in the Balfour Declaration and in the Mandate, both of which promised the establishment of a "Jewish National Home" without, however, defining its meaning. The conclusion seems to be inescapable that the vagueness in the wording of both instruments was intentional". And this is the conclusion which I desire to bring home to the minds of the Committee-that if the vagueness of the meaning of the Jewish National Home was intentional, then this is the more valid reason to expect the emergence of a refugee problem as a result of such a disastrously vague policy.

Let us now turn to another aspect of the refugee problem. In his report, the Director of the Agency has requested the General

Assembly to make its decision in the broad context of war or peace not only in relation to the Middle East but to the world at large. This request, on the part of the Director, I submit, is the master key to the Palestine question in general and the refugees' problem in general. The issue before us, in its wide context, is one of war or peace, particularly so, when we recall that the Balfour Declaration for the establishment of a Jewish national home was itself an instrument of war.

Important as it may be, I shall not elaborate the point that the Balfour Declaration was issued at a time which the British did not possess Palestine and had no right to dispose of a country not their own. It is enough to know that the whole thing was a war policy, which not only lacks legality and morality, but in fact led to a brutality.

In support of this point let me read from a statement made by Mr. Lloyd George who was the head of the cabinet that issued the Balfour Declaration: "The launching of the Balfour Declaration," said Mr. Lloyd George, "was due to propagandist reasons". Outlining the serious position in which the Allied and associated powers were then, he said "The Romanians had been crushed. The Russian Army was demobilized. The French Army was unable at the moment to take the offensive. The Italians had sustained a great defeat. Millions of tons of British shipping had been sunk by German submarines. No American divisions were yet available. In this critical situation-Jewish sympathy would make a substantial support to the Allied cause, and in particular would confirm the support of American Jewry".

It is under these circumstances that the Balfour Declaration was issued-as a propaganda campaign-as an instrument of war-and as a lever to drag the U.S. into the war-such circumstances are not only tainted with imperialistic designs but have proved to be the malignant seeds sown in 1917, to grow into a catastrophe in 1948f, when the refugees were expelled from the country.

But although, as we have traced, it was potentially growing with the growth of the Jewish national home in Palestine, the problem of the Palestine refugees had taken a definite turn in November 1948. In the three decades preceding, the danger facing the Arabs of Palestine was rising slowly but steadily. In 1948, the situation has rapidly moved to the point of explosion. Thus far, the danger was potential. It started then, to be actual. The United Kingdom, desirous to relinquish its authority as a mandatory power has asked the United Nations to decide the future of Palestine, and the United Nations became seized of the problem. That was a decisive landmark, inadmissible for us to track closely under the present item. Nor is it relevant at this stage to refer to the Jewish war of atrocities that led the United Kingdom to choose to evacuate the country and place the matter in the hands of the Assembly. I shall only address myself to the immediate cause that unleashed the catastrophe of the refugee.

And at this point, I ask your indulgence-I beg of you-not to be struck by amazement nor shocked by bewilderment. Loudly and tragically I speak of amazement and bewilderment, for now, after fourteen years of sober reflection and sound evaluation, everyone should realize what flagrant injustice and what disastrous iniquity has brought about the tragedy of the Palestine refugee. I submit, Sir, that we must be ready in our hearts not to resist frankness, no matter how bitter it may be, and no matter how sharp its edges may be. We must be receptive, objective, and open minded-this is the charter of our charter-The United Nations of 1947 is no more existing. Ours of 1960, is a different United Nations. The crushing duress and cracking pressure that dominated the U.N. in 1947 and led to the tragedy of the refugees stands no more. The United Nations of today must be ready not only to do justice for the present and future, but to undo the injustice of the past, if we are determined to preserve world peace for the present and future.

The simply truth, tragic and disastrous as it may be, is that the refugee problem has started on 29th November 1947 with the adoption of resolution 181 (S11), which provided for the partition of Palestine and the establishment of Israel. No matter how innocent some delegates have been for supporting such a resolution, and no matter how poor victims were other delegations that have fallen under the most abominable pressure ever to be experienced in the United Nations, the stark fact remains that the partition of Palestine and the establishment of Israel should be held responsible for the creation of the Palestine refugees. The explanation is simple, and the facts are simply too.

I shall not place before you any assertion of my own. I shall leave it fore the (Unscop) the U.N. Commission to spell out the facts. I refer you to paragraphs 22, 25, 29, 162, 164 of the report of the Unscop. This is for the distinguished delegates to examine, and for Israel to contradict, but without distortion.

Summing up those facts, we can readily find that when the partition of Palestine was decreed, the Jews were only 1/3 of the population. They owned only six percent of the whole area in Palestine. The Arabs owned the rest. They produced 80 percent of the total cereal crops, 98 percent of its olives and 75 per cent of its citrus-and these are the three main sources of national income.

The Unscop further states that there is no clear territorial separation of Jews and Arabs, and that the economic separateness of Jews and Arabs does not correspond to any clear territorial division.

On the general pattern of the Jewish State, as proposed, the U.N. Committee has provided the most amusing features. While the land in the Jewish State is predominantly Arab-owned, the population figures do furnish the most awkward international joke. In the so-called Jewish State, the Jews were 498,000, against 497,000 Arabs-only one thousand Jews sin excess of the Arabs.

Is it not an international joke to establish a Jewish State with marginal majority of 1000 Jews?

Verily and truly it is a joke of the first order-But this joke has led to a tragedy of the first order-in its horror and terror.

Thus the picture is now crystal clear. The tragedy of the Palestine refugees is to be found lurking in every word of the partition resolution-a resolution that recommended the creation of a Jewish State on Arab land and with no Jewish majority. This is a tragedy of common sense that led to a human tragedy.

But tragedy or no tragedy, Zionism was determined to go ahead with its plans-and let Rome be set on fire. A Jewish State must be established and let Carthage be destroyed. The Zionists, however, were faced with the dreadful question: How can a Jewish State be established on Arab land, and with such a great majority of Arab population. The Arabs, and this is their right, will not accept Jewish sovereignty, nor will they abandon their lands. To Zionism, that was an obstinate fact which must be confronted. The Jewish State will either be established by sheer brutal force, or be abandoned. The choice has to be made, and it was made. Zionism had decided: The Jewish State must be established, and the Arabs must be driven out from their country. And this is exactly, fellow delegates, what has taken place. Under unspeakable terror, bloodshed and destruction, the defenseless people of Palestine were driven out of their towns, villages and homes. Their homeland was usurped, and the so-called State of Israel was established.

At this stage it is only fair to examine how the refugees have become refugees. We are duty bound to present the picture, at least in miniature; for, of the million refugees, every single refugee has a tragedy to say to the U.N. Israel was established on the remains, the root, the exodus of each and every refugee. Israel was proclaimed on 15 May 1948-and I submit, Sir, nothing

could be more conclusive than to picture the general situation in Palestine just shortly before that inglorious date.

After the Partition Resolution of November 1947, the Jewish forces went into the field of action. They have undertaken to establish Israel. Knowing that Israel cannot be established before the Arabs are driven out, the Jewish forces were in need of a major war operation-terror. The Jewish forces have carried the operation terror, with all the rules of terror-And Israel has provided the world with a code of terror-quite original and abominable. Let us examine one or two instances.

On April 10, 1948, the village of Deir Yassin, in the suburbs of Jerusalem, was attacked by the Zionists. The Jewish forces rounded up most of its 600 inhabitants, looted everything of value in the village, and next turned their attention to their human booty, slaughtering men, women and children without mercy. About 250 Arabs were butchered. Among these, were fifty-two mothers with babies at their breast, sixty other women and young girls, and 25 pregnant women, whose bodies were deliberately ripped open with bayonets. Little children were cut to pieces under the eyes of their mothers. About 150 mutilated corpses of women and children were thrown down a well. Zionist troops prevented all access to the scene of the massacre, and when M. Jacques Regner, delegate of the International Red Cross, asked permission of the Jewish Agency to make an inspection of the place, he was delayed a whole day, in order to give the assassins time to clean up the frightful mess. In relating the facts Mr. Regner stated "the situation was simply horrible". Apart from the bodies that had been thrown down the well, other corpses were lying about among the ruins of the destroyed houses. Mr. Regner himself found a little girl about six years old injured, but still living, under a pile of dead bodies, and her personally took her to a hospital.

Four days after the massacre of Deir Yassin, the Jewish forces attacked the village of Nasr el Din, near Tiberias, and repeated there the same horrors. The bulk of the population of this village consisted of defenseless women and children, yet the Zionists attacked them with machine-guns and hand-grenades. Of the whole population of this village, only forty women and children were able to escape to a neighboring village. All the rest perished, victims of the Zionists blood thirst.

On May 6, 1948, the Jewish forces attacked some Arab villages near Tiberias, and blew up the German monastery on the shore of Lake Tiberias, killing the three monks who were then living there.

On the same day, a Jewish scouting plane directed the Jewish forces to a place near Samakh where a large number of Arab civilian refugees were trying to escape by boats. Hundreds were killed while others were drowned.

Also on May 6, the Jewish forces packed a large number of old men, women and children into the village mosque at El Zaytoun (near Safed) and then deliberately blew up the mosque with these innocent victims, thus destroying the house of God and his creation.

On May 13, 1948, the Jewish forces attacked the village of Beit Darras, in the Gaza district. They found the inhabitants to consist only of children, women and elderly men. These innocent and harmless people were brutally murdered in cold blood. Some of the women were pregnant and were subjected to the same ghastly treatment as that suffered by the women at Deir Yassin, ripped open with bayonets. The bodies of some of the old men were mutilated. Having disposed of the human victims, the Jewish forces looted all the household goods and provisions in the village, and then systematically destroyed all houses by mines and shell-fire.

These and scores of similar dreadful acts of terror have been part and parcel of the major operation: Terror: to clear the way for the establishment of Israel. The central target was to drive out the Arabs-usurp their lands, so that the rise of Israel becomes possible.

At times, Israeli spokesmen would either deny these atrocities or throw them at the door of Jewish dissident groups. But this is a perjury-a perjury by the verdict of an Israeli court.

In proceedings instituted by Kauffman, the Israeli officer, who conducted the massacre of Deir Yassin, and had sued Israel for pension, the court declared "We have been convinced that the Deir Yassin operation was ordered by the Jewish Minister of War as an operation against the Arabs".

Nothing could be more condemning to Israel than a verdict from a court of Israel. It is these brutal acts that brought about the exodus of the refugees-acts which aroused universal despite, consternation and indignation in every part of the civilized world. They were condemned as a modern version of Nazism. Father Ralph Gorman writing in the "Sign", the American National Catholic Magazine, said "The Nazis never used terror in a more cold-blooded way than the Israelis in the massacre of Kibya".

Even pro Zionists in the U.S. have been appalled by these atrocities. Hall Lehrman, writing in the Commentary Magazine said "The Israeli soldiers have looted, burned and slaughtered ... It is even hinted that certain officers actually ordered their troops to let themselves go".

An American Missionary, Miss Bertha Vester, who has spent her entire life in Jerusalem reported in her book entitled "Our Jerusalem", that Jewish jeeps with loudspeakers were warning the inhabitants in Jerusalem and Arab villages, in these words: "Unless you leave your homes, the fate of Deir Yassin will be your fate".

In the Foreign Affairs Quarterly of July, 1954, the British Lt. General Glub wrote as follows: "The Israelis seized every possible opportunity to get rid of the Arabs still living in the area allotted to them. ... The civil inhabitants were driven out immediately by Israeli troops or were given half an hour to leave. All means of transport were seized by the Israeli army, so that the inhabitants were obliged to abandon all their possessions and homes".

In his book *The Revolt*, Menachem Begin who led most of these atrocities, has boasted that the Deir Yassin butchery has resulted, and I quote "in the maddened flight of the Arab refugees, the economic and political significance of which can hardly be over-estimated". This confession touches the heart of the problem. The political significance, to which Begin referred was the establishment of Israel; the economic, was the seizure of all Arab land and property.

Yet in few lines, Begin has provided us with the whole background of the problem of the Arab refugees. With criminal pride, the leader of Jewish atrocities, Begin, wrote as follows: "Kolonia Village, which had previously repulsed every attack of the Haganah, was evacuated overnight and fell without further fighting. Beit-Iksa was also evacuated. These two places overlooked the main road; and their fall together with the capture of Kastel by the Haganah, made it possible to keep open the road to Jerusalem. In the rest of the country, too, the Arabs began to flee in terror, even before they clashed with Jewish forces. The Jewish forces proceeded to advance through Haifa like a knife through butter. The Arabs began fleeing in panic, shouting "Deir Yassin." Not one person of 14,000 people was left in Safad in northern Palestine, six hours after the exodus commenced".

This is in brief the story of the refugees, and mind you, as related from events that all took place between November 1947,

the date of the partition resolution, and the 15 May 1948 the day of the proclamation of Israel.

The rest of the story, Mr. Chairman, is hair raising and heart breaking. These innocent refugees, expelled from their homes, have streamed in all directions to the surrounding area. Ever since, they have survived through U.N. assistance, while their possessions are seized by Israel-possession that do not admit of any evaluation-they are the toil and sweat of generations-The refugees have left behind, their towns, villages, homes, farms, factories, shops, public domains and scores of possession of invaluable value. The revenue of these possessions is enormous. It amounts to millions of dollars, and this is the right occasion for me to propose that a General Administrator be appointed to look after the properties of the refugees. He will collect their revenues and hand them over to the refugees. We suggest that Dr. Davis, the Director of the Agency be authorized to act as a General Administrator of the properties of refugees. Dr. Davis possesses the experience and the confidence required for such a mandate. If for any reason it should be necessary to assign this task for another independent agency appointed by the General Assembly, we would be only willing to accept such an arrangement as long as it secures to the refugees the rentals, produce, and revenues of their properties. Furthermore, we would be ready to consider the possibility of defraying the expenditure o the Administering Agency from the revenues of the refugees properties, thus relieving the U.N. from further financial commitments. For the last thirteen years, the Israelis have been seizing the whole income of the refugees. Entering upon its terms of reference, the first thing the administering agency would do is to collect from Israel the total of such income. This proposal, I submit, is a great relief to the refugees and the U.N. Thousands of the refugees would live on their own and the U.N.'s financial responsibility would be reduced to a minimum. It is most inhuman that the refugees should survive on international charity,

when their national wealth does not admit estimation. The U.N. should not pay the price of the defiance of Israel. Israel should surrender the properties of the refugees to U.N. authority. This is a fair proposal to make, and the minimum the U.N. should do. The refugees are suffering beyond imagination and such a measure becomes the more demanding. No amount of words would be sufficient to describe the life of the refugees. It is simply horrible, unthinkable, and indescribable. They live now in tents and camps, and their distress has moved the conscience of the world. Their tragedy has provided a complete history of frustration and human suffering. This disastrous episode has attracted to the refugees camps, congressmen, Parliament members, commentators, reporters, humanitarians, religious ministers and people of all walks of life. All have returned from these visits with the souvenirs of grief and bereavement. This is no wonder for this is the drama of a whole people uprooted from their homeland, living in exile-in the captivity of nostalgia, in the agony of homelessness-in the grip of anger, and entrenched in determination to go back home. These are no metaphors of eloquence. These are no words of wailings. There are no expressions of lamentations. These are the burning issues of a reality-an existing reality. Even diplomats, who are said to act without sentiments, have described the refuge situation in the most moving words-Mr. Henry Byroad, for some time a U.S. Assistant Secretary of State, said "a breath of fresh air would be given the world if all concerned would simply admit the fundamental facts that these people are homeless ..." Returning from his visit to the refugees in the summer of 1953, the late U.S. Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, said "within these camps, the inmates rot away, spiritually and physically. Even the Grim Reaper offers no solution, for as the older ones dies. Infants are born to inherit their parents' bitter fate."

I have placed these facts before you not to arouse your indignation and resentment against Israel. Israel is immune to all sentiments of indignation, and Israel is impregnable to any feeling of resentment. Neither moral pressure is of any avail with Israel. After all, the problem of the refugees is the cold-blooded making of Israel, and no one should expect Israel to go against its very nature of defiance, and its very instinct of aggression. Defiance and aggression are not the attributes and qualities of Israel. They are inherent in her existence.

These facts however are placed before the U.N. in an endeavor to arrive at a peaceful solution of the problem-and, at this point, permit me Mr. Chairman to say right away that the U.N. has already decided the solution, and has already established the machinery for the solution. You will find this in the U.N. resolution 194e 111 of December 1948. Under this resolution which has been commonly known as the repatriation resolution, the General Assembly decided that the refugees who wish to go back to their homes should be permitted to do so, and those who do not wish to go back to their homes should be compensated. This is the gist of the resolution. To put teeth in the resolution, the General Assembly has established The Palestine Conciliation Commission with definite instruction to facilitate the repatriation of the refugees wishing to return. This is the U.N. solution and this is the U.N. machinery-both decided in one resolution.

But what was the result. In a word, not a single refugee was repatriated-and not a single refugee was compensated. The Conciliation Commission has been unable to persuade Israel to accept the U.N. resolution. Up to this moment, the Conciliation Commission has submitted to the Assembly no less than 15 progress reports-all reporting no progress, except the defiance of Israel in progress.

Faced with this defiance of Israel, the U.N. has not betrayed its definite stand. Time and again, the General Assembly, reaffirmed its resolution of repatriation of 1948. Each and every session, Israel, basing herself on mutilated press clippings, raises the rusty arguments of sovereignty, the decaying plea of war, and the decomposed pretext of Israel's security and economy. But each and every session the General Assembly proceeds to uphold its resolution of repatriation. I shall not read the pertinent paragraphs of these resolutions. It is enough simply to enumerate them. They are: 194 (3), 212 (3), 302 (4), 393 (5), 394 (5), 512 (6), 513 (6), 614 (7), 720 (8), 318 (9), 916 (10), 1018 (11), 1191 (12), 1315 (13), 1456 (14).

All these resolutions have been passed by the Assembly- and all these resolutions have been violated by Israel. The resolutions of the last session was unanimously adopted with Israel abstaining. And here we are convened at this session only to find Israel devoted to her chronic rebellion against the wishes of the international community-a rebellion committed against the U.N. by the very creation of the U.N.

Had this organization not been torn by power politics, by the balance of terror and the East-West conflict, we would have reminded the U.N. of the forgotten article of the Charter. Article 6 of our Charter provides that "a member of the U.N. which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present Charter may be expelled from the organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council".

Israel's position on the question of the Arab refugees qualifies her for such a punishment. In the words of the Charter, Israel has persistently violated the principles of the Charter. Israel's persistent exclusion of the refugees is a persistent violation of the principles of the Charter. If Israel's resistance to U.N. resolutions passed by the Assembly in the last 13 years, is not a persistent violation of the Charter, I wonder what the term

violation means. Expulsion of Israel from the U.N. is the least sanction to redress the expulsion of a whole people from their homeland. And such a remedy must be invoked at the right moment.

I must remind, you, however, that the right of the refugees to their homeland does not arise from the U.N. resolutions or even the U.N. Charter. It is their birth right, inherent in their being, emanating from their national existence, devolving upon them from their ancestors-and the ancestors of their ancestors since recorded history. The right of the people of Palestine to their homeland is not the license, the grant, or the grace of the U.N. This organization does not establish a homeland, nor constitute a people. It does not invest or divest a public right. All the U.N. can do is recognize, uphold and support a right; and all the U.N. should do is facilitate the right to be realized, materialized and activated.

