A/SPC/L.7 and Add.1. Australia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, France, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Philippines, United Kingdom, United States draft resolution adopted by Special Political Committee by roll-call vote of 45 to 8, with 22 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Luxembour*, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Against: Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian SSR, USSR.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Austria, Bolivia, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Egypt, Finland, India, Indonesia, Israel, Jordan, Laos, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Yugoslavia.

A/SPC/L.8 and Corr.1 and Add.1. Australia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, France, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Philippines, United Kingdom, United States draft resolution adopted by roll-call vote of 44 votes to 8, with 23 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Against: Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian SSR, USSR.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Austria, Bolivia, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Egypt, Finland, India, Indonesia, Israel, Jordan, Laos, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Yugoslavia.

A/SPC/L.9. USSR draft resolution.

A/SPC/L.10. Argentina amendments to joint draft resolution, A/SPC/L.7.


A/SPC/L.12. India and Syria draft resolution.


RESOLUTION 1017 A and B (XI), as recommended by Special Political Committee, A/3519, adopted by Assembly on 28 February 1957, meeting 663, as follows: 1017 A (XI) on Republic of Korea by 40 votes to 8, with 16 abstentions; 1017 B (XI) on Viet-Nam by 40 votes to 8, with 18 abstentions.

A "The General Assembly,
"Recalling its resolution 296 G (IV) of 22 November 1949 finding the Republic of Korea qualified for membership in the United Nations,
"Noting that the Republic of Korea has been excluded from membership in the United Nations because of the opposition of one of the permanent members of the Security Council,
"1. Reaffirms its determination that the Republic of Korea is fully qualified for admission to membership in the United Nations;
"2. Requests the Security Council to reconsider the application of the Republic of Korea in the light of this determination and to report to the General Assembly as soon as possible."

B "The General Assembly,
"Recalling its resolution 620 C (VII) of 21 December 1952 finding Viet-Nam qualified for membership in the United Nations,
"Noting that Viet-Nam has been excluded from membership in the United Nations because of the opposition of one of the permanent members of the Security Council,
"1. Reaffirms its determination that Viet-Nam is fully qualified for admission to membership in the United Nations;
"2. Requests the Security Council to reconsider the application of Viet-Nam in the light of this determination and to report to the General Assembly as soon as possible."

S/3803. Letter of 4 March 1957 from Secretary-General to President of Security Council.

CHAPTER VI
THE QUESTION OF ALGERIA

On 12 April 1956, in a letter to the President of the Security Council, 17 Asian-African Member States stated that the situation in Algeria had been deteriorating to such an extent that the United Nations could not remain indifferent to the threat to peace and to the flagrant
violation of fundamental human rights. The letter came from the representatives of Afghanistan, Burma, Ceylon, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Pakistan, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand and Yemen.

On 13 June, the representatives of Afghanistan, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand and Yemen wrote to the President of the Security Council asking for an early meeting of the Security Council to consider the grave situation in Algeria under Article 35, paragraph 1, of the United Nations Charter, particularly in view of recent important military action taken by France.

The Council held two meetings on 26 June to consider whether to place the matter raised by these 13 Powers on its agenda.

Before the adoption of the agenda was considered, the USSR representative formally proposed postponing discussion, since the question was important and the Council required more time to collect information. France was against the USSR proposal because the 13 Member States had asked for consideration without delay. The representatives of Belgium and the United Kingdom held that the Council could not postpone discussion of an item before deciding to discuss it.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 7 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

When the Council resumed consideration of the adoption of its agenda, the representative of France requested the Council not to include the complaint in its agenda as Algerian affairs fell essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of France. It would, he said, be a dangerous precedent to recognize the right of the United Nations to intervene vis-a-vis the government of a State which was exercising one of the most normal attributes of domestic sovereignty, namely, maintaining public order which had been disturbed by rebellious citizens. Such action would also violate Article 34 and Article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter, since the Council was competent only to consider a dispute or a situation the continuance of which was likely to endanger "international" peace and security. The 13 States had referred only to a threat to the peace. Neither the violation of fundamental human rights nor the denial of the right of self-determination fell within the competence of the Council.