With regard to the problem of the Palestine refugees, the U.N. has recognized the right of the refugees to repatriation. But repatriation is a right which stands even without the U.N. recognition. The right of a people to their homeland is not deniable or even debatable. Otherwise, we would be impeaching this organization as an organ for Nations United. Nations do not exist without their homeland and their right to their homeland. Your right to your homeland is paramount-it constitutes the base of the pyramid without which the pyramid is bound to collapse. Without a homeland your independence, your sovereignty, your security, your dignity and indeed your very existence are the absolute non-existence, and the infinite nothingness.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, the right of the refugees to their homeland is primary, elementary and mandatory. It cannot and will not be assailed by any consideration of any nature. The right of the people of Palestine to their country-is the very same right you have with regard to your country-a right you exercise with

full right, and enjoy with full joy. Let no one in this committee infringe the rights of the people to their homeland unless he is ready to betray his right to his own homeland.

I have laboured this point for the simple fact that the problem of the Arab refugees, is in essence, the problem of a whole who should not be denied their right to self determination. The people of Palestine are the 20th century victims of the denial of the right of self determination. As the U.N. Committee has rightly remarked in 1947 "The principle of self determination was not applied to Palestine. Actually, it may be said that the Jewish National home and the man date for Palestine run counter to that principle".

With this glaring conclusion, I should like to put the question, can the U.N. deny the right of self determination to the Arab refugees. Has the right of self determination become a refugee principle uprooted from the U.N., without a home and with no support?

In exercise of that principle, the people of Palestine have been, since their exile, clamoring to go back to their homeland to live in their homes.

In 1922 the people of Palestine were placed under Mandate A to prepare them for independence. You all know, people under Man-date C, and even people under direct rule-under no mandate-have become independent, and were admitted to the U.N. To deny the people of Palestine their right to their homeland is travesty of the U.N., a mockery of the universal declaration of the rights of man, and a shameful breach of international decency.

Last year, the General Assembly has adopted a resolution requesting the Conciliation Commission to make further efforts for the repatriation of the refugees. That was a unanimous resolution. A year, now, has elapsed and not a single refugee has

been repatriated. If for the past year, one refugee was repatriated each month, we would expect the Conciliation Commission to report the repatriation of 12 refugees. The questions then arise: what further efforts has the Conciliation Commission made to implement the resolution of the General Assembly? Why has not the Conciliation Commission submitted a progress report pronouncing no progress? Why has not the Commission complied with the resolution of the General Assembly?

Clearly, Mr. Chairman, this is a serious situation. The problem involves the destiny of a whole people whose dignity has been wounded by charity. To the U.N. it involves a great financial responsibility necessitated by the defiance of Israel and perpetuated by the continued defiance of Israel. Such a situation calls the Conciliation Commission to question-and a serious question indeed.

We are, therefore, bound to ask in public, and from this forum whether the Conciliation Commission stands ready to implement the resolution of last year for the repatriation of the refugees. The Conciliation Commission, we cannot deny, has been faithful in its support to the principle of repatriation, but in the field of action, the Commission has failed. The Commission did not even suggest to the Assembly any course of action. I do not think any explanation of this default has been ventured in the past-and I venture to explain why.

The Conciliation Commission has been constituted from the U.S., France and Turkey. This composition, by itself, was a great blunder-and those Arab regimes who did not see the blunder at the time, exist no more-I say a blunder for many reasons-in the first place with such a composition the Commission does neither reflect an equitable geographic representation nor the general trends in the U.N. The Commission is a Western composition, and it is mainly the west that supported the partition of Palestine and the creation of Israel.

The U.S. is not only deeply involved with Israel, but particularly interested in its luxury and prosperity. France's position was some-what balanced at the beginning, but was later imbalanced by the aggression of 1956 and the sale of arms to Israel. As to Turkey-and here I speak of Turkey the government-not the people-the old regime did not, to say the least, live up to the expectations.

I wonder, whether after this bitter experience, and with such a composition, the Conciliation Commission is willing to do any useful work in the field of repatriation. It is now twelve years, since the Palestine Commission has been established. So far, the Commission submitted fifteen progress reports, that could be summed up in a word-nil-with this nil in mind, the one million refugees are wondering whether the Conciliation Commission should be maintained, abolished, or expanded.

These lines of action are really open for serious consideration and the U.N. should make up its mind as early as possible.

The maintenance of the Commission with such inaction is a stagnation, and a U.N. mockery. To abolish the Commission has the advantage of alerting the world public opinion of the worth of the U.N. To expand the Commission is not without justification. The Commission should not be an organ of the West, for the simple reason that the U.N. is not an organization of the West. At present, the Commission is constituted of three nations, why not add six other nations. Three would be representing the Eastern block with the Soviet at its head, and three others would be uncommitted nations-one from Asia, one from Africa and the third from Latin America. In the whole, it would be a nine member Commission representing all shades of the U.N.

This is, Mr. Chairman, how we can start a beginning for the solution of the refugee problem, within the framework of the

U.N. I say within the framework of the U.N. for if we fail to act as we should act, a solution to the problem would be sought outside the U.N. This conclusion is justifiable indeed. That it is justifiable hardly calls for reasoning. This is quite natural and human-and we cannot resist human nature. The Arab refugees, have been telling you through direct solicitation, through the reports of the Conciliation Commission, and through the reports of the Director, that they are determined to go back to their country, that lapse of time serves only to kindle their languish-that change of conditions in Palestine does not change their national aspirations, and that no power on earth would bend their determination to go back to their homes in their homeland. So far, their demand has not been met. Israel is in defiance and the U.N. is in silence-no action and no sanction.

To the refugees this is quite intolerable, and unacceptable. These people were the so-called sacred trust of the League of Nations. Starting from 1947, this trust has devolved upon the U.N., and the U.N. cannot and will not be absolved from its responsibility before they are returned to their homes. In the Congo, the U.N. has shouldered a vast and active responsibility. I beg of my colleagues of Africa, to say in passing that the plight of the Arab refugees is more grievous than the situation in the Congo. With all its seriousness, the situation in the Congo does not involve the fate of a people. No matter what dangerous developments may take place in the Congo, the people would remain in the Congo-they would still live in the Congo. With regard to the Arab refugees, they are not there-they are not in their homeland, and the refugees simply ask, what is the worth of the U.N. if we cannot live in our homes. I would not hesitate also to ask what is the worth of the U.N. if the U.N. cannot restore a refugee to his home, restitute his property and protect his dignity.

If we, in the U.N. do not answer these questions, the refugees are bound to answer them themselves. If we do not

protect their right, they are bound to protect them themselves. If we do not enforce the law-they are bound to take the law in their hands.

Taking the law in their hands simply means rising to arms. It means war and all the misery and sorrow of war. War is bad, but what is worse is to allow a situation to drift to the brink of war.

Let me tell you, the Arab refugees are now starting a movement of reorganization. They are a gallant people who fought the British for thirty years to emancipate their country. The tombs of their martyrs and the graves of their heroes have gemmed its plains, its valleys, and its mountains. The refugees are determined to die to the last man, woman and infant in defense of their country rather than die in starvation and humiliation.

Should the refugees rise to arms, it will be the responsibility of the U.N., caused by the inaction of the U.N. The Charter makes it imperative upon the U.N. to remove all causes of war and threat of war. The universal declaration of the rights of man, in its preamble, has demanded the protection of human rights so that "man is not to be compelled to resort to rebellion against tyranny and oppression". The preamble of the constitution of the Unesco has declared that "war was made possible by the denial of the democratic principles of the dignity, equality and mutual respect for men ...".

Thus, Mr. Chairman, the U.N. is duty bound, not to make war possible by the denial of the dignity of man. What is before you is not the dignity of one man, but the dignity of a whole people. So let the U.N. restore to these people their dignity, and not make war possible. Except for self preservation, and the sacred defense of one's country, war is the worst invention ever made by man.

That is why I have pressed for a solution within the U.N. before it is too late-before a solution is sought outside the U.N. It is our ardent hope that the U.N. would wake up, would harken to the siren, would rise to the challenge, would shoulder its responsibility, and finally would extend to the land of peace, a message of peace, based on justice, equity and human dignity.

The final intervention by the leader of the Saudi Arabian Delegation on November 30, 1960 is printed below:

I have listened with close attention to the various statements that were made before this Committee, since I first made my opening address. Of particular significance is the statement of the honourable Francis Wilcox on behalf of the U.S. We attach great importance to his statement for many reasons. First, the United States is a great power and its views, in spite of the sovereign equality of the U.N. members, must carry a great deal of weight; Second, the U.S. has played a major role in the partition of Palestine, the establishment of Israel and its continued survival. Third, the U.S. is a prominent member of the Palestine Conciliation Commission, with France and Turkey as the other members. Yet in fairness to international realities and with all due respect to Turkey and France, we can take the Conciliation Commission to be composed of the U.S. and the U.S. only.

For all these reasons, Mr. Chairman, we are duty bound to examine the statement of the U.S. with the utmost care it deserves.

We recall, first of all, that the Distinguished Representative of the U.S. has introduced his statement by an appeal for "the exercise of judicious restraint and for the application of the highest statesmanship". Taken for its face value such an appeal could hardly be resisted. In political questions, particularly when they are of an ordinary character, you do not even need to urge for judicious restraint and highest

statesmanship. These are prerequisite attributes highly necessary for tackling any international situation.

Be that as it may, we believe that this appeal on behalf of the U.S. was addressed to the Arab delegations. Surely it could not have been addressed to Israel for Israel has no complaint to make and no pain to suffer. Israel has been recognized with a nationhood which does not exist, a statehood with no attributes, and a homeland which she never owned or possessed. Thus Israel could not be called upon to exercise restraint and statesmanship except to arrest further expansion and aggression. By a necessary inference, the appeal, therefore, is addressed only to the Arabs, who suffered a great injustice, whose country has been usurped, and who were driven out of their ancestral homes.

It is a fact that on the question of the refugees, the Arab Delegations do speak with a great deal of sentiment, carried by high passion. This is quite understandable, natural and human. Charged as it is with humanitarian convulsion, the question of the refugees involves out of necessity a set of human feelings. I assume that the delegates to whom I am addressing myself, Israel excluded, are moved by human feelings on this problem. As members of a human brotherhood, we all share in the sentiments of distress in any distressing problem. The question is only one of degree between those proximate and those remote. For our part, our feelings are expressed in the strongest of emotional passions and passionate emotions, for the refugees are our people and Palestine is our homeland.

I would like, however, to remind our distinguished colleague of the U.S. that in essence, our deliberations in the U.N. are no more than expressions of passion that are at work in our minds. The level of tension generated is measured by the conditions of any given problem. In fact, the U.N. is an embodiment of our human passions. Our search for peace is motivated by passion. War in self defense is inspired by passion

too. This is the absolute truth. In the final analysis, national liberty, state sovereignty and human dignity are nonexistent without the passion to achieve liberty, sovereignty and dignity. Even hunger and thirst, our material necessities of life are passions striving for the survival of our race.

It is no shame, therefore, if we speak on the question of the refugees with emotion as long as those emotions are sincere and genuine. On the contrary, the shame lies in the contrary. If we were to address ourselves on the question of the refugees without disclosing our feelings, we would be betraying our humanhood, nationhood, and the very purpose for which we have joined the U.N. The U.N. is not a senseless chemical laboratory devoid of nerve and spirit. It is the storehouse of human aspirations, hopes and fears.

The question of the refugees, therefore, is deeply seated in the greatest and the noblest of human sentiments. Instead of appealing for restraint, it is more worthy to remove the very causes that underlie those sentiments. Nations, all nations large and small, including those with nuclear weapons are vibrant with such sentiments, and the U.S. is no exception. In 1954, the U.S. responding to passion, has inscribed an item on the U.N. agenda for the repatriation of eleven airmen who were held in communist China. They were only 11 human beings, yet the U.S. has engaged the Assembly for a whole week speaking emotions and breathing passions. The U.S. item was one of repatriation, the very same principle involved in the present item. It was Ambassador Lodge who represented the U.S. and presented the case with a singular ability. On 8 December 1954, at the 505th Meeting of the General Assembly, Ambassador Lodge conveyed the passions of the U.S. on the question of repatriation in the following moving words: "I have the grave responsibility to try to convey to you the depth of the emotion and the anguish with which the American people received the news of the so-called

trial which was held in Peking ... Any self-respecting government has the elementary and historic duty to protect its men. The U.S. has come before the U.N. because the U.N. was set up as a collective instrument for justice. The families of these men are still waiting, and we here have a grave responsibility to these men, to their families and to their fellow citizens, in Alabama, Pennsylvania, Montana, New York, Tennessee, Minnesota, Ohio, Virginia, Nebraska, Iowa and as a matter of fact, in all the U.S."

These words of Ambassador Lodge are passion down to the root. They are emotions right to the core. No doubt, you have noticed, Ambassador Lodge has even enumerated the States from which the airmen have come. Christmas, was then drawing nigh and the whole of the U.S. was disturbed that these eleven men were not repatriated to their homes to join their families on Christmas and the New Year's Eve. In its turn, the Assembly was carried by the passions of the U.S. and a resolution was adopted requesting the Secretary General to fly immediately to China to secure the repatriation of the eleven American men to the U.S.

We admire the U.S. for their vigilance, for their passions and for their a million to the U.N.

In our case, repatriation is sought not for eleven souls-but for over a million refugees. These refugees have their religious and national holidays, including Christmas and New Year's Eve. They are now in their fourteenth year of exile. Should we not be stirred by the same emotions of the U.S. Should we not seek, as the U.S. has sought, the repatriation of our people to their homes.

Even at this session, we have another illustration of the passions of the U.S. President Eisenhower has declared his refusal to meet Premier Khrushchev before an apology is offered, and two U.S. airmen are released. On the part of the U.S. such conduct was nothing but passion deeply seated in passion, seeking the liberty of two American citizens.

Again, Mr. Chairman, the problem under consideration involves one million refugees, representing half of the people of Palestine. In terms of the population of the U.S., the Palestine refugee problem means 80 million citizens. This is what it means for us to suffer a refugee problem; and what is involved embraces everything that belongs to human life. What is at stake is not only food and shelter but dignity, national existence and all the spiritual and material human rights.

As to the appeal of the U.S. for the application of the highest statesmanship, I can only say that we must first agree on intentions and definitions. What is intended by the highest statesmanship as well as its definition are matters which determine the fate of this item under our consideration. If statesmanship is intended to give up the right of the refugees to repatriation, then, this is no statesmanship-it is a brinkmanship verging on human bankruptcy. It is a betrayal of the lowest order which no Arab is prepared to commit, whether he be moderate, extremist, capitalist or communist.

An appeal, however, for the application of the highest statesmanship could be well received, when it is made by a State that has practiced on the problem even a reasonable degree of statesmanship. The Palestine problem, of which the refugee problem is only an integral part, has been the direct outcome of the lack of statesmanship on the part of the U.S. In 1947, it was the U.S. that pressurized the U.N. to adopt a policy that led to the present calamity of the Palestine refugees. What sort of statesmanship is it to divide a country against the wishes of its people. What statesmanship is it for the U.S. to have extended on the 15th May 1948, recognition to Israel just one minute after its establishment had been declared, without being assured that Israel would respect the rights of the refugees. What statesmanship is it for the U.S. to have endorsed, on the 11th May 1949, the admission of Israel to the U.N. without the slightest

assurance that Israel would implement the resolution of the U.N. on the problem of the refugees. All throughout these years and up to the present moment, the U.S. has been extending economic assistance, grants in aid, and facilities for fund raising campaigns, without pondering for a moment that such policy on the part of the U.S. amounts to fortifying the refusal of Israel to admit the rights of the refugees to their homes and homeland.

The matter, however, Mr. Chairman, did not stay at this point. The U.S. made another appeal which goes far deeper to the substance of the matter. In his statement before the committee, the Distinguished Representative of the U.S. has urged all delegations to proceed from the premise that the crucial factor is the present and future welfare of the Palestine refugees themselves. He further stated that if all work proceeds from that basic premise, real progress will be possible. This is a highly important statement that cannot be left without comment. It becomes more serious indeed when we remember that it is made by a State Member of the Conciliation Commission, entrusted to carry out the resolutions of the U.N. on the question of the refugees.

As worded by the U.S., an approach based on "The present and future welfare of the refugees" has raised in our minds grave concern and I daresay a serious alarm. We are really disturbed by such a statement. The present and future welfare of the refugees within the context of the statement of the U.S. can entail the most serious implication. It can imply a future for the refugees far from their homeland, torn from their past. It can imply no repatriation but a resettlement wherever possible. It can imply a welfare of material needs for the refugees with no national entity in their homeland. It can mean the refugees with no national entity in their homeland. It can mean the acceptance of the present de facto situation as a prelude for a definite future situation. It can mean to bow to Israel, consecrate her defiance,

and to abandon the rights of the refugees. It can mean the total cancellation of the U.N. resolutions on the question of the refugees. In a word, it can mean the liquidation of the problem, a liquidation not by admission but by an entire negation.

On our part, these are no mere hallucinations. They are genuine apprehensions based on past experience. These appeals which seem so innocent on the surface, are loaded with intentions not difficult to discover. They have been betrayed by current tidings which are taking place at a time when we are discussing the refugees question. The story has been disclosed recently and it is imperative that we bring it to the attention of the U.N.

On November 19, 1960, the New York Times, based on diplomatic sources has reported that "the U.S. has begun to bring renewed pressure on Israel and the Arab states to end their simmering twelve-year-old dispute." The New York Times has summarized the U.S. proposal as follows:

"The United States would contribute the major part of an international loan that would permit the repatriation of 100,000 to 120,000 refugees to their old homes in what is now Israel, and the resettlement of the remaining 900,000 or so in Arab countries.

"The United States would contribute to the development of the Jordan Valley irrigation project to the benefit of Israel and the Arab states.

"The United States would guarantee the Arab-Israeli frontiers after the permanent borders were drawn and agreed upon by both sides. With a firmly stated guarantee, the United States is said to feel, the Arabs and Israelis would no longer need to continue the arms race that is both exhausting and alarming other countries of the world".

The proposals of the U.S. boil down to two main points. The first, to accept the de facto situation as a starting point for

the solution of the Palestine problem. The second, in relation to the Palestine refugees, is the repatriation of one tenth of the refugees and the integration of the remaining nine tenths in the Arab countries.

Such proposals, Mr. Chairman, not as yet denied, are totally unacceptable. The Arabs will not accept the de facto situation, and never will they accept it. We will not abandon the right of any of the refugees. Neither would we abandon the right of one single baby refugee to his right of repatriation. I stress baby refugees to answer the point referred to by the Distinguished Representative of the U.S. that "about half of the refugee are young people born after their parents left their former homes".

But this is not all. We shall not be confined only to the mere rejection of the U.S. proposals. Should they stand undenied, we are bound to take the necessary position in keeping with the resolutions of the U.N. on the question of the refugees. Our position, then, would be to consider the U.S. becoming disqualified to serve as a member in the Conciliation Commission. Furthermore, we will be bound, under such circumstances, to discontinue our cooperation with the Commission.

This is not an extreme position inspired by the spur of the moment. It is a balanced application of the very statesmanship which the U.S. has urged. To declare the disqualification of a commission member when he violates the terms of reference of the mandate, is a sound judgement based on sound statesmanship. In the present case, to propose the repatriation of a fraction of the refugees, is an infraction of the resolution of the U.N. and a breach of the mandate as assigned by the U.N. It is an established rule of international jurisprudence and practice that when the terms of reference of any assignment are violated, the assignment becomes ipso facto rescinded, further action is

arrested and the assignees lose their status under the assignment. Thus, should no denial of those proposals be made, the U.S. stands absolved from her membership in the Commission with no necessity for a formal resolution by the U.N.

Let me turn now to the U.S. financial approach to the refugees problem. In his statement, the distinguished delegate of the U.S. has invited our attention to the fact that since May 1950, a number of governments have voluntarily contributed a total of nearly 319 million dollars. Since UNRWA began, we are told by the Distinguished Delegate of the U.S., the contribution of the U.S. has been over 222 million dollars. Here is an occasion for me to pause for a while to look into the balance sheet of the whole transaction.

First of all I should like to express my deepest gratitude to all contributing governments, and charitable institutions for their donations and services to alleviate the plight of the refugees. I express this gratitude not only out of a sense of responsibility but in response to our best traditions of gratitude. You can ascribe to the Arabs any demerits if you please. But the Arab chivalry and the sense of gratitude are the qualities that cannot be denied to the Arabs even in their greatest moment of hardship and affliction.

But with candor and truth I should tell our distinguished friend of the U.S. that the 222 million dollars so far contributed by the U.S. is in essence not without a political background. This sum is only a partial price for the policy of the U.S. on the question of Palestine. Against our advice and protests the U.S. has chosen to pursue a policy which was bound to lead to the expulsion of the Arabs of Palestine from their homeland. The U.S. has employed every form of undue pressure and every amount of duress to drive the U.N. into the hazards of the partition of Palestine. Now, after the catastrophe, the U.S. cannot simply wash its hands from the mess. The donations of the U.S.

are only a partial indemnity for the damage done to the people of Palestine. It is no use complaining of the consequences, when the consequences are the direct result of the policy adopted. This is the price of lack of statesmanship in handling the Palestine question. You did not heed our warnings nor the warnings of great friends of yours. In 1947, when the U.N. was discussing the partition of Palestine, Sir Zafarullah Khan, then foreign minister of Pakistan, a man of great talent and foresight has appealed to you in the General Assembly in these historic and moving words "I beg of you not to ruin and blast your credit in the Middle East". This appeal you have rejected and most of your credit in our lands has been ruined. What remains is on the way to ruin, should you continue the same policy.

The U.N. should bear in mind, the U.S. included, that the hundreds of millions of dollars extended as a relief to the Arab refugees does not stand to measure to the sufferings of the refugees, or the loss of their property. The exile of the refugees from their homeland and the loss of their national dignity, does not admit evaluation. An inch of Palestine is as valuable as any inch in the territory of the U.S. Neither of them can be valued for the whole treasure of the world. Damage done to Arab property can be compensated, but for Palestine as an Arab homeland there is no compensation. The Arabs will not give up their right to their homeland for all the wealth in the world.

It is with such a background that Count Bernadotte, assassinated by the Zionists in the course of his heroic mission for the refugees, has stressed the U.N. responsibility for the question of the refugees. In his progress report to the General Assembly, the U.N. mediator has emphasized the continuing responsibility of the U.N. not to be discharged unless and until the repatriation of the refugees is implemented.

On the other hand, it is neither fair nor just to confront the refugees with any inference of indebtedness for the payments so

far made by the contributing government. The refugees have not been repatriated through a fault of their own. They are not repatriated because of Israel's defiance. The U.N. members who are continuing their payments are simply paying the price of Israel's denial of the rights of the refugees. The U.S. alone, not to say the U.N., can bring Israel to her knees. Israel's emergence has been made possible by the support of the U.S. Israel's viability in the past and present was also made possible by the support of the U.S. Without the U.S., the past decade has shown, Israel's existence is a political fiction. By withholding the U.S. economic assistance, Israel would admit the second day the rights of the Arab refugees, if any, in the words of Mr. Kennedy, the President elect, the U.S. moves forward.

Let us turn now to another aspect in the position of the U.S. In his statement to the committee the distinguished representative of the U.S. said that: "the PCC cannot fruitfully work in a vacuum. Progress ... depends fundamentally on the attitudes and the actions of the parties". The distinguished representative of the U.S. went on further to say: "During the last several years, the governments concerned directly with the Palestine problem have not utilized the commission by proposing possible solutions".

This is all wrong, Mr. Chairman. I do submit with all due respect that this statement of the U.S. is wrong in fact and wrong in conclusions. The distinguished representative of the U.S. is a very able and charming personality. He deserves our respect and admiration. But we are bound to tell him that what I have just cited of his statement is neither corroborated by the facts nor supported by the U.N. resolutions to which the U.S. has subscribed.

Our record with the PCC is one of a long history-too long to be capitulated at present. Those who followed closely the work of the PCC are not unaware of the facts. In particular, the States members of the PCC should be the last to be unmindful of the

facts. The U.S., I assume, should not be forgetful of our attitude towards the Conciliation Commission. In a previous session, I have outlined our attitude towards the PCC in its efforts on the question of the refugees, and I quote from my statement:

"The Conciliation Commission, at the outset of its mission, held its conference in Beirut in March 1949, in an attempt to explore the positions of the parties. The Commission heard the views of the Arab delegation, and the representatives of the refugees. Later, the Commission flew to Tel Aviv and met the Israeli authorities. Although the talks of the Commission were of an exploratory character, it had appeared from the start that Israel was beginning to manufacture a case against repatriation. The Beirut Conference failed because of Israel.

"Thereupon the Commission asked the parties to send their representatives to Lausanne for a fresh start in a fresh and neutral atmosphere. The invitation was accepted and the talks lasted for weeks and weeks. On 12 May 1949, a protocol was signed between the parties and the Commission, making the partition plan of 1947 a basis for discussion. The Israeli delegation signed this protocol which declared the object to be: 'to achieve as quickly as possible the objectives of the General Assembly's resolution of 11 December 1948, regarding refugees, the respect for their rights and the preservation of their property ..' But no sooner had this protocol been signed, than Israel refused to accept repatriation, and the Lausanne Conference failed, because of Israel.

"In a further effort, the Conciliation Commission called the parties for further discussion in New York. The meetings took place during the whole summer of 1949 and covered every aspect of the refugee question, but the New York talks ended in failure, because of Israel.

"But the Commission did not fail in its patience. The parties were called again-this time to Geneva. Discussion roamed

over every field. The meetings exhausted all winter, the spring and most of the summer of 1950. The Geneva talks failed, because of Israel.

"Trying again, under these trying circumstances, the Conciliation Commission called the parties to a meeting at Lake Success in October 1950. The talks were held as usual-Israel rejected repatriation and as usual, the meetings failed.

"The Commission, not yielding to this continued failure, called for another conference to be held-this time, in Paris. The meetings were started in the middle of September 1951 and continued to the end of November-Israel stood adamant against repatriation and compensation; and the conference dispersed on this failure".

All throughout these years we have cooperated with the Commission regarding all aspects of the Palestine question. We have submitted a number of proposals oral and written. The records of the Conciliation Commission are too voluminous to be summarized. They dealt with every aspect of the Palestine question. We have offered the Conciliation Commission a solution for every problem. We have submitted detailed proposals with regard to the properties of the refugees, their conservation, and their administration. On the repatriation of the refugees we have also stated the principles and details for the whole operation of repatriation. On the question of the internationalization of Jerusalem, and this is included in the terms of reference of the Conciliation Commission, we have submitted detailed proposals for the establishment of an effective U.N. regime for the city of Jerusalem. In the Trusteeship Council we have worked out a statute for the city of Jerusalem. In all aspects, we have done our most and our best to bring the efforts of the Conciliation Commission to a success. This is our record with the Conciliation Commission. What is the record of Israel?

In the first place, Israel has violated the Lausanne protocol which bears her signature. In the second place Israel has rejected the internationalization of Jerusalem and instead claimed the city to be her eternal capital. In the third place, Israel has refused to recede one inch from the Arab territory she now holds, and in the words of Mr. Ben Gurion, Israel would not hand over at the peace table what she has gained in the battlefield.

With this record in mind, it is only fair and just that the U.S. should state the facts in fairness and justice. It is unfair and unjust, on behalf of the U.S., to refer to the Arab States and Israel in the same terms and in the same adjectives. Israel has rejected the implementation of the U.N. resolutions on the question of repatriation while the Arab States have always urged the implementation of these resolutions. You cannot put in one equation the defiance of Israel and the acceptance of the Arab States. You must place the guilt where it belongs and seat the guilty in the dock. I wonder what is it that the Arabs are asked to do. What is it that they are asked to propose to the PCC? What reasonable proposals are they urged to suggest? Should they propose the abandonment of the rights of the refugees? Should they agree to the integration of the refugees in their countries? Is this what you consider to be reasonable, realistic and practicable?

Such proposals we shall never advance, nor will we accept, now or at any time to come. The Arab States will never betray the right of the Arabs of Palestine to their country. Palestine is their home, and to those who deny this historical fact I would simply say "You do not, then, belong to your homeland." Furthermore the Arabs of Palestine are determined to go back to their country. This is their indomitable determination, now and for all time to come.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, if the Conciliation Commission is now in vacuum, it is because Israel has succeeded to bring failure to the effort of the Conciliation Commission. The Commission,

too, instead of pursuing an effort of action, has retreated into inaction just maintaining a shadow existence. Instead of disclosing the rebellion of Israel against the efforts of the PCC and in violation of the U.N. resolutions, the distinguished Delegate of the U.S. places the Arab governments and Israel on the same footing.

But this approach of the U.S. regarding the refugee problem is not amazing. That was the U.S. policy in the past and in the present. I do not think that it would even develop into fairness in the future, unless a basic change of mind and a revolutionary approach is made by the new U.S. Administration.

In formulating their policies, on the question of the refugees and on the Palestine question as a whole, the U.S. is bridled and led by the Zionists against the true interests of the U.S. When a group of U.S. diplomats told President Truman of the deteriorating American position in the Middle East, President Truman replied: "I am sorry, gentlemen, ... I do not have hundreds of thousands of Arabs among my constituents".

This is most eloquent, most telling and most informative. It simply shows that the position of the U.S. on the problem is not based on fairness, or justice. It is not even based on the interests of the peoples of the U.S. as a whole. It is based on the agitations of some thousands of American Zionists in the U.S. I beg your pardon, they are not American Zionists-they are Zionists in America.

That is why the statement of our colleague of the U.S. cannot tolerate to be fair and just. On the contrary, because of this Zionist pressure we should expect it to be unfair and unjust. And it is because of this Zionist pressure that the U.S. cannot take a just, fair and bold position within the Conciliation Commission. This is the cardinal defect in the composition of the PCC ever since it started in 1948, when the U.S. was first chosen as a member of the Conciliation Commission. At that time it was

speculated that, because of her economic assistance to Israel, the U.S. possesses the power to prevail over Israel to recognize the rights of the refugees. The assumption was right. By withholding economic assistance from Israel, the U.S. can bring Israel to surrender before the U.N. But experience has proved that the U.S. although possessing the power does not possess the Will. At least, the Will of the U.S. on this question is in the grip of Israel and the American Zionists.

Recent events have shown that in spite of the deterioration of her position in the Middle East, the U.S. is still unable to take a position based on fairness, justice, or in the minimum in accord with the interests of the people of the U.S.

To substantiate this conclusion, I shall not refer to the declarations of Senator Kennedy and Vice President Nixon on the problem of refugees-declarations which gave me the impression that Israel is not on the Eastern side of the Mediterranean, but right here, between the Pacific and the Atlantic. I would refer to another instance in passing. In the course of his campaign for Vice Presidency Ambassador Lodge has been attacked as being anti-Israel in the U.N. We all know, Ambassador Lodge has served his country here in the U.N. to the best of his ability. I have not known Ambassador Lodge to be a pro Arab. I do not think he can choose to be. But if Ambassador Lodge is to be disqualified because he is anti-Israel, how are we to hope that the statement of the U.S. can be fair here in the Committee. How fair can the effort of the U.S. be in the PCC. Our distinguished colleague Mr. Willocks or any American serving in the Conciliation Commission could be censored as anti-Israel, or worse still black-mailed anti-Semitic, and that would be his end.

At the very end of the statement of our distinguished colleague of the U.S. the whole problem of the Palestine refugees seems to be brought to an end. It is brought to an end without an

introduction, bluntly and frankly. It is brought to an end without much speaking but by employing the letter A. Of the five points which distinguished Representative of the U.S. has stressed as necessary to make real progress in dealing with the problem of the Palestine refugees, the fourth point reads as follows: "The Palestine Conciliation Commission must continue its efforts to prepare the way for progress toward A solution of the refugee problem".

Thus the U.S. is looking for A solution of the refugee problem. This little A is more telling than a whole volume. For anyone descending upon the U.N. from the planets, confronted for the first time with the problem of the refugees, this statement of the U.S. seems very sensible and reasonable. The matter simply appears as a refugee problem for which we must seek a solution. But as soon as we tell this celestial visitor that the U.N. has already decided a solution since the year 1948d, he would be shocked.

We cannot, therefore, but be bewildered at this statement on behalf of the U.S. The U.N. Resolution 194 III has decided the repatriation of the refugees. This resolution has been recalled and reaffirmed in each and every session. The U.S. did not only vote for these resolutions but was a co-sponsor, I daresay a major co-sponsor of these resolutions. As such the U.S. should stand for the effective implementation of the U.N. resolutions. Instead, the U.S. comes this year to remind us that we should search for A solution as though the solution has never been found. It is regrettable for a great power as the U.S. to hide the little letter A. Such a hiding, Mr. Chairman, does warrant the assertions of the Soviet Union that were it not for the support extended by the U.S., Israel would have long ago recognized the rights of the refugees.

In the course of the debate, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Israel has desperately attempted to destroy the case of the

refugees on a number of grounds. First of all, he endeavored to reduce the number of refugees. His concern, on this count, is to eliminate the resentment of world public opinion. The attempt is abortive and is refuted by the figures of the U.N. Agency which has been handling this matter now for ten years. Israel has attacked the refugees, driven them out of their homeland and dispossessed them of their properties. After such a crime, it is no wonder Israel is attempting to reduce the number of its victims. But their number is no difficulty. We can ask the Agency to carry out a census, when Israel retracts from her defiance to the U.N. The second is the question of reintegration. This is not the first time this plea, or distortion, is invoked by Israel in the U.N. We entirely reject as groundless the contention made by the gentleman from Israel that the U.N., the Secretary-General, the Conciliation Commission, the CLAP Mission or the UNRWA have suggested reintegration as a substitute for repatriation. Repatriation, ever since December 1948 up to December 1959, has been the policy of the U.N. and all organs acting under the U.N. So far, the General Assembly has adopted 15 resolutions supporting repatriation. Contrary to what the gentleman of Israel has suggested, Resolution 393 V did not speak of reintegration in vacuum. In Paragraph 4, reintegration has been defined as either through repatriation or resettlement-repatriation for those who wish to be repatriated and resettlement for those who do not wish to be repatriated. This is the gist of reintegration. On several occasions, this point was raised by Israel, and in each instance, we read the pertinent paragraph on the question. We expect Israel to raise the argument next year and we shall read the resolution of the General Assembly again. Should Israel find it pleasing to distort, it shall be more pleasing for us to refute. Anyhow, if Israel is not tired to repeat a fallacy, why should we be tired to state the truth.

On the other hand, Israel assisted by a few delegations, has voiced in the Committee a number of slogans as an exercise to

defeat the cause of the refugees. I do not wish to mention by name those delegations that have taken part in that exercise. Some of them are innocent. Others are ignorant-and others do speak in their sleeves so that their people do not hear them. I propose to deal with those slogans one by one with the utmost of brevity.

The first slogan was an appeal extended to us, to forget the past, not to look to the past. To forget the bitterness of the past is understandable, but to forget the past is not understandable, nor admissible. Do you want the refugees to forget their past life in their homeland-to forget their associations in their country, to forget their souvenirs, their memories. Surely, Mr. Chairman, such an appeal is not appealing. No man with sound senses would be ready to commit self betrayal. I assume that none amongst you is prepared to forget his past. The refugees are no less human than we are. Nations, too, cannot be without a past and cannot be asked to forget their past. Here in the U.N. our past is the greatest driving force in our minds, hearts and souls to inspire our progress in every field of national and international life. It is the past of France and Belgium that led France and Belgium to repel Nazi occupation when their countries were invaded in World War II. Why then, have not the United Nations who fought the Second War, forgotten the past of Europe and submitted to the Nazi domination?

Nevertheless, those who speak of forgetting the past, have been trapped in their own trap. What is the Israeli case except historic associations, that date back to three thousand years-associations submerged in an ocean of fiction and confusion. Your U.N. has unjustly raised these historic associations from the resurrection of the past. Your appeal to forget the past, where was it in 1947. Why did you look far back to the past of antiquity, to establish a State from the ruins of the temple of Solomon? The refugees, on the other hand, have a past, but well

defined, continuous and immemorial. The Arabs of Palestine are the inhabitants of the country since recorded history. Their exile is not three thousand years old, as the Hebrew exodus. It is 13 years old, preceded only in its medieval and modern history by 13 centuries. When we speak of forgetting the past, let us not forget that in this world of ours there is something called logic, common sense. Forgetting the past is plain nonsense.

The second slogan, Mr. Chairman, calls upon us to face the realities. This has been laboured at length by the gentleman from Israel. In reality this slogan lacks reality. It means that the refugees have been expelled from their country and that is the end. There should be no return, the conditions of the country have changed and Israel does not want the refugees to go back. The country is now Israel and there is no room for the refugees. This is the Israeli case. All this is sheer nonsense. If we are to accept situations as they exist, this organization of ours should not exist. There is no room and reason for the U.N. We have to face the realities of the situation, and there is no need for an international forum to examine any situation. Maybe, to make a show, in a showroom, the U.N. can be convened just to be seized with any situation and then proceed immediately to pronounce that this is an existing situation and that is all. In this sense, all injustices are realities—they do exist. They become part of international life. Territorial invasions, breaches of the peace, and many other violations can be realities. Should we accept them? Should we simply resign, abdicate and retire? If this is the philosophy with which we approach international problems why not liquidate the U.N. and leave the events establish themselves as existing realities. It is more honourable to revert to the law of the jungle, pure and simple. We will meet then, only to apply the law of the jungle in the U.N., in these nicely decorated chambers well equipped with all the amenities of civilization.

The third slogan, Mr. Chairman, has urged that we should not reverse the course of history. On the surface this seems to be an innocent appeal. Who can resist a genuine reminder not to reverse the course of history. In fact the refugee problem is the outcome of an Israel attempt to reverse the course of history. It is a simple fact of history that Palestine is the ancestral home of the refugees since the days of Canaan. The establishment of Israel itself, was, therefore, a reversal of the course of history. Its emergence since 1948 has not become history, nor part of the course of history. The whole thing is still an experiment proceeding towards failure. Those who volunteer the advice not to reverse the course of history, must apply it where it belongs. Zionism is the only surviving ideology endeavoring to reverse the course of history. If Zionism is based on religion, the trend of history is not in the direction of establishing States on the basis of religion. If it is the race, there is nothing known as the Jewish race, and it is a stigma in the present historic era to create a State on the basis of race. If it is a nationhood, the Jews are not a nation-the first prerequisite for the constitution of a State. Judaism is a faith, culture, and a civilization. The only common denominator between a Jew of America, Russia, India, Africa and China, is Judaism as a religion. Just as Christianity is the common denominator between a Christian of Italy, France, Japan or the Congo. This is now the course of history in its march towards the highest goals of Democracy. Yet I should ask of those who speak loudly with an advice not to reverse the course of history, where was your wisdom in 1947 when you voted for the establishment of Israel, the classic example for reversing the course of history? Where was this eloquence of yours, why didn't you voice such an advice at the time? Now that the course of history has been interrupted for a decade, you insist that we should not reverse the course of history. Consistency is the greatest charter to seek truth. When such a charter is lost, we simply lose the U.N. Charter. Nonsense is tolerable but not lack

of consistence. For even in talking nonsense, one can be consistent. I should stress, however, that by insisting on the repatriation of the refugees we revert to and not reverse the course of history.