The representatives of Cuba, the United Kingdom and Belgium agreed that the United Nations, under Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, was precluded from dealing with the matter, because Algeria was constitutionally an integral part of France. The United Nations should not allow itself to be used by Member States to encourage open and violent defiance by elements of the population of other countries against their lawfully constituted governments.

The representatives of China, Peru and the United States felt that a debate at that time would not achieve any practical results.

The representative of Iran maintained that the Algerian question did not fall essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of France. Algeria, he said, had been an independent country before 1830. The Algerian sovereignty vested in the Algerian people was inalienable. It had not disappeared. Refusal to allow the Algerian people the right of self-determination would violate the Charter, particularly Article 1, paragraph 2. Moreover, the Declaration of Human Rights applied in this case, regardless of whether Algeria was an integral part of France or a French colony. Thus, a question concerning the violation of human rights and affecting relations between Member States could not be regarded as essentially a matter of domestic jurisdiction. Further, by including the Algerian question in its agenda, the Council would in no way prejudice its competence or the substance of the question.

The USSR representative also requested the inclusion of the question in the agenda. The parties must be heard to determine whether or not any threat to peace existed, he said, and the matter must be objectively examined to find a solution.

The Council, however, decided against the adoption of the provisional agenda, by 7 votes against to 2 in favour (Iran, USSR), with 2 abstentions (China, Yugoslavia).

On 25 October 1956, the representative of France requested that the item "Military assistance rendered by the Egyptian Government to the rebels in Algeria" be placed on the agenda of a forthcoming meeting of the Security Council. In making this request, he stated that a vessel, the Athos, with a cargo of
arms from the Egyptian authorities to the rebels in Algeria, had been intercepted by a French warship on 16 October. Such action by the Egyptian Government constituted an attack on French sovereignty prohibited under international law.

On 29 October 1956, the Security Council decided without vote to include the item on the agenda, but did not discuss it.

On 4 February 1957, the representative of France transmitted additional information to the Security Council about the cargo of the Athos.

CONSIDERATION BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY

On 2 October 1956, Afghanistan, Burma, Ceylon, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Pakistan, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria and Yemen asked that the "Question of Algeria" be included in the agenda of the General Assembly's eleventh session. At the Assembly's tenth session, they recalled, they had accepted postponement of further discussion of the question in the hope that France would meanwhile negotiate a peaceful settlement with the Algerian people. That hope had been in vain. France had continued its acts of extensive military repression, and had increased its armed forces in Algeria from 150,000 men to over 450,000. By its policy of repression and extermination of the Algerian people, France had violated the Genocide Convention to which it was a party. Continuing the repressive operations would endanger international peace. The General Assembly had a compelling responsibility to end such acts of repression and genocide.

On 15 November 1956, the Assembly decided to include the item on the agenda. The matter was considered by the First Committee between 4 and 13 February 1957.

The representative of France stated that, although he challenged the competence of the United Nations to deal with a problem essentially of a domestic nature, he had not opposed the inclusion of the item. One reason for not opposing it was that France wished to reply publicly to the campaign of systematic denigration directed against it for several years. It wished to draw attention to foreign interference in the Algerian question, which would have been settled if certain Powers had not kept the conflict alive by their deliveries of weapons and by propaganda. Further, having demonstrated how a democratic country heeded United Nations recommendations, France wished to afford to each Member an opportunity of showing equal respect for the Charter.

This position, he added, was not inconsistent with France's contention that Article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter precluded consideration of the Algerian question. Moreover, the Charter contained no specific provision granting the Assembly any power to make recommendations with regard to the right of peoples to self-determination. On the contrary, the United Nations was committed to respect the national boundaries of its Member States, and any intervention it made in violation of the principle of domestic jurisdiction would imply a direct threat to the territorial integrity and, indeed, to the very existence of States.