The fourth slogan, Mr. Chairman, is the appeal for negotiations, with a view to solving the refugee problem by the agreement of the parties concerned. This is a chronic slogan of Israel. The gentleman from Israel has made of it much ado about nothing, in a poor imitation of Shakespeare's play.

In the first place I should like to stress that the people of Palestine, not the Arab States, are the main party concerned. Just as had been the case in the U.N. on the items of Tunisia, Morocco, Libya and now Algeria, the Arab States do stand to support the cause of justice and equity. Thus it is with Palestine. Although part of the Arab homeland, Palestine is an Arab country with a special entity and a separate personality. Its people, although part of the Arab nation, are lord and master of their country. They have the last word in the destiny of their country. The Arab States, therefore, are not a party to negotiate with Israel, just as they are not a party to negotiate the Algerian question with France. The Arab States are backing the Algerian cause but it is the government of Algeria which is the lawful party to negotiate. Thus it is the people of Palestine, who determine the destiny of Palestine. This is the intelligible meaning of the principle of self-determination. There is no reason why the people of Palestine should be denied this universal principle. The gentleman from Israel suggested the other day that the refugees be resettled in the Arab countries where there are no barriers of religion, etc. I shall make no effort to refute this fallacy. The people of Palestine belong to Palestine and can only be resettled in Palestine. There's no need to look for new homes because they have their homes in Palestine. By analogy the suggestion from Israel, should the

Christians of New York be driven out by its Jews, is tantamount to saying "you Christians, go and live in other states where there are no barriers of religion. The people of Palestine reject any resettlement outside their homeland. Israel's permission for repatriation, as suggested by the gentleman from Israel does not arise, for the people of Palestine have existed in Palestine centuries before the establishment of Israel.

In the second place, the question of repatriation, by its very nature, does not admit negotiations. The moment you speak of negotiations for repatriation, you have destroyed repatriation as a principle. Negotiations are conceivable for problems which are problematic, for matters which are contentious, for questions which are debatable, for issues which are arguable. I should like to ask you, is the question of repatriation contentious, arguable, debatable? Is the question of repatriation negotiable? Repatriation is an inherent right, just as the right to live, to worship, to freedom, to liberty, to human dignity. Are these rights subject to negotiation. The rights of man as embodied in the Universal Declaration are rights per se, that stand on their own. They are not rights that rise as a result of negotiation. We know, negotiations can end in denial or acceptance. Can the right of repatriation be denied? Never, and I would challenge the U.N., Israel excluded, to deny the right of repatriation. Therefore, neither the Arabs of Palestine, nor the Arab States, would enter into negotiations with Israel on the question of repatriation. This is a final conclusion reduced to the last point of finality-never to be changeable and never to be reversible.

In the third place, and I make it third because it is not the first consideration, the U.N. has recognized the right of repatriation independent of the agreement of Israel. The arguments raised by the gentleman from Israel on this point had been raised at every session since 1948. At each and every session they were rejected, and at each and every session the

U.N. has reaffirmed its stand on repatriation. The U.N. resolution 194 III did not make the agreement of Israel a condition precedent for the repatriation of the refugees. Paragraph II pronounced that "the refugees wishing to return to their homes ... should be permitted to do so ..." The same paragraph spelled out the injunction to the Conciliation Commission to facilitate the repatriation of the refugees. Thus, the agreement of Israel is not written into the resolution. It could never be. Repatriation would be sheer nonsense if we were to subject it to the consent of Israel. It would be tantamount to subjecting our resolutions to the consent of one or more of its members-indeed it would amount to subjugating the whole of the U.N. to the agreement of this member or that. The whole idea of the U.N. would be a comedy and its charter would be a tragedy.

On the 12th May 1949, at 10:30 A.M. a meeting of the Palestine Conciliation Commission was held in Lausanne with the Israeli Delegation. Those present were:

Mr. De Boisanger (Chairman) France

Mr. Yalcin, Turkey

Mr. Ethridge, United States of America

Mr. Azcarate (Principal Secretary)

Dr. Walter Eytan, Israel

In the course of this meeting the following Protocol was signed by the delegation of Israel, on the one hand, and the members of the Conciliation Commission on the other:

Protocol

The United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine, anxious to achieve as quickly as possible the objectives of the General Assembly resolution 11 December, 1948, regarding refugees, the respect for their rights and the preservation of their property, as well as territorial and other

questions, has proposed to the delegation of Israel and to the delegations of the Arab States that the working document attached hereto be taken as a basis for discussions with the Commission.

The interested delegations have accepted this proposal with the understanding that the exchanges of views which will be carried on by the Commission with the two parties will bear upon the territorial adjustments necessary to the above indicated objectives.

Lausanne, 12 May 1949.

(Signed)

Claude de Boisanger

(France), Chairman

Cahid Yalcin (Turkey)

Mark Ethridge (United States of America)

(Signed)

Walter Eytan (Israel)

This resolution 194 III, I am not tired to repeat, has been reaffirmed by all the resolutions passed by the Assembly on the question of the refugees. Of these, resolution 512 VI has a direct bearing on this slogan of negotiations and agreement. This resolution leaves no room for agreement and negotiation, because it calls for unreserved, unconditional and unqualified implementation. Paragraph 3 reads:

"CONSIDERS that the governments concerned have the primary responsibility for reaching a settlement of their outstanding differences in conformity with the resolutions of the General Assembly on Palestine".

Paragraph 4 reads:

"URGES the governments concerned to seek agreement with a view to an early settlement of their outstanding differences in conformity with the resolutions of the General Assembly on Palestine ...".

Paragraph 5 reads:

"CONSIDERS that the Conciliation Commission for Palestine should continue its efforts to secure the implementation of the resolutions of the General Assembly on Palestine ...".

Thus in one resolution the General Assembly has pronounced three injunctions urging the repatriation of the refugees through implementation not negotiation. And before this resolution as well as the remaining fourteen resolutions are shamefully revoked, the U.N. is duty bound to implement its resolution. Any slogan for the agreement of Israel or any appeal for negotiations with Israel is an attempt which brings upon the U.N. nothing but shame, disgrace and degradation.

I say shame, Mr. Chairman, for the slogan of negotiation has no meaning with Israel. The gentleman from Israel has gone into great labour to show that resolution 194 III was one and single, and should be viewed as a whole. Well let us take it as a whole, and let us put the record of Israel in relation to the whole of the resolution.

The Palestine question, Mr. Chairman, falls into three main divisions: The refugees question, the territorial question, and the question of Jerusalem-all these problems are treated by the resolutions of the General Assembly.

On the question of Jerusalem, Israel has transmitted to the Trusteeship Council a document T431, which contained the declaration made by Mr. Ben Gurion with regard to Jerusalem. Mr. Ben Gurion states as follows:

"The General Assembly of the United Nations has decided to place Jerusalem under an international regime as a separate

entity. This decision is utterly incapable of implementation-if only for the determined, unalterable opposition of the inhabitants of Jerusalem themselves. But for the state of Israel there has always been, and will be, one capital only-Jerusalem, the eternal. So it was three thousand years ago-and so it will be, we believe, until the end of time".

With Jerusalem declared a Jewish capital until the end of time, what are we going to negotiate?

On the question of the refugees, the Palestine Conciliation Commission in Paragraph 13 of its progress report of 1950 stated as follows:

"The Commission has not succeeded in achieving the acceptance of the principle of repatriation by the Government of Israel".

With this statement, Mr. Chairman, is there anything left for negotiation on the question of the refugees, when Israel does not even accept the principle of repatriation?

On the question of the territorial aspects, the Permanent Representative of Israel in a letter dated 27 October 1949, addressed to the Conciliation Commission, stated the following:

"The Government of Israel now asserts its title to the territory over which its authority is actually exercised. All that territory had to be fought for ... but of the territory now constituting the State of Israel there can be no secession".

With this statement, Mr. Chairman, is there anything left to negotiate on the territorial question, when Israel rejects to give back areas assigned to the Arabs by the United Nations? Thus on the whole Palestine problem, there is nothing to negotiate, and we have to negotiate nothing.

The fifth and last slogan urges for resort to peaceful means rather than to force of arms. We cannot agree more. Resort to

force to resolve international problems is outlawed by the Charter of the U.N. It is through peaceful means that international disputes must be settled. In the case of the refugees, the matter has been settled as early as December 1948 in support of repatriation. Ever since, the refugees have been conveying to you through all peaceful means their demand for repatriation. It was expressed, through direct solicitations, through the Conciliation Commission, through the Director of the UNRWA, and through the representatives of the Arab Delegations. The refugees have always demanded that effective measures be taken to put their rights into effect. For fourteen years they have been resorting to peaceful means to demand these rights. Until when should they wait the U.N. inaction. Resort to force indissoluble, only when the U.N. resorts to action. But when it retreats to inaction-and for 14 years, the refugees have no course to follow but to take the law in their hands. The truth of the matter is that Israel, right from the beginning, has resorted to force. By the force of arms Israel was established. The U.S. King Crane Commission of 1921 has declared that the Zionist plan for the establishment of a Jewish State could only be established by military force. After his trip to the Middle East, President Roosevelt told the State Department that, in his opinion, a Jewish State in Palestine could be established and maintained only by military force. The day before yesterday, the gentleman of Israel told the Committee that "There is no other realistic outcome, short of a war which would destroy the State of Israel, and resettle the refugees among the ruins". Of course the gentleman of Israel can speak of the ruins so lightly for neither the land nor the property in Palestine are the ownership of Israel. This is the strategy of every retreating army in destroying the land of the enemy. Nonetheless, Israel has put the question very frankly and we should provide the answer very frankly too. Israel has been established not as a peaceful implementation of the resolution of the U.N. It was established by the force of arms, and by the force of arms Israel has driven

out its people and dispossessed their property. At this session Israel asserts that repatriation can only be effected by war. The Arabs of Palestine, then, have no other choice but to resort to war. It would be a war of liberation, to regain their homes and homeland. It would be a war in self defense. It would be a war invited by Israel and by Israel's denial of the U.N. authority.

Israel, therefore, should not complain of the military preparations of the Arabs of Palestine. If you do not restore to me my home except by war, then war shall be the answer. The Arabs of Palestine, the present generation or their descendants, if you please, shall spare no effort or sacrifice until their country is emancipated to the last span.

Yet in an attempt to maintain peace, a number of delegations have stressed the need for an immediate solution to the refugee problem. I would repeat, the solution should be sought not for the principle, the principle has been decided and there is no power on earth to deny it. It should be focused on the measures of implementation. It is admitted that the refugee problem is part of the Palestine question. This is a major finding in the report of the Director of the Agency. The solution as recommended in 1947 in resolution (181 SII) has proved to be a calamity. It has led to the refugee problem, it brought about conflict, and has generated insecurity. It is still breeding instability, and should it continue, it will lead to untold consequences. The U.N. is therefore duty bound to go into a reconsideration of that resolution. And a reconsideration is one peaceful means to remove an injustice. The gentleman from Israel has attempted in vain to demolish resolution 194 of the 1948 repatriation resolution. His hair-splitting distortion is of no avail. In 1948, Israel has made every effort against the adoption of the repatriation resolution. But in spite of all the arguments, of the sovereignty of Israel, of the security of Israel, of the fiction of

peace with Israel, the General Assembly has passed its resolution. There is nothing invalid about that resolution.

But the resolution which stands now null and void is the resolution of 1947 which gave rise to the establishment of Israel.

In the first place, the United Nations is not empowered to partition a country against the wishes of its people. In all the colonial issues, in Asia or Africa, that were examined by the United Nations, the General Assembly did never resort to partition as a solution. The territorial integrity of any country is one of the fundamentals of the United Nations. By decreeing the partition of Palestine, the United Nations was simply betraying its own charter.

Contrary to what the gentleman from Israel has inferred, the partition of the sub continent of India, which give rise to the two sovereign States of India and Pakistan, was made outside the U.N. and by the consent of the people concerned. In the case of Palestine, not only an entire lack of consent was obvious, but there was a determined opposition, and what is devastating, the Jews in Palestine were the minority. They were an alien mass in gathering possessing literally all the features of an invasion.

Again, in the question of Cyprus, with the Turkish and Greek communities, the solution was sought on the basis of a unitary state, and not on the basis of partition. And in that case the Turks and Greeks in Cyprus were legitimate citizens-not aliens.

Last, in the question of the Congo, not a single voice was raised in the Assembly in support of partition or secession. On the contrary, the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly stressed the territorial integrity of the Congo.

Again the resolution of 1947 is drenched with illegality. The assumptions upon which it has been based have collapsed

and a reconsideration by the U.N. has become an imperative duty, at least to facilitate the repatriation of the refugees.

It is on the books of the U.N., that even those who voted for that resolution have done so with such a reluctance, that goes to vitiate their votes. Speaking on the plan for the creation of Israel, the representative of Sweden said that the "plan has its weak sides and some dangerous omissions". The representative of Canada said "we support the plan with heavy hearts and many misgivings". The representative of New Zealand spoke of the "grave inadequacies of the present proposal". The Foreign Minister of Belgium said of the plan "we are not certain that it is completely just, we doubt whether it is practical; and we are afraid that it involves great risks ... The Palestine question is particularly disturbing for Belgians. They have to make an effort to understand Zionism. The national home of our Jewish patriots is in Belgium. No one has treated them in such a way as to make them want to find another home in Palestine." The representative of the U.S. envisaged that "the boundary between the Jewish and Arab States will be as friendly as the boundary which runs for three thousand miles between Canada and the U.S." In all its paragraphs, the resolution itself had aimed at bringing peace to the holy land. These were the assumptions of the delegations that supported the 1947 resolution-assumptions that are now fully vitiated by the general unrest that has overtaken the Middle East from 1947 until the present moment. That resolution has aimed at bringing peace to two conflicting communities within Palestine. After this resolution, the conflict has widened. It has embraced the states of the region, and in 1956 has almost brought the world close to a nuclear conflagration. The boundaries which the U.S. envisaged to be as peaceful as those separating the U.S. and Canada, have proved to be the boundary of hate, unrest and bloodshed, bringing in its wake the expulsion of over one million human beings.

Yet from the very beginning the partition resolution has been born in illegitimacy. In the Committee it has failed to get two-thirds majority, and thereupon, the greatest pressure was employed to snatch votes from here or there, just to make it pass.

Before the final voting, the Philippine Delegation had announced that they received instructions to vote against the resolution as being against "the unviolable primordial rights of a people to determine their political future and to preserve the territorial integrity of this native land ..." Haiti Representative told the General Assembly that "the principle of sovereignty was in opposition to the adoption of the resolution".

But all of a sudden, the delegate of the Philippines sailed on the Queen Mary, and the succeeding delegate voted for the resolution. In another surprise, the Haiti delegation has also voted for the resolution. Also, the credentials of the Siamese Delegate were cancelled. In general, The campaign of pressure as noted from U.N. records has changed five votes to yes, and seven votes from no to abstentions, thus procuring within only 24 hours a change of votes sufficient to muster the necessary majority.

It is under these circumstances, Mr. Chairman, that the question of the refugees was brought into the international arena. The question of the refugees has arisen in the wake of the Palestine question. To solve the refugees question by repatriation you have to solve the Palestine question, and for the Palestine question there is only one solution and one solution only. This is how we see the solution.

Palestine is a State under the mandate. That is the real status under the League of Nations. The U.N. as its successor, must respect its political independence, and its territorial integrity. The refugees should be repatriated and the unity of Palestine must be restored. It goes without saying that the Jews, the legitimate citizens of Palestine, will enjoy full rights. The half-million Jews who migrated from Arab lands to Palestine in

the last decade will be given the choice to stay as citizens in Palestine in the last decade will be given the choice to stay as citizens in Palestine or go back to their respective Arab countries. We take them to be our citizens. The rest of the immigrants will be repatriated to their countries of origin or to wherever they can go. Thus the situation would be normalized in Palestine. Its people, the legitimate citizens, Moslems, Christians and Jews alike can constitute their State in accordance with all the democratic principles and with a democratic constitution. Palestine, free and independent will join the U.N. and its delegation will embrace Moslems, Christians and Jews in accordance with their merit and ability.

As we see it, as we are endeavoring to realize it, this is the only way to solve the question of the refugees, and the only way to solve the question of Palestine. Indeed it is the only way to extend peace to the holy land, to the Middle East and to the whole world.

With Israel's Statehood, there can be no repatriation of the refugees, no peace in Palestine, no stability in the Middle East and no tranquility in the world. The U.N. will have to make its choice-Israel or peace.

For our part, our choice is for peace. The land is ours, the people are ours. We cannot but throw our choice on the side of peace. And the battle for peace we shall spare no sacrifice, no matter how great it may be, for the cause is great and noble.

And it is worthy for the United Nation to join in our determined efforts to do justice, undo injustice, and maintain peace in the land of the prince of peace.

Mauritania ...

Mr. Shukairy delivered a speech in which he stated point by point why Mauritania is considered part and parcel of the sovereign state of Morocco. Below is the full text of the statement that he delivered in the First Political Committee on that item on November 16, 1960.

In examining the question of Mauritania, our memory goes back to the thirteenth day of December, 1951, an historic day on the United Nations calendar. On that day, and in Paris, the heart of France—more specifically, in the Palais de Chaillot—the General Assembly was engaged in a highly contested debate, exclusively confined to the inscription of an item entitled "The Independence of Morocco". In the course of the Assembly's deliberations in that historic session, a handful of freedom-loving fighters—the representatives of Asia and Africa—bore the brunt of a dauntless challenge directed against France in France itself. The battle, one of the most admirable occasions in the history of the United Nations, was fought with chivalry, ability and dignity. After a sharp and tense debate, the request for the inclusion of the item in the United Nations agenda was rejected.

France, then, scored a triumph, and the Afro-Asians were defeated. But the defeat was more inspiring than victory. Supported by freedom-loving peoples, the gallant struggle of the people of Morocco has inscribed the item not only on the agenda of the United Nations but deeply into the records of current history.

Ultimately the people of Morocco regained their independence. His Majesty King Mohammed V was rushed back from exile, and Morocco was admitted to the United Nations as a fully sovereign State. That is how the item of Morocco, then refused inclusion, has evolved in the United Nations, from stage to stage, until Morocco attained full-fledged membership.

Today, although we meet to consider the question of Mauritania separately and distinctly, you can be sure that the question before us, in essence, is a continuation of that historic item on Morocco. The problem is one and the same, one phase having already been determined and the other awaiting determination. Hence, the question of Mauritania is now before you for consideration.

This continuity stems from an unassailable reality that could be stated in all simplicity. In short, Mauritania is part and parcel of Morocco, just as any of your provinces is part and parcel of the State you represent here in the United Nations. To be more precise and to put the emphasis where it belongs, Mauritania is part of Morocco, just as Normandy is part of France.

I have specifically referred to France because, by sheer force, France is the other party in the problem of Mauritania, in spite of the disclaimers emphasized by our colleague yesterday in his statement in this Committee. In the nineteenth century France sliced-and I use the term "sliced" in all its physical significance-Mauritania by military conquest, and it was France that fashioned in November 1960 an independence to Mauritania by military presence, or, if you please, by the strength of the continuation of that military conquest. This item, therefore, or this complaint, if you please, is not submitted against Mauritania or its people. Mainly, it is filed against France and for actions perpetrated principally by France. It is not a dispute between Arabs and Arabs, as France is eager to display and as our colleague from France eloquently attempted to portray in his statement yesterday. It is not a grudge on the part of Morocco against Mauritania; far from that. It is a colonial issue, against France as a colonial Power. The problem is part of the legacy of French imperialism in Africa. That is the core of the matter. Let us go into its merits.

The case is simple to state; and, no matter how eloquent and able French advocacy can be, the facts speak for themselves. They speak loudly, high above the eloquence of France, no matter how superb the eloquence of our colleague from France may be. Neither could the facts be submerged under the impact of the so-called independence which the French have lavished upon Mauritania-and I say "lavished" with its full meaning. Paris tailors are skilful indeed, yet the events have shown that Mauritania's independence was so tailored to meet the interests of France rather than the aspirations of the people of Mauritania. Independence as a concept-and here I agree with my colleague and neighbour from Senegal-is so supreme and commanding that no one dares to resist. None the less, as granted by France, the independence of Mauritania will not make us waver in fighting out this item. We are not afraid of the magic of independence, and we shall face the problem bluntly, squarely and honestly. We shall not be deflected by a war of nerves, and Mauritania's independence has become a war of nerves through the actions of France, no matter what the slogans might be. French strategists have planned that in order to corner Morocco, to put the Government and people of Morocco in a corner, the independence of Mauritania must be declared and given the big name of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania, so big and fascinating that Moslem representatives would probably tremble to speak on an item which pertains to an area with this grave name of Islamic Republic of Mauritania, containing half a million people in the great Sahara south of Morocco, which has formed ever since the dawn of history part of Morocco. The thinking of France was: how can the Arabs dare to challenge the idea of independence or resist the emergence of an Islamic Republic? With this strategy, France appears more Moslem than the Moslems themselves, just as Napoleon, declaring his Islam in Cairo, had appeared at the time more of a Moslem than the Egyptians themselves. We shall not be terrorized by such a

manoeuvre so awkwardly planned. Here I am not using violent language. The representative of France has complained of violent debate, in referring to our colleague from Morocco. Violent debate is no danger; it is the violent acts of repression by France in Mauritania that are the source of danger. Surely the representative of France does not wish a violent debate, because he does not want to disclose the violent acts of repression by France in Mauritania. France has never had the cause of Islam at heart or Arab interests on her mind. All this is tactless tactics, but we shall proceed to state the case without fear or reluctance. Obviously we have nothing to fear. Neither is there anything to be ashamed of. On the contrary, the cause behind the present item is praiseworthy and dignified and should find a place of eminence in our deliberations.

The facts of the case, briefly stated, offer no difficulty to accept because they are borne out by the facts of history-and arguments of history were the basis of the statement which the representative of France offered to the Committee yesterday. I submit that these facts cannot be contested by France, because they are the culmination of French imperialism in Africa; and Mauritania, we must recall, has been one of the many victims of French imperialism in Africa. But Mauritania was not a victim separate and distinct. It was a victim as part of Morocco and not as an independent entity with a separate personality. Since the dawn of history, Mauritania had been an integral part of Morocco, constituting the southern provinces as far south as the Senegal River. In spite of change of rule or of dynasty, these southern provinces have been, century after century, within the domain of Morocco. These provinces-and I stress this point for the intelligent consideration of the representative of France-were named after the names of the tribes inhabiting from time immemorial those southern provinces of Morocco in Mauritania. The word "Mauritania", after all, was coined by France in 1904, and the coin proved to be worthless. That explains why

Mauritania as such remained unknown in international history and continued to be known only as part of Morocco.

In fact, with regard to the word "Mauritania," I would refer my colleague to the Encyclopedia Britannica if he does not like any other encyclopedia. Probably the Encyclopedia Britannica is an authoritative source which all of us can agree contains sometimes material that can be invoked and employed here in the United Nations. If we invoke the material that is there, we find that "Mauritania" was first applied by the Romans to embrace the whole of Morocco and many surrounding areas. In his book entitled "Inside Africa," Mr. Gunther, an American authority this time and a famous author and traveler, has stated:

"In early times, there was no particular distinction between the three countries, Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia. The Romans called the area Mauritania, but the Mauritania on the maps today is something different".

I had to dig into the archive of history in search of these findings, because Mauritania as a separate entity has no existence in world geography and has no place in world history. If the representative of France bases his stand, his argumentation on facts of geography and history, these are the facts of history and geography and this is the verdict of history and geography which you have to accept, which you must invoke.

The word "Mauritania" is so anonymous that we feel it necessary to acquaint the Committee with its identity because it has an almost unknown identity. Mauritania is a French creation, that has no roots of its own. It is a branch stemming from a main trunk which had always been known in geography and history as Morocco, Mauritania, as such, has no past nationhood, has never exercised any statehood or any sovereignty whatsoever. Mauritania is a French prefabrication compressed-and I use this word with its full meaning-compressed in what was called French West Africa, another baseless prefabrication, because

French West Africa has no existence also in world geography and history. It is simply a French creation. But to give it a name, France was compelled to name the baby after the name of the father. That is the custom. These are the traditions. In the days of Rome the fatherland was Mauritania, and the French creature was thus given the name of Mauritania. This is how Mauritania came to be known.

But to give it a name does not change the basic structure of the country, nor would it crack the stratum upon which national existence is founded. Mauritania, in spite of the French carving, continued to embrace the southern provinces of Morocco, and these, in turn, remained Moroccan no less than the northern provinces. It is a continuity dictated by nature. The coasts of the north have been forever beaten by the waves of the Mediterranean, while those of the south are gently washed by the waters of the Senegal River. It seems as though nature has united this homeland, embraced as it is by the Senegal in the south and the Mediterranean in the north. And what nature has united, France cannot disunite.

When I refer to unity, I mean it with all its attributes, and with all its qualities. Unity is not a slogan, neither is it the convenience of the moment. It is the expression of the oneness of existence, past, present and future. It is the identity of spiritual strivings. It is a community of cultural and material evolution. It is an accumulation of past historic associations. No better classic illustration could be furnished in support of this absolute truth than the relation of Morocco to Mauritania. This is a truth which neither France could question, nor the granting of Mauritania's independence would demolish. And how could it ever be demolished, when every aspect of human life between Mauritania and Morocco cries out for attachment, not detachment, cries out for unity and not disunity?

Against this unity the representative of France, in his statement yesterday, has marshalled a mass of doubt and argumentation. It was, I would say, a cocktail of argument, the blend of history, geography, technology, Islamic technology and international law, but the attempt on the part of our colleague, the representative of France, was a failure. On the other hand, in contrast to the French stand on Morocco, our arguments are valid, consistent and, I would say, cogent.

In the first place, the people are one and the same. The people of Mauritania, in their entirety, are a counterpart, so to speak, of the people in Morocco. Tribal life, dominant as it is in Mauritania, the tribes of those provinces of Mauritania in the south, whether Arab or Berber, are no more than clans, no more than factions, of the tribes in the north, in the northern provinces of Morocco. I do not desire to weary you about names that might be quite alien and foreign to you. There is just one illustration: take, for instance, the Rugeibat tribe; one part of this tribe is to be found in Morocco, in the north, and the other part, under the same name, you will find in Mauritania, in the southern provinces. So it is with the rest of forty major tribes which are to be found in the south, in Mauritania. It is so with all these tribes that constitute the majority of the population in Mauritania—one branch in the north and the other in the south, one brother in the north, one brother in the south. Yet France is pleased to destroy this national brotherhood.

In the second place, apart from the oneness of language, which seems to be nothing to France, and the oneness of faith, which seems to be almost a flimsy argument in accordance with the statements of the representative of France, and apart from tradition, which also was eliminated and discarded by the representative of France, apart from all these considerations, the people of Morocco, Mauritania included, had one past written in the annals of history. In the south, as well as the north, the

people have shared a common fate and joined in one destiny. They warred together, and together they made peace. They triumphed together, and together they were defeated. Their rise was one, and one was their decline. They made civilization hand in hand, never untied, except after advent of French imperialism. Yet, behind all those fictitious barriers, national oneness continued to struggle to realize the oneness of the future, based on the oneness of the past and the oneness of the present.

This history of the past is the continuous stream of national existence that made of Mauritania the southern part of Morocco, just as it made the northern provinces the other part of Morocco. France as disclosed in the statement of its representative yesterday, has claimed, in support of the independence of Mauritania, the authority of the Sultan of Morocco was never exercised over Mauritania in an effective, organized and durable manner. Nothing could be more fallacious than this argument. Morocco, more than a thousand years old, is one of the oldest, if not the oldest, States now represented in this house. And I want you to consider this point: Morocco, being the oldest State in the world, has always exercised, in that capacity, sovereignty over Mauritania. With the succession of various dynasties to the throne of Morocco, all throughout the centuries, Mauritania has been part of Morocco under the authority of the Sultan, spiritual and temporal. The earliest of those dynasties was that known as the Almoravides, of the eleventh century, who ruled the whole of Morocco, including Mauritania. But most expressive, most telling, is the fact that these Almoravides came from the suburbs of the present capital of Mauritania, to be seated on the throne of Morocco, with its capital then in Marrakesh. Four dynasties have followed in succession, until we are brought to the present dynasty, to which His Majesty King Mohammad V belongs. I beg to recall a memorable occasion when I stood, the year before last, with reverence by the graves of those Almoravides who came from Mauritania to rule over the whole of Morocco,

including Mauritania itself. This is enough to support the position of Morocco on the question.

These are facts of history, and it remains for France to be prepared to accept the verdict of history. I do not desire to weary the Committee by a bulky heap of documentary evidence to prove these facts. Nor do I wish to place before you the terms of the Franco-Spanish Convention of June 1900, the Act of Algeciras of 1906, or the Franco German Convention of 1911, all of them showing, by express provision or by implication, that Mauritania is part and parcel of Morocco. The crux of the case does not rest on international instruments. It is rather the actual national life, the historic reality of the existence of Mauritania within Morocco, which counts first and foremost.

In any society, national life can be readily recognized at all times. But it is at its peak in times of crisis and in moments of distress. It goes without saying that nothing is more critical and more distressing than foreign invasion. And such was the case when Mauritania was first invaded by France. With this invasion, the chain of action and reaction that took place between France and Morocco has proved more than ever that Mauritania is part of Morocco. The record is lengthy, but I shall confine myself to the major events.

As we all know, the capture of Mauritania was only one chapter of French imperialism in Africa. The plans were set up as early as 1817, at a time when the name of Mauritania was not on the map of Africa. What were on the map were the ancient names of the provinces that still persist to the present moment. Those provinces, as the representative of France admitted in his statement yesterday, were ruled as Emirates, after the Arabic word Emir, meaning "prince" or "governor". These Emirs, their deeds and bibliography, have filled a great part of French political literature. "Emir," as a title, shows that the Emirate must belong to a higher authority—a Sultan or a King, as you please.

This is simple logic. You cannot have an Emir or a governor without a higher authority, call him what you will. Otherwise, to whom does the Emirate belong and to whom is the Emir responsible? They are governors, but on whose behalf? They must derive authority from a superior head. Who could the head be, if he is not the Sultan of Morocco? I hope France will tell us to whom these governors belong. Who is their superior authority. The word itself, in Arabic-the word Emir-entails of necessity, of logic, a higher authority from whom the Emir derives his authority.

If France should not answer-and in all certainty it will not answer, because it has no valid answer-I will give the answer myself.

These Emirs are the heads of those tribes that inhabited the area from time immemorial. They derive their authority from the Sultan of Morocco. They rule in his name. They receive his instructions. They pay him a visit of homage in his capital. They receive his envoys. In the mosques they and their tribesmen offer their prayers in his name as the spiritual and secular highest authority. French writings on the history of French imperialism did not leave us without evidence. French annals are full of the texts of correspondence between the Sultan and his Emirs in Mauritania. But it seems that the representative of France would not wish to disclose that correspondence, that part of the political literature and of the literature of French imperialism in Africa. Sometimes I mispronounce French names, but I never make a misquotation. Royal decrees by the Sultan appointing his Emirs in Mauritania are still to be found in their original text, if only France agrees to consult her archives. In an official document, France has admitted that:

"... Certain Moors"-this is a reference to Mauritania-"have received, particularly in the seventeenth century, letters of investiture or insigia of commad from the Sultans of Morocco."

If the representative of France is interested in having a copy of that official French document, we are quite prepared to furnish him with it.

In a communication of 1860, the Sultan replied to one of his Emirs in Mauritania as follows:

"We have gratefully received your kind recognition of our person as a legitimate prince".

On another occasion, in recognition of the vigilance of the Emir of Adrar in dealing with the French-this is a province in the south, in Mauritania-the Sultan sent a delegation to congratulate the Emir, with a letter which stated:

"The leader of the faithful congratulates the Emir on the manner in which he governs Adrae".

Writing in 1900 to describe a French expedition which had landed in Mauritania, and how its members were arrested, a contemporary witness stated:

"Upon my arrival in Adrar"-that is, Mauritania-"I found the Moorish people"-the people of Mauritania-"ready either to kill the members of the expedition or turn them over to the Sultan".

Then the Sultan is a foreign and alien, poor miserable creature to Mauritania, and the French text speaks of the expedition either to be killed or turned over to the Sultan. It would be nothing then in accordance with the French publication, has compiled a series of letters and reports dispatched by the French officials in South West Africa, as well as from their diplomatic and consular missions in Morocco-all stressing the fact that the occupation of Mauritania could never be dissociated from the affairs of Morocco and that the conquest of Mauritania is only one side of the general plan for the domination of Morocco as a whole. In a letter dated 13 January 1906-or could it not claim Mauritania only in 1958, as was suggested by our

colleague from France yesterday-here is a letter dated January 1906, addressed to whom? Addressed to the French Minister of the Colonies by the Governor-General of West Africa writing on the situation in Mauritania as follows:

"From all the reports"-this is what the French Governor-General says upon receiving the reports-"which have reached me, it is evidently apparent that the intrigues directly hostile to our influence which I have already pointed out to you, are continuing and intensifying. They have their centre in Saguiet El Hamra and are directed by the Sheikh Malainine, in the name of the Sultan of Morocco, very probably with the complicity of the representative of the Cherifian Power in the South of Morocco".

Again, Mr. Chairman, and this is my last quotation which I put before the consideration of our colleague from France, this one is dated 1907, a letter addressed this time not to the Minister of the Colonies but to the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, the French Consul-General in Morocco explains the responsibility of the Government of Morocco for the revolt in Mauritania. At that time there was a revolt in Mauritania against the French. And the French Consul in Morocco, explaining the position of responsibility of the Government of Morocco for that revolt, then reproduced a statement by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Morocco-having met the Minister, he had reproduced the statement of the Minister of Morocco in these words-and mind you, this is in 1907:

"A year and a half ago or thereabouts, the tribes of Adrar and Chenguit"-these are the tribes to which our colleague from France referred yesterday-"sent delegates to Fez"-that was the capital of Morocco at that time-"to complain that the French authorities in Senegal were taking over their lands. These regions"-the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Morocco says-"had never been a part of the Senegal. From very ancient times they have been put under the authority of the Sultan of Morocco, and,

at present, the Khotba is still said in the name of the sovereign of the Magrib in its Mosques. Under these conditions the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Morocco further states Moulay Abd el Aziz who is the Sultan, could not fail to take an interest in these Moslems place under his spiritual authority".

These few quotations make it abundantly clear that the Sultan of Morocco was the supreme authority in the affairs of Mauritania. The provinces to which those quotations refer are scattered all around Mauritania. This is a simple fact of geography. We trust France would not go to the extent of disputing facts of geography.

It was under such a system of Emirates that France planned to slice Mauritania from Morocco to annex it to its African spoils. In April 1855, France started its military adventure to prepare for a major counter-attack, the Sultan of Morocco supplied the Emir of Trarza with military equipment and entrusted him with full authority to repel the aggression of France. And this is an act of sovereignty, to defend a country when it is invaded by a foreign power; and by the way, the province of Trarza is deep south in Mauritania. In 1857, under the command of the Emir, the Moroccan forces, including the forces of Mauritania, took the offensive with daring courage. The Arab forces crossed the Senegal river and an agreement was eventually concluded between the Emir on one side and France on the other. It is interesting to know that the agreement stipulated, inter alia, that France had to pay a fixed charged of 3 per cent of the cost of rubber shipped in the Senegal river. The agreement remained valid until 1902. Should France deny the sovereignty of Morocco over Mauritania, the reminder is there. The rubber agreement remained operative for almost half a century.

The agreement ended in 1902, because that year marked the beginnings of large-scale operations by France to capture

Mauritania. France launched campaign after campaign to achieve this goal. Under the command of their Emirs, the tribesmen in all the provinces resisted the French invasions with all the means and weapons available at the time. They fought with bravery that became a folklore in the memory of the story of heroism. French authors have portrayed the event in brilliance and liveliness, typical of the French language.

But the most outstanding landmark in that era is the nature of the resistance, more than the resistance itself. In the battles taking place the fight was between Morocco, the whole of Morocco on one side, and France on the other side. When I say "the whole of Morocco" I include Mauritania. It was not a fight between Mauritania and France. The brave fighters from the north and the south fell martyr on the soil of Mauritania. They were not simply comrades-in-arms. They were in sacred communion fighting for one cause-their own cause. It so happened that the battlefield was in Mauritania, and compatriots of the north and the south had to die in defense of Mauritania because it is part of Morocco, their beloved homeland.

These are the facts of history, and we trust that France will not dare to deny them. Even the history of French colonialism has highlighted these facts. We have placed them on record by a well known Frenchman, Mr. Giller, who was quoted by our colleague from France yesterday. Mr. Giller has narrated the events of that period. He set out the details of the armed resistance under the Emirs of the Sultan. The Sultan, we are told by Giller, appointed his uncle as the head of the army of resistance with definite instructions to warn the French either to quit Mauritania or face a declaration of holy war. The Sultan's uncle led the war as a Moroccan, not as a Mauritanian war. His victory over the French at Niemilan is a sacred record of Moroccan bravery. In the course of his heroic fight, the Sultan sent reinforcements, men and ammunition to the army in the

South. We have it on record that the French legation in Morocco protested against the shipment of arms and ammunition to the armies in the South, but the Sultan did not heed and persisted in his sacred defense of his country.

Surely these military counter-attacks organized by the Sultan himself and led by his uncle, with shipment of arms and ammunition, would not have been carried out simply to drive the French out of Africa, but to drive them out of Mauritania, had it not been a part of the territory of Morocco. Had it not been part of Morocco, the Sultan would not have taken the trouble and all those sacrifices to send ammunition and military personnel, and his uncle with all his military forces, to counterattack the French invasion in Mauritania. But Mauritania was part of the homeland, and the Sultan and his people had to fight for every inch of its sacred soil. The struggle went on from 1902 up to 1912, and this is the continuity of the national existence and the national struggle, and all throughout these years of sacrifice the people of Morocco shed their blood in Mauritania, in its deserts, in its mountains and valleys, only to add by their common sacrifice another chapter of their unity.