Actually, the French settlement of Algeria was the result of the legitimate occupation of a territory at a time when no sovereignty was exercised in the territory. For more than 120 years no State had contested the legitimacy of the French occupation. France was thus entitled to decide, in accordance with its own constitution, what political system it desired to apply in Algeria, and it would not accept any Assembly recommendation concerning Algeria. France had considerably improved living conditions in Algeria, particularly by its efforts in such fields as public health, economic expansion, agricultural development, public utilities, social welfare and administrative reforms.

The French representative maintained that the present rebellion in Algeria resulted from activities of terrorist groups which had been gradually reorganized in recent years, more often than not with the help and at the bidding of foreign powers. He singled Egypt out as the country which had most systematically and continuously supported the Algerian rebellion. Egypt, he contended, had resorted to propaganda and incitement to violence, trained terrorist cadres on its own territory and supplied arms to the Algerian rebels.

France, however, was always ready to offer a liberal political solution, to be achieved in
three successive stages: (1) an unconditional cease-fire; (2) free elections supervised by both sides and possibly in the presence of observers from genuinely democratic countries; (3) discussion with elected representatives on the future regime of Algeria. The eventual regime remained to be worked out in such discussions, but France would agree to define Algeria's individual characteristics while maintaining the necessary links with Metropolitan France, including retention by France of a permanent power of arbitration to prevent the oppression of either community (European or Moslem) by the other.

Several other representatives also argued that the United Nations was not competent to intervene. Many States would never have agreed to become Members of the United Nations if Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter had not precluded intervention in essentially domestic matters. That over-riding principle constituted the fundamental condition and limitation of the obligations imposed on Member States by other provisions of the Charter. Also stressed was the fact that internal tension between communities of different origins and cultures had arisen in various countries in Asia and the Americas. It would, therefore, certainly be dangerous for the cohesion of the Organization if it interfered in each case and decreed how the principle of self-determination should be exercised.

Those representatives who considered the Assembly competent to deal with the Algerian problem cited the instances of United Nations intervention in the question of Hungary and in the questions of the treatment of people of Indian origin and of apartheid policy pursued by the Union of South Africa. Those who challenged the Assembly's competence replied that the question of Hungary was not comparable with that of Algeria. In the first case, foreign troops, namely, those of the Soviet Union, had intervened in the internal affairs of a State over which the Soviet Union had no sovereignty, and the Hungarian Government had, at the time, appealed to the United Nations for help. As to questions concerning South Africa, they considered United Nations intervention illegal and protested that one mistake should not be used to justify another.

Several other representatives contended that the United Nations was competent to deal with the Algerian problem because it did not fall exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of France. In their view, Algeria had been a sovereign State before the French occupation and had not been integrated into France either in fact or in law. Whatever the political methods used by France, Algeria was not a part of a genuine Union. It was neither a Trust Territory nor a mandate. The relationship of France and Algeria was rather that of one country trying to colonize another. According to international law and to the United Nations Charter, it was further argued, the Algerian people had an inalienable right to self-determination. Moreover, France itself had admitted that the Algerian question was not its exclusive concern by referring to it in a communiqué issued jointly with the USSR on 19 March 1956. United Nations action was justified since the Algerian situation threatened world peace and the freedom of nations and had provoked tension in the relations between the Arab world, especially Egypt, and the West. It was also clear that Article 11, paragraph 4, of the Charter empowered the Assembly to discuss all matters within the scope of the Charter, which included in the right of people to self-determination.

Among those presenting such views were the representatives of Ceylon, Egypt, Iraq, Morocco, Syria, Tunisia.

The Egyptian representative, in addition, rejected French charges of Egyptian intervention in Algeria. He denied that Egypt had shipped arms by sea for use against the French in Algeria. He considered that the French Government was seeking to divert responsibility for the distressing situation in Algeria onto the shoulders of Egypt. Also, in claiming that Egypt was giving military aid to the so-called "rebels", France was perhaps seeking to justify its act of "aggression" against Egypt, perpetrated in conjunction with the United Kingdom and Israel.