I refer to the year 1912 because that was the year that Morocco was placed under French protection, the story of which is quite well known and which I need not relate. Yet the significant fact which must be emphasized is that only after protection was declared over Morocco was France able to conquer Mauritania. Morocco, a protectorate, fell under the domination of France and was no longer able to continue its military defensive war South in Mauritania. That is how Morocco, including Mauritania, fell under the domination of France.

Although the French administrations in the South and the North were different, Mauritania was not peeled, just like an orange, from the history of Morocco. The national solidarity, the

national oneness and the national struggle has continued. From 1912 up to 1957, when the independence of Morocco was declared, the liberation movement swept the whole country from the Mediterranean in the North to the Senegal River in the South. The provinces in Mauritania, as well as the provinces in the North, have fought together for almost forty years to achieve unity and liberty. I mention unity first because Morocco lost its independence only after it lost its unity. Imperialism was unable to conquer a Morocco that stood united. It had to be dismembered to be conquered. That was the strategy of imperialism, and Morocco, as we know from history, was thus divided between Spain and France. Spain was established in the area on the North and became known as the Spanish zone. Tangiers was placed under an international regime. The rest, in turn, was divided by France. Mauritania in the deep South was made a separate administration. In the middle, the region of Tindof was annexed to Algeria, to cut off Mauritania from Morocco, and the remaining provinces were administered as a protectorate or just simply under direct French rule.

But these series of partitions have been resisted by the people of Morocco, and a liberation movement spread far and wide, transcending all the artificial lines that were set up to partition the country. In this battle for unity and freedom, the people of Mauritania were in the forefront. The battles of Port Etienne, Bou Garn, Lekdim and Treyfic in 1924 and the battle of Oum Toubi in 1932 will remain an everlasting reminder of the bravery of the people of Mauritania and their determined will for unity with Morocco.

But of all, the most significant was the battle fought against the French in 1911, high up in the North, at Casablanca, an event which was distorted, and I say this with a great deal of regret. And by whom was the battle fought? The battle was waged by the tribes of the South that crossed the country from

Mauritania under the command of the great leader, Shaikh Malainine, who was referred to yesterday. With the memories of that fight in mind, who can claim that Mauritania is not Morocco and that Morocco is not Mauritania? For thousands of valiant fighters to cross the Sahara and fight the French in Casablanca is not only a heroic venture, it is the most graceful expression of unity between the South and the North. It is the most graceful expression of unity between the South and the North. It is a unity of arms to achieve the unity of a people and the unity of their country.

After the Second World War, and this is the last stage in the evolution and the question of Mauritania, when the movement was revived in support of the unity and independence of Morocco, the Mauritians were in the forefront again. Their intelligentsia joined the political movement. Their warriors joined the Moroccan liberation army. With their brethren in the North hundreds of Mauritians paid with their blood the toll of liberty until liberty for Morocco was achieved. Those who survived stayed under arms and simply transferred from the liberation army into the Royal Army of Morocco. The Mauritania fighters who were enlisted in the liberation army simply slipped into the Royal Moroccan Army and what more eloquent evidence could there be of the unity between Mauritania and Morocco than that hundreds of Mauritania young men just moved into the Royal Army as regular soldiers? This explains why hundreds of Mauritians are now in the Moroccan army, their army, serving under the Moroccan flag, their flag, and the most sacred symbol of liberty and unity.

With the proclamation of the independence of Morocco in March 1956, the movement for unity did not come to an end. The cry for unity has not ceased, either in the North or in the South. It is true that the Spanish zone, the zone of Tangiers, and the French zone were liberated and all united. But that was not the

end. There were other parts, including Mauritania, still under foreign domination. The battle has now taken another phase. A political initiative was led by the Government in Morocco and a popular movement was launched by the people in Mauritania.

The Government of Morocco has seized every occasion to press France for the restoration of Mauritania. In a note to the French Government dated 28 August 1956, the Government of His Majesty the King expressed the most explicit reservations against the integration of parts of Moroccan territory in the common organization of the Sahara areas under the name "Sahara zones of the French Republic". On 11 November 1958 the Government of Morocco made a strong protest against the proclamation of the so-called "Islamic Republic of Mauritania". These and similar actions taken by the Government of Morocco were intended to exhaust all peaceful means of resolving the dispute before a request was made for inclusion of the item in the agenda of the United Nations.

In Mauritania itself the popular movement for unity with Morocco has left no man or woman unmoved. Demonstrations have crowded the streets in all towns and villages, and the only flag that moved the masses deep in their hearts was the flag of Morocco. There were conferences, mass meetings, numerous forms of representations-all clamouring for unity with Morocco and protesting the creation of a state that has never existed and a nationhood that has never been. It is true, as the representative of Senegal said, that the issue is one of self-determination. But self-determination can be exercised only under conditions of freedom, not in the shadow of tanks, not in the shadow of military bases and military forces. Self-determination must be exercised under full conditions of freedom so that choice can also be exercised in freedom. But the referendum to which the representative of France referred yesterday indicated only one choice-independence or no independence. There was no further

alternative put to the people with regard to unity because France has opposed unity and has resisted unity and it is still resisting unity, as could be observed from the statement of the representative of France. He said that France did not impose any obstacle to any type of relationship with any State which might be chosen by the people of Mauritania. If this is the case, why do you not pull out of the area so that the people can exercise full self-determination? It is a fact that subsequent events have disclosed the policy of France. The French army has intervened and a campaign of repression has been launched against the people of Mauritania. The political parties have been dissolved and no less than fifty leaders imprisoned. Many patriots were sent to concentration camps or deported, thus paving the way for separation under the shadow of independence.

This is the gist of the whole matter of Mauritania. The French, under the pleasant umbrella of independence, have established a republic against the public. Since the days of Plato the genesis of a republic has been an institution for the public. With Mauritania, the situation is the contrary. The public in Mauritania are for unity, not for disunity; and I challenge those who claim otherwise. The people of Mauritania have lived their lives in sacrifice after sacrifice for the purpose of restoring unity, not to create disunity. Within the context of unity, independence is a blessing, but with disunity it is not a blessing. To sound the depth of our problem I need only request our African colleagues to recall the attempts of imperialism which are now in process for the purpose of disrupting the unity of the Congo. Our Asian colleagues should call to mind the disunity which was in force in more than one country in Asia. We, the Arabs of the Middle East, have for long suffered dismemberment and disunity brought about by imperialism. Even around the Arabian Peninsula the British have created many States composed of many slices of the Arab homeland. The whole turmoil in the Arab world at the present time is due mainly to this fracture of the Arab structure.

Moreover, the problem of Mauritania presents a dangerous precedent, particularly to the people of Africa and Asia. It is true that imperialists have surrendered a number of territories, but they have not surrendered their plans. The colonial Powers have many plans in store. They harbour many intrigues-I can find no other word, no soft or gentle word, no one word except "intrigue" to describe an intrigue. Partition is their present strategy, and if this partition of Morocco succeeds-which God forbid-the peoples of Africa and Asia must stand ready to face the new danger: a new imperialism by separation, by partition and by secession. Mauritania is the test case, and France is the surgeon performing the operation. Let us, therefore, be on the lookout. Let us all close our ranks to defeat this new imperialism of partition carried out by France in the interest of France and against the interests of the people of Mauritania.

In this surgical operation France is administering a propaganda anaesthetic to the African States to neutralize their consciousness of the danger of the surgery; and the statement of the representative of France is evidence of that anaesthetic. None the less we are sure that the Nations of Africa will remain alive to the danger. The African States will not succumb to any anaesthetic in their struggle against imperialism.

France has launched a campaign in Africa to the effect that this item on Mauritania represents a new Arab colonialism. This is the argument which France is spreading around the world, that this item on Mauritania is a new Arab colonialism, that pan Arabism is an expansionist movement, and that Mauritania is claimed by Morocco on the basis of past conquest and past domination. This is simply a blasphemy; it is a fallacious argument to put to the Committee or to the people of Africa. These are bare falsehoods too naked to all for exposure.

Such distortions expose themselves and expose their authors. Neither Arab nationalism nor the cause of Morocco

could be impeached by such a malicious perjury. Arab nationalism seeks its own fulfilment and harbours aggression against none. It stands for no colonialism or expansion, for it has always been the victim of expansion and colonialism. In its modern awakening Arab nationalism is a natural reaction against imperialism. Nor is pan Arabism anything to be ashamed of; on the contrary, it is a source of pride and honour. To restore our national unity is a supreme and noble cause for which no sacrifice should be spared. We are one people, with one language, one past and one civilization throughout history. We are one, dismembered only by imperialism. We want to be united, or to be more precise, we want to be reunited. Is there anything wrong in that? Is it against ethics, against the Charter, against international law, to want to restore our unity, a unity that stems from the will of the people, that resists disunity made only by imperialism?

Thus it is a travesty of history, an insult of human intelligence to claim that the question of Mauritania, on the part of Morocco, is tinged with domination. If there is any colonialism about the question of Mauritania, it is the French tactics in fighting unity with a secessionist independence. Morocco is not claiming-and I underline the word "claiming"-Mauritania. It is not a claim. Morocco is endeavouring to restore the splinters into their original pattern, to put the parts together in their own frame. The purpose is not to build a union, but to restore a unity. For our part, we do not support the stand of Morocco simply to add one more territory to Morocco. Morocco itself is striving in a greater cause, the union of the Maghreb comprising Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco. And again, this great cause of the Maghreb union is a prelude to a greater cause-the United Arab States, a union to be realized freely by the Arab people on the strength of their will and their free choice.

This is the mainspring from which streams the Arab position on the question of Mauritania. Morocco, you must be sure, will not and can not stand in the shoes of imperialism. You all know, His Majesty Mohammed V is a great national hero who has spent the prime of his life in the battle against imperialism. Also, the people of Morocco are second to none amongst freedom loving peoples. Their position on Mauritania is dictated by no greed and by no envy. It is France which is entrenched in Mauritania for greed and exploitation. The present military bases of France in Mauritania are one explanation. The other is to be sought in the world bank loan secured by France to the mining company in Mauritania named Miferma. There is nothing Mauritanian in this company except the ore and the name. Miferma's share capital is 50 per cent French, 20 per cent British, 15 per cent Italian, 3 per cent German, and zero per cent for Mauritania.

Morocco, you can rest assured, seeks no benefit or profit. One does not trade with himself; neither does he made profit out of his capital. Within national partnership of Morocco, all the people, including the inhabitants of Mauritania, are one. They will be denied nothing exercised by others. The Prime Minister of Morocco could be a Mauritanian in his own right and on his own merit. Even today, in spite of the existing partition, the Mauritanians are an integral part of the political life of Morocco. There are hundreds of Mauritanians in the army. There is a Minister of State in the present cabinet, by the name of Ben Omair, who comes from the deep south of Mauritania. And how could Mauritania be not a part of Morocco when a Mauritanian gentleman from the south is elevated to be Minister of State in the present cabinet? There is also the Moroccan ambassador to Libya-and here we have our colleague from Libya to support this assertion of mine. He is a Mauritanian who has been a Mauritanian in various departments of the State-and no one would dare to tell them, Mauritania is your home, so you go to

your home. Never, because Morocco is their home. It is the home of the people of Morocco, whether they come from the north or the south.

This is the question of Mauritania as we see it and feel it. And I say feel it, because the people of Mauritania are our brethren. They are our kith and kin. We hold them in respect and esteem, for they have played an admirable part in our common history. Our love and our affection to them, equally, make it our duty to support their aspirations for unity. It is the independence of the whole of Morocco which could be the independence of the whole of Mauritania. Even those gentlemen at present in the Government of the so-called Islamic Republic are not absent from our minds, nor are they absent from our hearts. They are, too, our brethren. We are sure they will join in the movement for unity when the French military forces dismantle their bases and quit Mauritania. No doubt, that day will come, as the ultimate triumph is for liberty and unity.

It is therefore our respectful submission that a support to Morocco on this question is really a support to the cause of freedom and unity based on justice and equity.

So let us all extend our support to this just and righteous cause, as has been suggested by the Government of Morocco.

Colonialism ...

On November 29, 1960 Mr. Shukairy delivered the speech reproduced below, in which he advanced the reasons why Saudi Arabia is opposed to colonialism:

For the first time in the history of the United Nations, the question of colonialism is brought to the foreground on the platform of this organization with its doors wide open. In the past years, it is undeniable that colonial issues, whether in the Assembly or in its committees, have been examined under one item or the other. But never before has colonialism in its entirety been projected into full light-into full fledged discussion, with a lofty hope for a collective action worthy of the authority of U.N. and its dignity.

I preface my statement with this firm and sincere hope, for the problem of colonialism ranks uppermost in the history of human relations. It stands high up as a giant in the field of international relations. It involves political captivity, economic domination, social enslavement and cultural subjugation, that affect not only the colonial peoples but human society as a whole. To measure its devastating evils, it is sufficient to know that colonialism involves at the present time the future of one hundred million people. This fact, treated in passing, may sound to be of an ordinary significance. It may not arouse deep reflection or provoke our imagination. Yet, when we pause for a moment of steady focus, the picture shows up in all its shades and colours, and indeed in all its dimensions. The picture, then, presents the realities of the lives of millions and millions of people, their food-I daresay their starvation; their clothing-I daresay their nakedness; their shelter-I daresay their exposure; their education-I daresay their ignorance; their health-I daresay their debility; their social and economic progress-I daresay their social and economic misery.

All this, Mr. President, should invite our attention to the importance of the problem. Colonialism is no casual problem which we can examine with our minds at leisure, with our hearts at ease. It is a problem we should discuss with an alert mind, a lively heart and a restless soul. Of all international problems, except disarmament, Colonialism is second to none. In fact, Colonialism, war and disarmament are the three unscrupulous musketeers that are driving the vehicle of humanity into the abyss-and what abyss of annihilation and destruction. I have placed colonialism first in the order, because war for Colonialism is the institution, and armaments are its instruments. Armaments are not the great toys and hobbies of humanity. They are the Grim Reaper of mankind, and Colonialism is its harvest. Neither is war an end in itself. All throughout history, people did not war for war. They warred to achieved usurpation and exploitation. In plain terms, they warred to usurp the wealth to realize high returns, at a cheap cost, cheap labor and cheap raw materials. They have warred to conquer a new ground of exploitation, or to defend what had been already conquered. Even the first world war of 1914, which was thought to be one of ideas and ideals, was principally motivated by Colonialism. In the words of Dr. Moon, an American authority on international relations, "The catastrophe of 1914 was not brought about by the personal vagaries of William Hohenzolern ... The very alignment of European powers was dictated by imperialism, not by race or democracy or kinship of culture ... Imperialism is the root and raison d'etre of world politics ...".

I do not need to heap the evidence in support of this valid assertion. It is enough to recall that Colonialism was behind many treaties, many alliances, many entents, and many conferences. Indeed Colonialism was behind the paradox of converting friends into enemies, and making enemies out of friends. In a word, Colonialism had been the greatest single factor in history, to make bad history.

And what more bad history is there, when our generation was destined to witness two-thirds of the world population groaning under the yoke of Colonialism. It is common knowledge that at the eve of the Second World War, ten imperialist nations had possessed colonies and protectorates seven times the size of Europe. It was estimated that out of the two billion peoples that inhabit this planet, one and a half billion were living under the regime of Colonialism in company with disease, ignorance and poverty-the most notorious enemies of mankind. The estimate has revealed that every man, woman and child in Great Britain had ten colonial subjects, black, brown and yellow; and that for every acre in France, there were twenty in the French colonies. At that time, colonies were very much bigger than the so-called mother country. The colonies of Italy were six times Italy, of Portugal twenty-three times Portugal, and of Belgium eighty-one times Belgium. Hence, contrary to the rules of creation, the child was manifold bigger than its parents indeed all the parents put together.

This picture, Mr. President, has materially changed. The dimensions of Colonialism have decreased and the forces of liberty have increased. Liberty has triumphed, and many victories have been scored. The struggle of peoples for freedom, their yearnings for independence, their stirrings for economic betterment, their agitations for social advance, and in one word, their striving for human fulfillment has reversed the wrongful trend of history. Empires have fallen down shattered into splinters. Freedom was declaring a triumph after triumph, and Colonialism was striding in retreat after retreat.

The outcome, the glorious outcome is now with us. Many nations have achieved their independence; indeed, they have captured their independence. They entered the U.N.-indeed they have forced open the doors of the U.N. And now they are here in the U.N. occupying their worthy seats, outnumbering their old

masters. Many of their delegates have come to the U.N. from jail, from concentration camps and from detention cells, as sovereign equals with their old jailors. The other day, when the question of the Congo was discussed in the General Assembly, I have seen in my own eyes, Mr. Ormsby-Gore, the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of the U.K., kneeling down on his knees in this house before the delegations of Ghana and Nigeria begging of them not to press for their proposal. Fortunately or unfortunately, the cameramen have missed this historic pose. This is how the trend of events has been reversed from retrogression into progression, from monstrous history into glorious history and from the abyss of degradation into the heights of human dignity.

But the battle for freedom is not yet at an end. We still have an unfinished task to do. We must do it, here and now, at this session, and in this Assembly. At this moment, this historic moment, when we are debating Colonialism, we must recall that many a people in many a country are still chained in Colonialism. Call them what you call them, colonies, trust territories, non self-governing countries, dominated areas-the simple truth cries out with anger and vehemence, that one hundred million peoples are still under the heels of foreign rule. And mind you, these one hundred million souls are listening to our deliberation with mounting hope and promise. They are waiting for your voice to champion their freedom, for your resolution to sponsor their liberty, and for your votes in support of their independence. This is their right and our duty. The dominated peoples are entitled to overthrow this domination, and the U.N. is duty bound to declare its end. In fairness, I should say, this obligation of the U.N. has been overdue for a long time, and it is high time to discharge our obligations, with no delay and without hesitation.

Surely, Mr. President, our obligation in this regard has been overdue for a long time past. In the Charter of the U.N., in

the declaration of human rights, and in a host of U.N. resolutions, we have pledged ourselves to respect the principle of self determination for all peoples, large and small. But colonialism is still reigning in many parts of the world. Even in our books, the world is classified into dependent and independent peoples, thus consecrating the ugliest discrimination in the treatment of the human race. All peoples of the world must be independent. Dependence, as a status, must be finished and liquidated forever. By doing so the U.N. will truly become a true U.N. We have no valid title, at least to our name as a U.N., when a hundred million peoples are not with us in this organization. They must be with us, not as they had been, so far, as subjects of discussion, or as topics of debates. They should be with us as fully sovereign states and fully independent members. If Colonialism is the impediment, then Colonialism should be destroyed, and destroyed forever. All peoples should become free. Men are born free, and no man should be allowed to enslave man. This is not only right and just-but it is the dictate of human brotherhood under the fatherhood of God.

This is no sermon preached to a religious congregation, neither is our organization a worshipping house. This is simply a reiteration of our obligations, and a reaffirmation of our objectives. In fact it is a summation of our Charter to which we have solemnly subscribed. And if disarmament, as aptly described by Premier Khrushchev, is the problem of problems, then Colonialism is the evil of all evils, which we must destroy root and branch. And this is the unfinished task which we must finish.