Several representatives also maintained that Algeria had developed very little under the French colonial regime. Whatever progress had been achieved had benefited mostly the European settlers. The Algerian liberation movement, they declared, was a mass movement genuinely representative of the Algerian people as a
THE QUESTION OF ALGERIA

whole, purely patriotic and not Communist. The only legitimate objective was to ensure for the Algerian people the exercise of their right to self-determination and independence. Once this principle had been established, a provisional Algerian government might be constituted, to enter into negotiations with France. Concurrently with the establishment of such a government, a cease-fire should be ordered. The United Nations could play a valuable part in such a solution by recommending negotiations to those concerned and indicating on what basis they should be held.

Some other representatives, however, held that the question of Algeria should be solved by direct negotiations between France and representatives of the people of Algeria, without United Nations intervention. The problem was a very serious one but the competence of the Organization in the matter was doubtful. If the United Nations did not respect the legal and political status enjoyed by a State when it joined the Organization, all kinds of revisions of political boundaries would be permitted. This would result in transforming a peaceful Organization into an instrument of discord and, ultimately, of war. It was, however, true that the United Nations rested on two competing principles: on the one hand, the Organization could not seek to alter the organic constitutions of its Members; on the other hand, the Charter recognized the right of self-determination of peoples. Which of those principles should prevail was open to question. In the present case, they considered it preferable to trust the liberal and generous tradition of France, to find a constructive solution on the basis of direct agreement with Algeria. The Assembly should avoid any action which might impede a cease-fire and a programme for a settlement. It would, therefore, be advisable not to vote any resolution. If, however, a resolution had to be adopted, in order to conform to an established practice, it should merely express the hope of all Member States that the Algerian question might be settled by peaceful and democratic means. It was essential to create a climate in which a political solution could be negotiated with calm and reason.

During the debate, three draft resolutions were introduced. One was sponsored jointly by the following 18 Powers: Afghanistan, Burma, Ceylon, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia and Yemen. By this, the General Assembly, having regard to "the situation of unrest and strife in Algeria" which was "causing much human suffering and disturbing the harmony between nations", and recognizing "the right of the people of Algeria to self-determination according to the principles of the Charter", would: (1) request France to respond to the desire of the people of Algeria to exercise their fundamental right of self-determination; (2) invite France and the people of Algeria to enter into immediate negotiations with a view to the cessation of hostilities and the peaceful settlement of their differences in accordance with the Charter; and (3) ask the Secretary-General to assist the parties in conducting such negotiations and to report to the Assembly's twelfth session.

The second draft resolution was sponsored by Japan, the Philippines and Thailand. By this, the Assembly would express the hope that the Algerian people would endeavour, through appropriate negotiations, to bring about the end of bloodshed and the peaceful settlement of the present difficulties. It would do so having regard to "the situation of unrest in Algeria" which was causing "much human suffering and loss of lives", and believing that "the unsatisfactory situation now prevailing in Algeria" might be "normalized by the joint efforts of France and the Algerian people to find an equitable solution in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations".

The third draft resolution was submitted by the following six Powers: Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Italy and Peru. By this, the Assembly, having heard the statements of the French and other delegations and having discussed the question of Algeria, would express the hope that a peaceful and democratic solution of this question would be found.

These three draft resolutions were put to the vote on 13 February 1957, the representative of France declaring that he would not participate in the voting. The 18-Power draft resolution was voted on paragraph-by-paragraph by roll-call votes. In view of the rejection
of the first two operative paragraphs, the First Committee voted neither on the third operative paragraph nor on the draft resolution as a whole. The first operative paragraph was rejected by 34 votes to 33, with 10 abstentions, and the second by a vote of 34 to 33, with 9 abstentions.