But this voice does not come only from the newly independent nations-This had been the voice of humanity ever since man started to dominate man. Even when Colonialism was at its peak, there were heroic voices condemning Colonialism. At a time when the frontiers of British Empire were racing with the

setting and rising of the sun, there were many leading Englishmen condemning British imperialism. Jeremy Bentham, Father of British radicalism, in a letter published in 1830, under the title "Emancipate Your Colonies" has stressed that colonies involve, a great military and naval expense, the danger of foreign war, and political corruption in the mother country. Along the same lines, James Mill, in his article in the 1818 supplement to the Encyclopaedia Britannica, has exposed Colonialism and its evils. But the most devastating attack has come from Richard Cobden, the apostle of free trade. He called the British Government of that era "A standing conspiracy to rule and bamboozle the people". No matter how polite and courteous one can be, the fact cannot be avoided that Colonialism, from beginning to end, is nothing but the exploitation of weak peoples and the usurpation of their wealth. I do not wish myself to use the words, robbery or bamboozle, for robbery is inherent in Colonialism.

Of course, Colonialism was not left without defense. But this is the case of the culprit, who establishes himself as his own judge, and pronounces his innocence. The attempt was always abortive, and it simply proved the guilt, and what a most heinous guilt it was.

Colonialism, it was claimed, has a civilizing mission—a mission sacred, toward the black race. In accordance with this baseless premise, the white man has a right to exercise, a duty to discharge and a burden to shoulder. The white man's burden, is the whole philosophy of Colonialism. But this philosophy was exposed by its own philosophers. It was Rudyard Kipling, the poet of imperialism, who sang:

"Take up the white man's burden,
Your new-caught, sullen peoples,
Half-devil and half-child".

The truth of all truth, however, is that Colonialism is the devil itself. Colonialism is not the white man's burden. It has proved to be the white man's spoil and prize. If it had been a burden at all, it is because the white man was overburdened with the wealth of the black, with the treasures of the brown and with the riches of the yellow.

Yet the white man can legitimately be asked, who has entrusted you with this burden to shoulder? Who has vested you with that right to exercise; and who has charged you with this obligation to discharge? Of the millions of the white men, let one white man, one single white man volunteer the answer—a sensible answer.

It is not denied that an answer to these questions has been attempted by many architects of Colonialism. In this field the French have proved to be the cleverest advocates for a losing case. In 1886, Alfred Rambaud, a professor at the Sorbonne, has written a whole volume in justification of Colonialism with a boastful title: "la France coloniale". This title is enough to blemish the case. In 1870, Beaulieu, a French economist, wrote to say that "Every day that passes convinces me more and more of the importance of Colonization in general, and its importance above all to France". So above all, it is France which is at stake. Recently in 1924, Victor Beauregard in his book "The French Colonial Empire", declared that "The study of history reveals a conclusion which has the certainty of an axiom: France more ~~is~~ President, a genius fallacy, and if this is an axiom then it is an axiom of fallacy. For shortly after this reference to the genius of France, the writer went on to say: "The future of France is in her colonies". So it was France, not the colonies, which were at stake.

But the true axiom, Mr. President, is that Colonialism is not a mission sacre—it is a mission desecre. What is behind

Colonialism is subordinated markets, subverted consumers, and usurped raw materials. Behind Colonialism there is a dominating capital, land dispossession, and forced labor-all in the interest of the colonizers, under the umbrella of civilization.

Right from the beginning, Colonialism was launched as a campaign to capture business, trade and industry-all carried with a determined purpose of exploitation. Just remember the names of those enterprises: The East India Companies-The West India Companies-The Levant Companies, and the African Companies. And remember, too, that these companies had armies and mercenary troops which later had built those vast empires. There is a lengthy record of confessions by empire builders themselves that the white man's burden is a pale argument. Colonialism is meant primarily to serve the interests of the so-called mother country. And what affection is it to starve the child and nourish the mother. The grand of independence to colonial territories is an economic liberation-for Colonialism was intended initially as an economic domination. The record of Colonialism is most eloquent, and here again the record of France rises above every record.

In 1884, the French Premier, Jules Ferry, has declared in these terms-"The superior races have a right as regards inferior races ... If France refrained from imperialism, she would descend from the first rank to the third or the fourth" ... Hence Colonialism to France is not to help her colonies ascent, but to avoid France descent to the fourth rank.

Again in 1890, the French Premier disclosed that "colonial policy is the daughter of industrial policy". If they have any meaning, these words by the Prime Minister of France, only mean that a colony to France is nothing but a market, to sell at the highest, goods made of raw material bought at the cheapest, with labour at the lowest. Nothing betrays the motives of French

Colonialism more than this statement of the Prime Minister of France.

In the same vein, in 1881, Mr. Gambetta, justified the conquest of Tunis, in the Chamber of Deputies as follows: "Tunisia, is necessary for our material of Tunisia which was at stake."

Later, in 1895, Mr. Chautemps, Minister of the Colonies described himself as "in reality a Second Minister of Commerce". This is really a most condemning confession, freely pronounced by the Minister of Colonies.

If the Ministry of the Colonies is a Ministry of Commerce, then the colony, its people, its wealth and indeed its destiny are French commerce and nothing but French commerce.

In 1882, Beaulieu, the French economist, has exposed French Colonialism to the last point of exposure. In plain terms he stated that "Colonization is for France a question of life and death". So the matter is not the life and death of the colonial people. The heart of the matter is the life of France, and the death of France. The colonial people are to live as they could, and to die as they should. They are left to their fate, to the mercy of destiny.

Thus, Mr. President, Colonialism is not exposed by its enemies, rather it is defeated by its very authors. The architects of Colonialism, the builders of empires whether dreamers or schemers have all gone. But they have left behind a volume of confessions demonstrating the brutalities of Colonialism, and demolishing forever the fallacy of humanitarianism as a motive for Colonialism. In this second half of the Twentieth Century, I submit, it is not necessary to marshal all the facts in favor of granting independence to colonial peoples. It was in the middle of the Nineteenth Century when it was at the peak, that Colonialism was stripped naked as a heinous institution primarily

intended for usurpation and exploitation on an international scale. I say on an international scale, for the words of the notorious imperialist of Great Britain, Cecil Rhodes, are still ringing in our ears. Speaking of the world of the Nineteenth Century Cecil Rhodes said: "The world is nearly all parcelled out, and what there is left of it is being divided up, conquered and colonized ... If there be a God, I think what He would like for me to do is to paint as much of the map of Africa British red as possible ...". Finding the world too small to meet the greed of British Colonialism, Cecil Rhodes went on to say "I would annex the planets if I could, I often think of that. It makes me sad to see them so clear and yet so far". These words, I submit, Mr. President, about dividing, conquering, and parceling the world as well as painting the map of Africa British red as possible, are a vivid expression of Colonialism in its classical concept. But the greed, the fiery greed to annex the planets, simply discloses that British imperialism of the Nineteenth Century, not satisfied with Colonialism on earth, was hoping for Colonialism in the outer space. Today, the U.K. stands for the peaceful use of the outer space. They do not harbour any plans for Colonialism in the outer space, probably, because they are very much behind in the race for the planets.

But the granting of independence to colonial peoples has another human aspect. In addition to bringing about economic liberation, independence leads to spiritual emancipation. It is a restoration of human dignity and a rehabilitation of human personality. Colonialism is based on race superiority. The supremacy of the white is the fountainhead from which flows the whole philosophy of Colonialism. Colonialism has two gospels- one to preach on the ground of the white man's burden, and the other to practice in an unquenchable thirst for prize, and a hunger for spoils. But the gospel to preach, which is supposed to inculcate an idea or propagate a principle, is drenched with the most shocking ideology-race supremacy. Speaking of British

Colonialism, Cecil Rhodes declared: "I contend that we are the first race in the world, and that the more of the world we inhabit, the better it is for the human race". This is a blend of a paradox and a complex. It is a paradox that a superior race should condescend to rob the inferior race; and the complex is too flagrant to explain, the superiority complex.

But the stubborn reality is that it is human greed and not human grade which is the driving force of Colonialism. It is not the gospel of "Live and let others live". Rather, "Live, and let no one live" is the real gospel of Colonialism.

This state of affairs is no past history, Mr. President. For all intents and purposes, this is present history. In classifying the world of today, the phrase has been coined of the "have's" and the "have nots". This terminology has found respectable room even in our records. It is a fact that of the two billion human beings on earth, one and a half billion are poor, incredibly poor. That explains why the "have's" are the minority and the "have nots" are richer in area, in mineral wealth, and in material resources. But why are they poor, incredibly poor. The answer is Colonialism. The Colonialism of the Nineteenth Century explains the poverty of the Twentieth Century. Colonialism is the *raison d'etre* for classifying the nations of the world into the "haves" and the "have nots".

In our U.N. books-in estimates and statistics-we are often faced with staggering figures about the national economy of the various states members of the U.N. The fact is frequently referred to, often with pride, that certain states have a high, others have a low standard of living. For instance, Great Britain, France, and Belgium are shown to have a high standard of living, while countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America are shown to have a low standard of living. This is no pride for the rich, nor a shame for the poor. It is not special genius that made the western countries richer. Neither is it a natural disability which made the

other countries poorer. Colonialism is the explanation for the whole phenomena of disparity. The people of Africa, Asia and Latin America, because of ages of Colonialism, their peoples have been robbed of their gold, their diamonds, their cotton, their silk, their ivory, their spices, their drugs, their rubber, their oil, their animal wealth, and at many times even robbed of their fabulous museums, including the dead Kings and Queens.

That is the whole story of the "haves" and the "have nots" traced to Colonialism down to the root. The state of poverty and backwardness prevalent now in many areas of the world is the direct legacy of Colonialism. The dominated peoples, those that have become independent and those on the waiting list, have a colossal and outstanding debt to claim. What is extended to them, now, in the form of economic assistance is only a fraction in the grand total of the debt. It is not a moral debt, but one admitted and confessed with all the attributes of legal indebtedness. Let us see the statement of account.

Speaking on British colonial policy, Joseph Chamberlain said: "The Empire is Commerce". Joseph Chamberlain summed up in two words what two volumes cannot say. This empire of commerce was further portrayed by a well-known British imperialist. In a speech before the Manchester Chamber of Commerce in 1884, Henry Stanley, said the following: "There are forty millions of people beyond the gateway of the Congo, and the cotton spinners of Manchester are waiting to clothe them. Birmingham foundries are glowing with the red metal that will be made into iron work for them, and trinkets that shall adorn those dusky bosoms". Such plain words call for no comment. They are self explanatory. They go to show how Colonialism has raised the standard of living in Manchester and Birmingham, and how the whole of Africa was left in poverty and misery. The present disparity between the "have nots" of Africa. Asia and Latin America on one side, and the "haves" on the other, could be

eliminated. To be more precise, its elimination could be speeded, by the speedy grant of independence to all dependent countries. As freedom and peace are indivisible, so economic prosperity should be indivisible. The economic freedom of dependent countries requires now a chivalrous venture, at least as an expression of repentance, for their enslavement was the result of adventures devoid of chivalry. At times, this Colonialism of commerce was so outspoken that it required to evidence to prove. A genius imperialist like Disraeli and announced in his famous Crystal Palace speech that imperialism was one main objective in his policy. In practice, Disraeli has shown himself to be a big contributor to Colonialism in its present picture. Disraeli had many connections with the Rothschilds and many other financiers. When the offer was made for the sale of shares in the Suez Canal enterprise, Disraeli without waiting for a parliamentary appropriation, immediately accepted the offer-an adventure which, as we know, has added another chapter in the history of imperialism in the Middle East. But to meet the offer, Disraeli had to borrow four million sterling pounds from the Rothschilds, and we are told by Professor Moon, a well-known American authority on international relations, that Rothschild made a hundred thousand pounds on this transaction of four millions. This is only one instance to show how the wealth of the people was robbed, how fabulous profit was made, and finally, how Colonialism had led to this economic disparity, from which most of the nations of the world are suffering, up to the present moment.

I might at this stage mention that it was this Rothschild who on the 2nd of November 1917, had received a declaration from the British Foreign Secretary promising the establishment of a Jewish National Home in Palestine.

I bring this matter to the attention of the Assembly because, in examining Colonialism we should not forget, that the

establishment of a Jewish National Home in Palestine has originated, right from the beginning as an imperialist policy-just as other imperialist policies have been carried out in Africa or Asia. In establishing a Jewish Home in Palestine, the British policy, shared by the U.S., has proved to be the ugliest form of imperialism. Colonialism has receded from many parts of the world leaving the land for its people, and the people in their land. But as enforced in Palestine, Colonialism has led to the infiltration of two million Jews and the expulsion of one million Arabs, now living as refugees in their camps. However, the day is soon coming when the refugees will go back to their homeland, their country emancipated from Zionist occupation; and, with full sovereignty, will join the U.N. as the free and independent State of Palestine.

In the remaining areas, consolation is not absent. Having reached its climax in the Nineteenth Century, Colonialism in the Twentieth Century is now witnessing its own decline. In the past fifteen years, some 1,500 million human beings have destroyed their chains and went free. It was the biggest battle that restored liberty to more than half of the world's population. Figures are sometimes more telling than volumes. Think of these figures and what they mean. They mean that when established, the U.N. represented only one half of the world, and that the second half was still under the yoke of Colonialism. How we have reached the stage where only a 100 million peoples remain in this international captivity. The ratio of emancipation in the last fifteen years, has been 100 million per year. It is, therefore, imperative that the U.N. should declare, here and now the liberty of the 100 million of our friends, our brethren who are still in bondage. They are scattered far and wide on this planet, but they are united in their struggle for freedom, and their languish for liberty.

The people of Palestine, Kenya, Oman, Aden, extremities of the Arabian peninsula, Nyasaland, Angola, Mozambique, Rhodesia, Ruanda Urundi, South West Africa, Tanganyika, Uganda, West Irian, Malta and other parts of the world should be set free in their homelands. Algeria in particular, is a burning issue, because war in Algeria enters now its seventh year. The people of Algeria are entitled to what we are entitled. They should be free as we are, have independence as we have, and enjoy dignity as we do. All human beings are born free, and as our great Caliph said, "By what right do you enslave the people, when their mothers have begot them free".

The colonial peoples, Mr. President, have an inherent right to freedom, and it is our duty to recognize it, and declare it. I stress recognition for I do submit that the phrase, "the granting of independence", used in the memorandum of the Soviet Union, is not a happy expression. The freedom of one hundred million people is their privilege, not our grace. It is their inherent right, not our grant.

Be that as it may, the argument has often been adduced that these people are now under tutelage and that their economic and social advancement require that such tutelage should continue for some time. Well, this is an antiquated argument not worthy of the spirit of the day. This is pale argument which is really worthy of a pale smile.

These people have been under tutelage for decades and some of them for ages. How long should we wait for this weary ordeal-this painful trial-this bitter experiment. If the past tutelage has not been able, thus far, to raise these people from dependence to independence, then the tutelage is a failure, and the U.N. should put an end to failure. There is also the recent plea drawn of the Congo situation. Some voices-remnants of imperialism-are labouring to show that the Congo situation is a forceful illustration to warn against the untimely granting of

Independence. This is the latest fashion of logic, designed by the habitual designers of political fashion. But this logic lacks every quality of real logic. To impeach such an argument, it is sufficient to know that it has been put on the market by the enemies of liberty and freedom.

The situation of the Congo, however, is an argument in the direction of freedom, not the denial of freedom. The crisis of the Congo is not the outcome of speedy independence. It is the outcome of speedy aggression against a newly emerging independence. Had the Congo been left on its own, the whole crisis would have been averted, the U.N. forces would not have been assembled, the Congo would not have become an item on the agenda of the U.N., and imperialists would not have been furnished with a poor illustration in favour of Colonialism.

All these arguments, or to be more precise, these shallow arguments fall to the ground. The colonial peoples should be set free. Let them go their way. They will take good care of themselves. They will look after their economic development, their social betterment, and their cultural advance. They will be in safe hands, because they will be in their own hands. There is nothing more useful, fruitful and honourable than to be on your own. And nothing is more gratifying for a people than to construct their national life in their own hands. Behind this reconstruction, will be not only their hands, but their minds, their souls and their hearts. The result will no doubt be, not this decaying evolution of tutelage, but the revolutionary evolution of independence.

Take Ghana as an illustration. The potentials of water power have been lying dormant for years during the colonial regime. With independence, the Volta River project, which shall make of Ghana an industrial plant, is now in execution. So is the case of Guinea with its dramatic projects.

Take the U.A.R.-the project of Aswan Dam was slumbering in the archives for decades. With real independence, under President Nasser, the project is now between the jaws of the most efficient machinery to fulfill.

China, for long dismembered, dominated and humiliated, has become with independence, a production giant, rightly termed the impatient giant. Impatient with time, China is endeavoring to catch up.

And lastly, take India and Pakistan which have been, before independence, in complete stagnation. After independence they have become a bee hive of plans and projects.

I will not proceed with more illustrations, for the one and a half billion peoples who have been liberated in the last fifteen years, are the greatest illustration of the greatest human experience.

One last point, Mr. President, should not escape our attention. With Colonialism brought to an end, the Trusteeship Council should be brought to an end also. In fact, the U.N. Trusteeship as an institution is the image of the mandate system of the League of Nations. It is sad that the Trusteeship Council should remain up to this moment a principle organ of the U.N. Equally sad is the term self government, which was assigned by the Charter as the goal towards which the trust territories should be led. The final goal should have been expressly declared as independence, instead of the feeble expression, self government. When the question of trusteeship was discussed in San Francisco, in 1945, Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov recommended that the purpose of the trusteeship should be independence. At that time, only the Philippines supported Molotoc. Unfortunately, the opposition was led by U.S. Representative, Mr. Stettinius, who insisted to have it phrased as self government.

But this, Mr. President, is now past history. Whether it is independence or self government, let us now make a new history more worthy of our age. Let us declare the independence of all peoples, wherever they may be, and to what race or colour they may belong. Let us liquidate Colonialism in all its forms-let us wind up imperialism in all its manifestations. Let us set free all people, in all lands.

The 98 nations represented in this organization, and I make no mistake about the number, each of them has an independence day. Let us make this day an independence day for the whole world-so that, with joy and pride, we can commemorate a glorious achievement-liberty for all, sovereignty for all, independence for all, and what is more, a U.N. for all.

South Africa ...

TREATMENT OF PEOPLE OF INDIAN AND INDO-PAKISTAN ORIGIN IN THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

On March 24, 1961, Mr. Shukairy presented the following statement in the Special Political Committee on the question of the treatment of people of Indian and Indo-Pakistan Origin in the Union of South Africa:

Once again, the United Nations is faced with this human tragedy that figures on our agenda under the title, the treatment of the people of Indian origin in South Africa. Were it not for this traditional designation, the equities of the problem coupled with the inequities of South Africa, an outright alteration of the title becomes absolutely imperative. The facts of the case, even as revealed in the pacific struggle of the great master, Mahatma Gandhi, tend to show that to use the term "treatment" is a maltreatment of language. It is a gross violence to accuracy and a flagrant injustice to the very concept of justice. What is involved here is not the simple treatment of peoples. What is at stake are the basic fundamental rights of man, the worth and dignity of God's creation and the elementals of human decency. It is the violation of these human primaries which is the issue, not the mere treatment of peoples who happen to be of an Indian origin. I beg your indulgence, let me correct my own inaccuracy too. The problem is not one of violation. It is one of utter negation and sheer denial of the human rights that are recognized as a minimum standard for human behavior. If any proof is required, the absence of South Africa from our deliberations provides ample testimony. In fact, this absence, on the part of South Africa, adds insult to injury. South Africa inflicts the grave injury against thousands and thousands of the people in South Africa, and commits herself to a discourteous absence in the U.N. Fairly judged, this conduct is a gross misconduct. It is a defiance not worthy of the U.N. tolerance.

Mr. Chairman, we have listened with deep concern to the able and well balanced statements of our distinguished colleagues of India and Pakistan on this matter. In spite of the great restraint displayed, the facts as stated by our friends from India and Pakistan are painfully depressing and most deplorable. I am confident, these facts and conclusions stand before us unchallenged and the U.N. can uphold the case as presented without any shred of doubt or breath of reluctance. This is an historic tragedy of the ugliest character, the ugliness of which we can take a judicial notice, as a simple axiom, without and necessity for further proof. It stands self evident. It has so moved the minds of mankind, so stirred the conscience of the people all over the world, that it has become a political equation-South Africa the violation of human rights-and the violation of human rights-equals South Africa. Apartheid has identified South Africa with a set of ghastly associations and meanings. South Africa has become the embodiment of persecution, discrimination and humiliation. In the United Nations, South Africa has become a classic definition of violation. This is what South Africa means if we employ the proper adjectives for her monstrous practices and policies. I have no apology to make in resorting to such a phraseology. As recently as Tuesday this week, and before the House of Commons, Prime Minister Macmillan, referring to South Africa, has described her policy "as abhorrent to the ideals with which mankind is struggling in this century". Thus we cannot speak of a disgrace, neither can we honour an act of dishonour.

This is no strong language that falls short of the magnitude of the problem. Even if they were brutal and savage, such denunciations do not measure up with the actual brutality with which the people of Indian origin are treated in South Africa. A brutal expression does in no way stand to comparison with a brutal act. It is the savage acts and not the violent statements, which should provoke our resentment and indignation. So let us

take a look at the brutalities of the problem. I shall not go into the question of apartheid, of which this problem is part the parcel. I will only confine myself to the present question in its actual dimensions.

The problem refers to almost half a million people in South Africa. The grievance is not one of infringement or violation of a usual character. It is a totalitarian wholesale invasion of human rights. The issue involves not only the well-being of a half million people, but their very existence-not only their dignity and worth, but their employment, their trade, their dwelling, the liberties to which they are entitled, and all their activities in their daily life.

This half a million helpless people are no aliens or strangers to South Africa. They are not colonizers or immigrants. They are legitimate citizens of the country entitled to all the rights, privileges and decencies of citizenship. Whatever definition or standard for citizenship you may choose, these people are South Africans-by right and not by grace or sufferance. They are more of South Africans than many of the rulers of South Africa. Probably more than the Prime Minister of South Africa himself. The Indians in South Africa are more rooted in the country than all the Ministers of the Government of South Africa. The Indian community represents the fifth generation of Indian settlement in South Africa. Their forefathers went to South Africa in the second half of the nineteenth century. They did not go as colonizers or imperialists. Neither did they ever harbour any aggressive intentions. They entered the land in peace and with peaceful intentions. They did not have in mind to establish a national home or an Indian state in miniature. They have been admitted to South Africa as a recruited labour to work in the sugar plantations. Ever since, these people have settled in the country, decently, honourably and gracefully. They dwelt in towns and rural areas. They tilled the soil and raised cattle. They

made their contribution in the progress of the country and its economic development. In a word, South Africa has become their home and homeland. They have become integrated in the life of the country just as the most ancient citizens of the country. It was only South Africa that reminded the world that these people are of Indian origin. I make this assertion because right from the very beginning, South Africa has imposed upon these people a set of restrictions and subjected their activities to a number of disqualifications. Through legislation and administrative measures, these people have fallen victim to various disabilities and incumbrances. Call them what you call them, they are a naked discrimination based on race superiority-the most heinous product of Europe. Under the scourge of this policy of discrimination, the life of these people has become unbearable-intolerable. At the outset, these people have been brought into the country under a contract of law to plant sugar, but they were paid back in bitter-bitter conditions of life, not even sugar-coated with the very sugar they have produced.

This is no prosaic venture or an oratory exercise. The ill-treatment meted out to the people of Indian origin, was so glaringly marked, that the legislation enactments on the matter did not attempt to conceal its unworthy objective of racial discrimination. The legislation's of South Africa simply speak race superiority. They breathe colour discrimination without shame or any attempt of apology. On the contrary, in the words of Prime Minister Macmillan to the House of Commons, "They seek to turn the wrong into right." So let us have a birds eye view of South Africa's legislation, which is hardly worthy of the term legislation.

In 1943, the Parliament of South Africa has enacted what has become to be known as the Peggin Act, which has expressly prohibited the acquisition or occupation of land in certain areas as between European and Indians. Thus under specific

injunctions, racial discrimination is being consecrated by legislation. The prohibition of those people to possess, own or to occupy lands in their own country whose prosperity they have built in their sweat and toil, is the most heinous offence that a government can commit against its people.

Three years later in 1946, South Africa has made another inglorious advance in the field of racial discrimination. This time, the Parliament of South Africa has enacted the Asiatic Land Tenure and Indian Representation Act. By its very title, this enactment can be condemned as a discriminatory legislation-ultravires to the rights of man-and unconstitutional to the very concept of equality of citizens. Under this law, the most flourishing areas of Natal were reserved exclusively for acquisition and occupation by the European settlers. These privileged zones were out of bounds for the Africans and Asians. Here they were denied the right of ownership or occupation. As though a pest or pestilence, the Indians are to be cordoned in other less favourable areas where they are entitled to ownership and occupation. Suffice it to know that this enactment has been labeled as the 'Ghetto Act', such a description is disgraceful enough. A ghetto, whether self chosen or imposed, is the most degrading institution that plagued human society, and those who promoted such an institution are the first enemies of mankind.

Four year later, in 1950 the Parliament of South Africa has decided to come out quite naked into full daylight with a policy of discrimination. Partial measures did not seem to be sufficeint to lay the foundations of the overall policy of South Africa-like disarmament, general and comprehensive. The Parliament, therefore, has passed the Group Areas Act. We need not go into details and technicalities of the legislation. The heading of the legislation is sufficiently indicative and fully informative. The Group Areas Act, has simply established groups and areas. It has legalized the twin evils-discrimination and segregation. This

enactment has provided for the partition of South Africa into areas, and the division of the people into groups, each group occupying an assigned area.

This last legislation hardly calls for any analysis. Its unique character is so appalling that no amount of intelligence is required to unfold its evils. It is vicious, nasty enactment from title to signature. It is hair raising and heartbreaking, for one single citizen to be uprooted from one area in his homeland, to be planted in another area, not his own choice. How catastrophic and how tragic could this operation be when it affects the lives of thousands and thousands of people, whose only guilt, whose only offence is the color of their skin and the curl of their hair.

And let me ask, who can claim the right to propose such a legislation, who is entitled to impose these restrictions, who can prescribe these disabilities? Every man is born free. He comes to this world in a skin not of his making or colouring. Whether it be white or black or yellow, man's skin does not determine the person, his status or his quality. It would be idle mockery to marshal the pronouncements of prophets, philosophers and leading men in all walks of life against the practice of racial discrimination. It is enough simply to say that our charter is the last word on the matter. Modern trends in modern societies is progressively progressing towards equality, unity and integration. Unlike the Parliament of South Africa, the Parliaments of the world at present are not engaged in setting up their societies on the concept of race-and race superiority. On the contrary, they aim at integration and equality. The Parliament of South Africa seems to be immune to the principles of democracy and the modern trends of democracy, and the reason is not difficult to discover. Like its legislation, the Parliament of South Africa is a "Group Area". This House has become also a reserved area for a reserved group. It is a Parliament that parleys not in the name of the people of South Africa. It represents only one race and the

doctrine of racial supremacy. The paradox, the irony, is that both the Parliament and the Government in South Africa stand for a minority, determined to crush the majority. It is a regime against its people, and the time, we hope, will not be too far when South Africa becomes fully independent and fully sovereign.

Nevertheless, the glaring injustice and the depth of its agony-should be sought not only in examining these so-called legislation's enacted by the so-called Parliament of the so-called South Africa. The tortures to which these people are subjected must be sought in the current actual situation-in the present realities that identify and typify the life of the people of Indian origin.

In his remarkably able, lucid and restrained statement to the committee, Ambassador Jha, the distinguished representative of India, has reminded us that October of the year 1960 was the centenary of the first arrivals of the Indians to South Africa. Ambassador Jha has stressed the fact, a fact which stands established, that thousands of Indian families in South Africa have members amongst them who are now the fourth or fifth generation. The significance of this fact need hardly be elaborated. It presents a set of crying and alarming questions. What more is required of a human being to become a citizen with full fledged citizenship? Should his color be the only certificate of his citizenship, and lastly, are the human rights inherent in man's skin-in the purity of his blood-in the supremacy of his race?

What is lamentable in this situation is that these South Africans of Indian origin have been an asset to the country and not a liability. In the words of the distinguished representative of India, they have contributed much to the growth and development of South Africa and its economy. Addressing the South African Institute of Race Relations, Dr. S. Coopan, a well-known economist, has emphasized the fact that it was the Indians

laborers who had saved Natal from economic ruin. To the Indian community, such a finding of fact is a source of pride and satisfaction, for South Africa has become their home, and the greatest human joy for a citizen is to build his homeland, his legitimate homeland. But it must be a painful grief down to the heart of their hearts if the Indians are to be rewarded with inequalities, disabilities and a host of discriminations of an unspeakable character. I employ the expression unspeakable character, for if we move from the generalities into details, we are faced with the picture loaded with gray and dark shades.

In the towns and the rural areas of South Africa, this obnoxious Group Act is working havoc on the peoples of Indian origin. In one town only the entire Indian community has been ordered to move out to a stretch of barrenness two miles away. They had settled in that town for seventy-five years. In the course of those lengthy years, weary with toil and labor, that Indian community has been rooted, so to speak, in the very town which they, in fact, have established. Now, they are being uprooted from their homes, to suffer an entire displacement of their dwelling and a wholesale dislocation of business.

In another town in Transval area, the Indian people have been warned to leave their homes and establishments and move to an arid area not far away from the town. The irony in this tragedy is that these restrictions are designed for the pleasure, the taste and luxury of the white man in South Africa. In the words of a Deputy Mayor, these Indians are moved simply because, "they are surrounded by whites." I wonder if any movement is justified, why should not the white people be moved, they are the minority, they are the descendants of colonialism and the sons of imperialism.

I have cited these illustrations only to draw a picture in miniature of the distressing plight of these people. The picture in its real magnitude leaves no conscience undisturbed and no mind

unperturbed. We, in the U.N. cannot stay unmoved witnessing this human tragedy related year after year.

I sincerely and earnestly think that an approach to the problem must be earnest and serious. We must have a serious and earnest role to play in the matter before the situation reaches the point of explosion.

This item I submit must belong to all of us not only to India and Pakistan-not even to the Afro-Asian states. We must take it as belonging to humanity as a whole. Such items must be viewed by the U.N. as the property of the U.N. We cannot be neutral to injustice. We cannot be absolved of our responsibilities, simply by resigning to the out-modeled plea-we are not involved-we are not directly concerned-our interests are not involved-our citizens are not affected. This is the most dangerous approach to follow in the United Nations. Under the Charter of the U.N. we are all involved, our interests are at stake, and all of us must be directly concerned. The world has been so interlinked that no member state can sit arms folded in abdication, only to say, it is none of my business. U.N. problems must be our problems, and this problem of the 500 thousand Indians must be the problem of all, and the deep concern of all.

These 500 thousand Indians are looking to the U.N. for support, not simply in verbal pronouncements, but in actual and effective measures. They have had much of pious appeals and sober advice. Their grievances as voiced by their leaders is heartrending. In their statements, the words tremble with agony and horror. Dr. S. Coopan, a leading South African Indian has referred to South Africa as a "hell under the sunshine". He charged South Africa with genocide. Another South African Indian leader, Mr. Naiker, has described the Group Areas Act as "leading to a life without hope and purpose, a life cut off from the moors of civilization and a life at the mercy of those who rule".

These and similar pronouncements, Mr. Chairman, are addressed to all of us-to the U.N., as a custodian of human rights, as a guardian of fundamental liberties and over and above, as the last hope for the trodden peoples all over the world. The U.N. must rise to its responsibilities and respond to the cry of the people.

I trust Mr. Chairman, this moving appeal which I am making to the committee, is not misunderstood or misconstrued. We have no ax to grind in this matter. We are not directly involved, nor our interests or our citizens. But this is not the criterion which guides our intervention, nor should it be. We are and should be one with the people of Indian origin We must take the item as though they are our citizens, maltreated, persecuted and humiliated.

It is in this spirit that I appeal to you to feel the problem. To reach a decisive stand we must feel the problem-we must live in its stirrings and its turbulence, so that we are stirred to positive action. These people of South Africa are suffering from a century old grievance. All international efforts to resolve the problem have so far failed, whether before or after the U.N.

In 1914, there was an agreement concluded between Ghandi and Smuts to lighten the yoke under which the Indians were living. The name of Ghandi associated with the agreement is sufficient to give it sanctity and meticulous observance, but South Africa has chosen to violate the terms of the agreement.

The Cape Town agreement, which was concluded as a result of the round table conference in 1927 between India and South Africa, has also been violated. The clause well known in the agreement as the "uplift clause" was given a "down lift" by South Africa. The situation, instead of amelioration, has progressively moved to deterioration.

In 1932 the governments of India and South Africa have reaffirmed the Capetown agreement, but South Africa has again reaffirmed its adamant defiance and its stringent violation.

This is the record of South Africa prior to the U.N. With the advent of the U.N. it was assumed that human beings would be treated humanly if not humanely. This is a correct assumption, for what is the worth of the United Nations if a human being cannot live at peace in his home. What is the value of the U.N. if a citizen, any citizen, can be uprooted from his home, and just planted like any plant, any where and whenever the vicious gardener desires, capriciously and arbitrarily.

The record in the U.N. since 1946 is not difficult to explore. Our distinguished colleague of India has made our task easy. He has traced the resolutions of the General Assembly down to the present day. Ever since its inception, the U.N. has stressed that South Africa should shape her policy in accordance with the principles of the Charter. Time and again, the General Assembly has urged the parties to enter into negotiations, to reach a solution in accordance with the principles of the charter. What was the position of South Africa?

In a word, South Africa has diametrically defied the United Nations. South Africa refused to abide by the will of the U.N., rejected conciliation, resisted negotiation, opposed investigation and in brief, stuck in the mud the rusty plea of domestic jurisdiction.

To meet this abominable situation, we have chosen at this resumed session to table a resolution that does not in fact rise to the height of the tragedy. All what the resolution has spelled out is a gentle appeal couched in gentle words urging for negotiations-an appeal that has been repeated by the Assembly in the past 15 years and repeatedly disregarded by South Africa. In his brilliant statement to the committee, the distinguished representative of Pakistan has most ably and eloquently referred

to this resolution as expressing the minimum concern of the international community.

This is a fair and well balanced assessment of the resolution to which we are co-sponsors. We have hoped for a stronger resolution, not in language, but in terms of positive action. This is a chronic case where ordinary and conservative treatment is of no avail. We must move from declarations of principles into the stage of action in terms of sanctions and effective deterrent measures. Moral pressure and the moral voice of the international community have not been heeded by South Africa. No less than 15 resolutions of the U.N. have been flatly rejected by South Africa. At a time, South Africa had the courage, I dare say, the shamelessness to speak of the Capetown Agreement as a fairy tale. Maybe the whole U.N. to South Africa is a fairy tale, or anything with a tale.

Such a situation, Mr. Chairman, must be stopped. Surely there must be an end to this tragedy. In Africa what is at stake is the destiny of the people. Here in the U.N. what is at stake is the authority and prestige of the U.N. The problem boils down to this central question-should one or two member states be allowed to resist the will of the U.N. forever and ever? Obviously there must be an answer to this question, an answer worthy of our organization, as the last refuge for fairness and justice.

I take this resolution now tabled before the committee as the last resolution on this matter-the last attempt in the series of appeals and solicitations. For our part, we submit this resolution as a final warning to South Africa, to harken to the counsel of wisdom and to heed the dictates of international decency. Should we find at the forthcoming session that South Africa still maintains her position of defiance, we would be forced to look for a way out of this disastrous dilemma.

Happily the way out has been pointed out by a very responsible and highly distinguished gathering. In the

commonwealth meeting which was held recently in London, it was made plain to South Africa that her readmission into the Commonwealth as a republic under the gloomy shadow of apartheid will not be entertained. Contrary to certain reports, the matter was not a question of free withdrawal on the part of South Africa. It was a courteous expulsion of South Africa. From the membership of the Commonwealth. Although we are not on friendly terms with Great Britain through her fault, still, we cannot withhold our admiration for this attitude taken by the Commonwealth as a whole. It was a bold step, no doubt. It is true, the Commonwealth has decreased by one, but their dignity and integrity has increased many fold. With racial discrimination in their midst the Commonwealth becomes common poverty-rather a common bankruptcy.

This is the way out as nobly chosen by a great body of nations, presided by great men, the prominent leaders of their people. Like the English Parliament, the Commonwealth is without a written constitution, but they have written into this free international association, a Magna Carta for this era-a Carta under which they have refused comradeship with human persecution embodied in race superiority and race discrimination. Such, is a glorious achievement, that should go down in history as a great triumph for humanity.

Parallel with this, our organization has a charter, clear and mandatory. Our charter provides for sanctions of various degrees, economic, political and what not. Our charter provides for suspension of membership and even for expulsion from the U.N. We should tell Shout Africa from this platform and through various ways and means that we are bound to conceive these measures in the forthcoming session should South Africa continue her policy of racial discrimination. In fact, the President of Ghana, the Prime Ministers of Nigeria, Federation of Malaya, India and Pakistan, to mention only the Commonwealth

members, have at many times contemplated punitive measures against South Africa.

This week, President Nkrumah reiterated the necessity for applying the sanctions against South Africa. In a dispatch to the New York Times, President Nkrumah declared as follows:

"Now that South Africa has decided to continue her apartheid system and has elected to withdraw from the Commonwealth, it is incumbent on all the members of the Commonwealth and the duty of all nations in the world to bring pressure to bear on South Africa to abandon her apartheid system, imposing total economic and political sanctions on her".

Some other Heads of Governments in Asia and Africa have made similar representations. Thus the case is ripe for sanctions.

I am fully aware, Mr. Chairman, that this is a harsh treatment to be extended to South Africa, but South Africa deserves it. Anyhow, such a treatment is less painful than the maltreatment of South Africans, and surely less degrading than the degradation of the U.N. With one or two members dropped out, this organization will gain strength and integrity. It is not a healthy universality to have with us member addicted to consistent violations. In the U.N. a clash of views is understandable, but a defiance that subsists for fifteen years is unthinkable. Happily like South Africa, without mentioning any name, there is no more than one member state, who defied the U.N. so constantly and so persistently.

It is high time for the U.N. to redeem its authority and save its integrity. The U.N. could only be a tower of strength by the quality, rather than the quantity of our membership. Even in sports clubs or social associations, the criterion for membership is god behaviour and decent manners. We cannot allow the U.N. to lag behind these standards, or step down below the levels of

students' clubs. States, like South Africa, with such a conduct, must have no room in our organization. This is not simply an interpretation of the charter. This is the letter and spirit of the charter, if we are really determined to respect the Charter.

Such states, therefore, will either be tamed into decency, or we do without them. It is with his warning in mind, Mr. Chairman, that we find a breath of relief in this modest, soft and gentle resolution, that stands in our name before the committee.

Our rendezvous with South Africa, shall be the forthcoming session. Let us pray that it will be a pleasant rendezvous.