The Committee then decided by 38 votes to 35, with 3 abstentions, to give priority to the six-Power draft resolution, which was adopted as a whole by a roll-call vote of 41 to 33, with 3 abstentions. The three-Power draft resolution was subsequently adopted as a whole by a roll-call vote of 37 to 27, with 13 abstentions, after paragraph-by-paragraph roll-call votes. Accordingly, the First Committee recommended to the Assembly the adoption of two draft resolutions, each of which had been approved by a simple majority.

The matter came before a plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 15 February 1957. Before it was the report of the First Committee, and also a new draft resolution sponsored by the following nine Powers: Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Italy, Japan, Peru, the Philippines and Thailand. By this, the Assembly, having heard the statements made by various delegations, having discussed the question of Algeria and having regard to the situation in Algeria which was causing much suffering and loss of human lives, would express the hope that, in a spirit of co-operation, a peaceful, democratic and just solution would be found, through appropriate means, in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

The President of the General Assembly pointed out that this new draft resolution was a conciliatory text submitted by the sponsors of the six-Power and the three-Power draft resolutions adopted by the First Committee. The General Assembly adopted the new, nine-Power draft resolution by 77 votes to 0. This result followed a roll-call vote of 75 to 0, with 1 abstention. Immediately after the roll-call, the representative of Costa Rica, absent during the voting, requested that his delegation be recorded as voting in favour of the resolution, and the United Kingdom representative corrected his vote to one in favour.
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A/L.220. Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Italy, Japan, Peru, Philippines, Thailand draft resolution.

RESOLUTION 1012(XI), as submitted by nine Powers, A/L.220, adopted unanimously by the Assembly on 15 February, meeting 654. (See article above for details on vote.)

"The General Assembly, "Having heard the statements made by various delegations and discussed the question of Algeria, "Having regard to the situation in Algeria which is causing much suffering and loss of human lives, "Expresses the hope that, in a spirit of co-operation, a peaceful, democratic and just solution will be found, through appropriate means, in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations."

CHAPTER VII

THE QUESTION OF CYPRUS

On 13 March 1946, Greece requested that the General Assembly put the question of Cyprus on the agenda of its eleventh session. In an explanatory memorandum, the Greek Government ascribed the breakdown of negotiations between the Governor of Cyprus and the Cypriot leader, Archbishop Makarios, to the refusal of the United Kingdom Government to recognize the right of self-determination of the people of Cyprus. It further charged the United Kingdom with having set up a powerful, repressive military machine of about 20,000 troops in the island. Had the Assembly carried out its responsibilities in regard to the Cyprus issue in 1954 (as Greece had then asked), the present critical situation in Cyprus would not have developed. This situation had had an immediate and understandable repercussion in Greece, straining Greek-British relations heavily. Further, members of the United Kingdom Government had recently stated officially that Cyprus would be kept under colonial rule because of strategic and political considerations and, in particular, that it was to be used to defend British oil interests in the Middle East.

On 12 October 1956, the United Kingdom proposed a new item, entitled "Support from Greece for terrorism in Cyprus", for the agenda of the eleventh session of the General Assembly. In an explanatory memorandum, the United Kingdom charged Greece with inciting and materially supporting terrorism in the island over a considerable period. It added that up to 6 November 1956, terrorist organizations in Cyprus had murdered 196 persons, of whom 114 were Cypriots. The obvious objective of terrorism was not to secure democracy, but to secure by force the annexation of Cyprus to Greece. This objective had not been disguised by Athens Radio. The time had thus come for the United Nations to consider this external attempt to change the status of Cyprus by force and subversion.

On 14 November, the General Assembly considered a recommendation from its General Committee to merge the Greek and British complaints into a single item for inclusion on the Assembly's agenda.

The United Kingdom representative argued that although Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter precluded the United Nations from interfering in the internal affairs of the United Kingdom with regard to Cyprus, the Assembly could and should consider that aspect of the situation covered by the item proposed by the United Kingdom. He agreed, however, that